



South Ripley
SOLAR PROJECT

ConnectGen Chautauqua County LLC

South Ripley Solar Project

Matter No. 21-00750

900-2.9 Exhibit 8

Supplement 2

Visual Impacts

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXHIBIT 8	VISUAL IMPACTS.....	1
(a)	Visual Impact Assessment.....	1
(1)	Character and Visual Quality of the Existing Landscape.....	1
(2)	Visibility of the Facility.....	2
(3)	Visibility of Above-ground Interconnections and Roadways.....	3
(4)	Appearance of the Facility Upon Completion.....	3
(5)	Lighting.....	4
(6)	Photographic Overlays.....	4
(7)	Nature and Degree of Visual Change from Construction.....	4
(8)	Nature and Degree of Visual Change from Operation.....	5
(9)	Operational Effects of the Facility.....	5
(10)	Description of Visual Resources to be Affected.....	7
(b)	Viewshed Analysis.....	8
(1)	Viewshed Maps.....	9
(2)	Viewshed Methodology.....	9
(3)	Sensitive Viewing Areas.....	12
(4)	Viewpoint Selection.....	12
(c)	Visual Contrast Evaluation.....	14
(1)	Photographic Simulations.....	14
(2)	Additional Simulations Illustrating Mitigation.....	14
(3)	Simulation Comparison.....	14
(d)	Visual Impacts Minimization and Mitigation Plan.....	18
(1)	Advertisements.....	18
(2)	Electrical Collection System.....	18
(3)	Transmission Facilities.....	19
(4)	Conductors.....	19
(5)	Wind Facilities Equipment.....	19
(6)	Shadow Flicker for Wind Facilities.....	19
(7)	Glare for Solar Facilities.....	19
(8)	Planting Plans.....	19
(9)	Lighting Plan.....	20
	REFERENCES.....	21

LIST OF TABLES

Table 8-1. Viewpoints Selected for Production of Visual Simulations13
Table 8-2. Summary of Rating Panel Results16

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 8-A Visual Impact Assessment
Appendix 8-B Visual Impacts Minimization and Mitigation Plan

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A Technical Memorandum in Response to Notice of Incomplete Application

EXHIBIT 8 VISUAL IMPACTS

(a) Visual Impact Assessment

The Applicant engaged Environmental Design & Research, Landscape Architecture, Engineering & Environmental Services, D.P.C. (EDR) to conduct a Visual Impact Assessment (VIA; see Appendix 8-A) that describes the extent and significance of Facility¹ visibility. The VIA includes identification of visually sensitive resources (VSRs), viewshed mapping, results of field review, visual simulations (photographic overlays), and proposed visual impact mitigation. In response to the Notice of Incomplete Application submitted by the Office of Renewable Energy Siting (ORES) on October 12, 2021, EDR revised the VIA to reevaluate the visual impact associated with the Interconnection Facilities due to changes in design and layout, further describe visual effects from properties of historic significance, and provide additional information related to viewpoint selection and cumulative visual impacts. In response to the Notice of Incomplete Application submitted by the Office of Renewable Energy Siting (ORES), EDR revised the VIA to re-evaluate the visual impact associated with the Interconnection Facilities due to changes in design and layout, further describe visual effect from properties of historic significance, and provide additional information related to viewpoint selection and cumulative visual impacts. In addition, EDR provided additional information related to potential visibility and visual effect from VSRS in a Technical Memorandum dated March 28, 2022. The methodology and results of the VIA are further described in Appendix 8-A and summarized herein.

In addition, in response to the second Notice of Incomplete Application submitted by the ORES on March 28, 2022, EDR, on behalf of the Applicant, performed additional characterization of potential Facility visibility through the use of line-of-site (LOS) cross sections from the Ripley Rod & Gun Club, Chautauqua Lake Snowmobile Trail, and the Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area. The deficiency response and results of these additional LOS analyses are detailed in a Technical Memorandum dated April 1, 2022 (Attachment A).

(1) Character and Visual Quality of the Existing Landscape

Per the requirements set forth in §900-2.9(b), the Visual Study Area (VSA) is defined as the area within 2 miles of the Facility Site. It should be noted that VSRs with federal jurisdiction (e.g., National Register of Historic Places, National Natural Landmarks, National Wildlife Refuges) were identified within 5 miles of the Facility, in accordance with §900-1.2. The VSA is described in Sections 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3 and shown on Figure 3.1-1 of the VIA.

¹ As defined throughout this Application, the Facility collectively refers to PV modules and their rack/support systems; direct current (DC) collection lines and communications cables connecting the modules to inverters; the inverters, and foundations, control electronics, step-up transformers; buried and overhead alternating current (AC) medium voltage collection lines; security fencing and gates around each array of PV modules; gravel access roads; temporary laydown areas; medium voltage-to-transmission voltage collection substation with associated equipment and fenced areas; a short length of transmission voltage line (approximately 200 feet) to connect the Facility to the designated POI; a switching station, to be owned by National Grid, that loops the Erie to Dunkirk 230 kV transmission line through the POI; an operations and maintenance (O&M) facility at the collection substation with off-site storage containers located outside of collection substation fencing; a battery energy storage system; and any other improvements subject to the Office of Renewable Energy Siting (ORES) jurisdiction.

Within the VSA, four distinct landscape types exist. These Landscape Similarity Zones (LSZs) can provide a useful framework for describing the character and visual quality of the existing landscape and can facilitate the analysis of a project's potential visual effects. In accordance with established visual assessment methods (notably, United States Department of Agriculture [USDA] Forest Service, 1995; Smardon et al., 1988; United States Department of Transportation [USDOT] Federal Highway Administration, 1981; United States Department of the Interior [USDI] Bureau of Land Management [BLM], 1980), LSZs within the VSA were defined and mapped. These include Forest, Rural Residential/Agricultural, River Gorge, and Transportation Corridor LSZs. The extent of each LSZ within the VSA is depicted on Figure 3.3-2 of the VIA and representative photographs of the LSZs are illustrated in Figures 3.3-1 through Figure 3.3-4 of the VIA. In addition, VSRs were identified based on consultation with State and local governments and organizations with knowledge of local cultural and historical resources. VSRs are discussed in Section(b)(3) below and in Section 3.6 of the VIA.

(2) Visibility of the Facility

The VIA (Appendix 8-A) includes an analysis of the potential visibility of the Facility and identifies locations within the VSA where it may be possible to view the proposed PV arrays, overhead collection lines, and the interconnection facility (comprised of the collection substation and associated O&M building, the point of interconnection [POI] switchyard, and the battery energy storage system [BESS] and adjacent O&M yard). PV panels will be installed on a fixed tilt racking system, consisting of a steel frame secured to support piles driven into the ground on which the individual PV modules are mounted. The PV panels are fastened together to create a continuous row on the racking. The PV panels will have a typical height of 13 feet above the ground at their highest point. The methodology used to prepare the viewshed (i.e., visibility) analyses for the Facility is described in Section 4.1.1 of the VIA and summarized in Section (b)(2) of this Exhibit. Viewshed maps (see Figures 5.1-1, 5.1-2, and 5.1-3 in the VIA) show areas where the Facility will potentially be visible, and areas where existing topography, vegetation, and structures will screen potential views of the Facility.

As described in Section 4.1.2 of the VIA, EDR personnel conducted field reviews to verify results of the viewshed analysis. During these site visits, EDR staff members drove public roads and visited public vantage points within the VSA to document locations from which the PV arrays and other Facility components would likely be visible, partially screened, or fully screened. EDR determined potential Facility visibility based on the known location and dimensions of Facility components, the location of screening vegetation and structures, and the visibility of existing identifiable fields and landscape features on and around the Facility Site, which served as location and scale references. During the field review, photographs were obtained from 77 separate viewpoints to document potential visibility of the Facility from the various LSZs, distance zones, directions, and VSRs throughout the VSA. As

discussed in Section 5.1.3 of the VIA, the results of the field reviews suggest that the viewshed analyses generally provide an accurate indication of Facility visibility. A photolog, including a representative photograph in the direction of the Facility Site from each viewpoint visited during field review, is included in Attachment B of the VIA. Further information regarding viewpoint selection for simulations and photograph details is presented in Sections 4.1.2 and 4.2 of the VIA.

(3) Visibility of Above-ground Interconnections and Roadways

To the extent that they are visible, access roads and the above-ground interconnection components of the Facility are depicted in the visual simulations included as Attachment D in the VIA. The above-ground electrical components include the interconnection facilities (the collection substation and associated O&M building, POI switchyard, and BESS and adjacent O&M yard) and overhead collection and transmission lines. Most of the equipment in the collection substation, POI switchyard, and BESS will remain below a height of 40 feet with the exception of the overhead gantry H-frame structures, which will have a maximum height of 70 feet. The equipment within the collection substation, POI switchyard, and the BESS will be installed on concrete foundations and enclosed by chain link fencing topped with barbed wire strands per industry safety and security standards and best practices. The overhead collection lines will be approximately 4.6 miles long and will utilize wood or steel pole structures with heights ranging from 41 to 75 feet above ground level. Section 5.1.1 of the VIA includes a viewshed analysis of the interconnection facility and overhead collection lines (see VIA Figure 5.1-2 and Figure 5.1.3).

(4) Appearance of the Facility Upon Completion

To show anticipated visual changes associated with the proposed Facility, EDR used high-resolution computer-enhanced image processing (Autodesk 3ds Max Design®) to create realistic photographic simulations of the proposed Facility from 13 selected viewpoints. The methodology used to create the simulations is described in Section 4.2.2 of the VIA. Photographic simulations were developed to create a simulated perspective (camera view) to match the location, bearing, and focal length of the existing conditions photograph(s) for each viewpoint. Some of the locations chosen for viewpoint simulations were provided through the visual consultation with the municipal representatives (See Exhibit 2 and Appendix 2-B of the 94-c Application for more details about municipal consultations).

As described in the Visual Impacts Minimization and Mitigation Plan (VIMMP; see Appendix 8-B), while the Applicant has attempted to avoid and minimize potential visual impacts, there are instances where potential visual impacts may occur. In response to these potential impacts, the Applicant has developed a comprehensive Landscape Mitigation Planting Plan (Attachment 1 of the VIMMP), using native species and natural

arrangements/designs that mimic the natural character of roadside vegetation, hedgerows and woodlots in the VSA, to minimize and mitigate the Facility's visual effect on the surrounding landscape. Proposed mitigation plantings were incorporated into the series of simulations for each viewpoint, where applicable, showing the existing view, a simulated view of Facility components prior to installation of plantings, and the view with associated mitigation plantings simulated. To accomplish this, three-dimensional plant models representing each of the species proposed were placed into the simulation model at the locations specified in the plan. The models were sized to reflect five to seven years of growth based on region-specific growth rates for the selected species. The plantings were then rendered to accurately represent shading that would occur on the ground and on the proposed Facility components based upon the time of year and day the photos were captured. The visual simulations include both leaf-on and leaf-off conditions of the proposed mitigation plantings. Simulations are included in Attachment D of the VIA.

(5) Lighting

The Applicant has developed a Lighting Plan (Attachment 2 of the VIMMP) that describes the security and exterior lighting design of the proposed Facility. No lighting will be installed as part of the PV arrays. The only light sources that are anticipated to be installed for the Facility are safety/security lighting at the collection substation and associated O&M building, POI switchyard, BESS, and the adjacent O&M yard comprised of three equipment storage containers. Illumination at the Facilities is designed to comply with applicable State and local standards. All proposed exterior lighting will be placed at the lowest practical height and will utilize shielded fixtures with no drop-down vertical elements to minimize light trespass and off-site spillage. Additionally, all lighting will utilize automatic activation dependent on light sensitive switches (with manual activation as a potential alternative) to minimize the duration of required lighting.

(6) Photographic Overlays

As mentioned previously, high-resolution computer-enhanced image processing was used to create realistic photographic simulations of the Facility components from each of 13 selected viewpoints to show anticipated visual changes associated with the proposed Facility. See Section 4.2.2 of the VIA for discussion of the methodology used to create the simulations, and Section 4.2.1 for a discussion of the viewpoint selection process. The visual simulations of the Facility are included in Attachment D of the VIA.

(7) Nature and Degree of Visual Change from Construction

Visual impacts during construction are described in Section 5.3.5 of the VIA. These impacts will be relatively minor and temporary in nature. Representative photographs of construction activities are included in the VIA. Anticipated

visual effects during construction will include soil disturbance, loss of vegetation, and addition of construction workers, equipment, and materials to certain views. Large construction equipment, including dump trucks, concrete trucks, excavators, pile driving equipment, and delivery vehicles will be present on and adjacent to the Facility Site over the course of several months during the construction phase.

(8) Nature and Degree of Visual Change from Operation

The methodology and results of the visual impact evaluation that was conducted as part of the VIA are described in Sections 4.2 and 5.3 of the VIA, respectively. The visual simulations included in Appendix D of the VIA were evaluated by a rating panel consisting of four registered landscape architects with experience in the visual/aesthetics field to determine the type and extent of visual impact likely to result from installation of the proposed Facility. The methodology utilized in this evaluation compared simulations of the completed Facility with photos of existing conditions at each viewpoint and was developed by EDR in 1999 (and subsequently updated) for use on utility-scale renewable energy projects. The methodology involves using a short evaluation form and a simple numerical rating process to: (1) document the basis for conclusions regarding visual impact, (2) allow for independent review and replication of the evaluation, and (3) allow many viewpoints to be evaluated in a reasonable amount of time. The results of this analysis are described in Section 5.3 and Appendices D and E of the VIA and summarized below in Section 8(c)(3) of this Exhibit.

(9) Operational Effects of the Facility

Unlike other forms of energy generation, solar projects typically have minimal operational visual effects associated with the process of generating electricity from the sun. For example, the Facility will not generate visible plumes, air emissions, or other obvious visual effects during operation. Similarly, the Facility's operation will not generate shadow flicker and any "shading" from the Facility would be limited to the shading from built Facility components, typically low-profile and unlikely to impact adjacent properties. The potential for glare from PV arrays is the most frequently raised possible visible impact relating to solar projects.

Glare is defined as a continuous source of bright light and is a common phenomenon in existing environments. Both the sun and artificial light sources can cause glare either directly (such as from a sunset when driving westbound) or indirectly (such as from the sun's reflection on a lake or glass window). Glare is raised as a potential concern as, under some conditions, potential impacts can include:

- After-image in a viewer's vision, which can result in temporary reductions in visibility for pilots landing near the Facility or for road users; and

- Distraction, temporary avoidance of a view, or other annoyance impacts.

There is an inverse correlation between light absorption and reflection. PV panels are designed to absorb as much of the solar spectrum as possible to maximize efficiency. Consequently, virtually all PV panels installed in recent years have at least one anti-reflective coating to minimize reflection and maximize absorption. However, the front-facing surfaces of PV modules are smooth, specular surfaces that can reflect sunlight at high incidence angles, much like windows on a building. Therefore, the Applicant conducted a study to assess glare that may be generated by the Facility (see Attachment 3 of the VIMMP [Appendix 8-B]).

Not all glare generated by a Facility has the potential to produce potentially adverse effects. The Applicant engaged EDR to assess the glare produced by the Facility that could potentially be visible to sensitive receptors and be considered an “impact.” The 94-c regulations require the Solar Glare Hazard Assessment Tool (SGHAT) model developed by Sandia National Laboratories (Ho et al., 2015) to be used in developing an assessment of glare impacts. In order to focus on the glare that may cause a potential impact, glare was analyzed for all non-participating residences and public roadways located within 1,500 feet of the Facility. The Solar Glare Assessment prepared by EDR used ForgeSolar’s GlareGauge tool, an industry standard commercial software that is based on the SGHAT model. The SGHAT model was initially developed for use by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) in evaluating safety impacts to pilots while landing aircraft (Ho et al., 2015). Although the SGHAT model provides the option to model glare at residences and along roadways, this tool is a conceptual model with limited accuracy in quantifying potential glare impacts for ground-based receptors in locations such as the Facility where terrestrial and atmospheric obstructions that limit the production of glare are common.

The SGHAT model does not consider atmospheric conditions that scatter incoming solar radiation, terrestrial obstructions (e.g., structures, trees, or topography) that visually block the receipt of glare by an observer, or site-specific variability in panel spacing and design. Accordingly, SGHAT outputs reflect a scenario which is unlikely to exist in real-world conditions: (1) visual receptors with full visibility in all directions and with the ability to see through any PV panels within the Facility that may be obstructing their view,² (2) no cloud cover during daylight hours over the course of the year, (3) no vegetation or structures anywhere within, or adjacent to, the Facility Site or the receptor, and (4) full coverage of each PV array area by PV panels, with no gaps between rows.

The Solar Glare Assessment prepared for the Facility factored in these limitations and utilized the SGHAT model as a baseline tool in identifying receptors within, and adjacent to, the Facility Site that are likely to have potentially

² The PV panels are taller than many road users and residents and can therefore limit a receptor’s view to just the panels on the edges of an array.

higher incidences of glare than other receptors, in order to identify appropriate avoidance, minimization, and mitigation techniques.

Based on the SGHAT model, in total, eight of the 72 non-participating residences within 1,500 feet of the Facility (11%) and portions of three public roadways may receive some glare from the Facility over the course of a year. Timing and duration of glare for both residences and roadways vary depending on the position and proximity of the receptor relative to the PV panels potentially producing glare. In general, glare is not anticipated during the fall and winter and would not be received after 7:00 AM or before 5:00 PM. Typically, residences with higher modelled glare levels receive glare somewhat evenly throughout the spring and summer months, whereas residences with lower modelled glare levels receive glare generally around either the summer equinox or the vernal and autumnal equinoxes. Appendix 8-B provides a detailed breakdown of the results for each receptor evaluated.

The potential glare impacts to the residences and roadways identified above are anticipated to be generally minimal or minimal to moderate. To mitigate potential glare impacts, the Applicant is proposing a comprehensive vegetation screening program, is considering other mitigation options, and is committed to working with members of the community to proactively resolve concerns. These measures will be sufficient to ensure solar glare impacts are avoided or minimized, and will not result in complaints, impede traffic movements, or create safety hazards. Additionally, please see Appendix 7-B for a Draft Complaint Management Plan that outlines the Applicant's commitments regarding the resolution of complaints from local stakeholders.

(10) Description of Visual Resources to be Affected

As described in Sections 3.6, 5.2, and Attachment C of the VIA, VSRs within the VSA were identified in accordance with guidance provided by New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) Program Policy DEP-00-2 *Assessing and Mitigating Visual Impacts* (NYSDEC, 2019) and the requirements of Section 94-c, as described in Chapter XVIII, Title 19 of NYCRR Part 900, §900-2.9(b)(4). In addition, EDR identified other resources that could be considered visually sensitive based on their type or intensity of use and input from public outreach efforts and stakeholder consultations. The categories of VSRs that would be typically required for consideration in VIAs include the following:

- **Properties of Historic Significance**, such as National Historic Landmarks, sites listed on the National or State Registers of Historic Places (NRHP, SRHP), properties eligible for listing on the NRHP or SRHP, or National or State Historic Sites.
- **Designated Scenic Resources**, such as rivers designated as National or State Wild, Scenic, or Recreational, Adirondack Park Scenic Vistas, sites, areas, lakes, reservoirs or highways designated or

eligible for designation as Scenic, Scenic Areas of Statewide Significance, or other designated scenic resources.

- **Public Lands and Recreational Resources**, such as National Parks, Recreation Areas, Seashores, and/or Forests, National Natural Landmarks, National Wildlife Refuges, Heritage Areas, State Parks, State Nature and Historic Preserve Areas, State Forest Preserves, other State lands, Wildlife Management Areas & Game Refuges, State Forests, State Boat Launches/Waterway Access sites, State or Nationally designated trails, publicly accessible conservation lands/easements, rivers and streams with Public Fishing Rights Easements, or named lakes, ponds, and reservoirs.
- **High Use Public Areas**, such as State, US, and Interstate Highways, Schools, Cities, Villages and Hamlets.
- **Locally Identified Resources**, such as local parks and recreation areas.
- **Locations Identified by Municipal Planning Representatives**, that may represent an area with local importance or are otherwise not addressed by the public databases and other available information on potential resources.

Further information regarding how VSRs in the VSA were identified is presented in Section 3.6 of the VIA. In addition, in accordance with the requirements set forth in §900-2.9(b)(4), the Applicant has conferred with municipal planning representatives, the Office of Renewable Energy Siting (ORES or the Office), and the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP) in its identification of VSRs. These consultations resulted in the identification of seven additional, unique VSRs identified by the Ripley Town Board and Ripley Planning Board. Copies of the correspondence sent by the Applicant, as well as responses received from stakeholders, are included as Attachment F in the VIA.

As a result of database review and outreach efforts, a total of 14 VSRs were identified within the VSA. The locations of inventoried VSRs are included on Figure 3.6-1 of the VIA, and VSRs within potential views of the proposed Facility (as determined through viewshed analysis) are described in Section 5.2 of the VIA. Appendix C of the VIA includes additional information on VSRs and potential visibility. Viewpoints selected for the development of visual simulations, including those that illustrate Facility visibility from specific VSRs, are described in Attachment D of the VIA.

(b) Viewshed Analysis

The VIA includes viewshed analyses to identify locations within the VSA where it may be possible to view the proposed PV arrays, interconnection facility (POI switchyard, collection substation, and BESS), and overhead collection line from ground-level vantage points (i.e., defining the Facility's area of potential effect [APE]). This analysis included identifying

potentially visible areas on viewshed maps and verifying potential Facility visibility in the field. The methodology employed in these analyses is summarized below and described in Section 4.1 of the VIA.

(1) Viewshed Maps

The VIA includes viewshed maps (Figures 5.1-1, 5.1-2, and 5.1-3), which define the maximum area from which the completed Facility could potentially be seen within the VSA.

Line-of-Sight cross sections (LOS) were also prepared to demonstrate potential Facility visibility and sources of screening from precise locations (typically including VSRs) along a single line “cut” through the landscape. The LOS cross sections from various resources are presented in Section 5.2 of the VIA and in the Technical Memorandum (Attachment A).

(2) Viewshed Methodology

The methodology used to prepare viewshed analyses for the Facility are described in Section 4.1 of the VIA and summarized below.

Digital surface model (DSM) viewshed analyses were conducted for the proposed PV arrays, interconnection facility (collection substation and associated O&M building, POI switchyard, and the BESS and adjacent O&M yard), and overhead collection line to evaluate potential visibility considering the screening effects of topography, structures, and vegetation. Viewshed analyses based on topography alone were not provided because the results of such analyses do not accurately represent conditions within the VSA.

The DSM viewshed analysis for the proposed PV arrays was prepared using: (1) a DSM derived from 2017 New York State Geographic Information System (GIS) Program Office (NYSGPO); (2) sample points representing PV array locations placed 300 feet apart in a grid pattern throughout all proposed PV arrays; (3) an assumed maximum PV array height of 13 feet applied to each sample point; (4) an assumed viewer height of 6 feet; and (5) Esri ArcGIS Pro® software with the Spatial Analyst extension.

A few modifications were made to the lidar-derived DSM prior to analysis. Transmission lines and road-side utility lines that are reflected in the lidar data are mis-represented in the DSM as opaque screening features. In order to correct this inaccuracy, DSM elevation values within transmission line corridors and within 50 feet of road centerlines were replaced with bare earth elevation values. It is important to note that this clearing of the DSM may also eliminate legitimate screening features such as roadside vegetation and structures, which likely results

in an overstatement of potential Facility visibility along road corridors within the VSA. Additionally, all areas within the PV array fence lines were cleared of any vegetation to reflect the bare-earth elevation in these locations. This modified DSM was then used as a base layer for the viewshed analysis. Once the viewshed analysis was complete, PV array visibility was set to zero in locations where the DSM elevation exceeded the bare earth elevation by 6 feet or more, indicating the presence of vegetation or structures that exceed viewer height. This was done for two reasons: (1) in locations where trees or structures are present in the DSM, the viewshed would reflect visibility from the treetops or building roofs, which is not the intent of this analysis, and (2) to reflect the fact that ground-level vantage points within buildings or areas of vegetation exceeding 6 feet in height will generally be screened from views of the Facility.

Because it accounts for the screening provided by topography, vegetation, and structures, the DSM viewshed analysis is an accurate representation of potential PV array visibility. However, it is worth noting that because certain characteristics of the Facility and the VSA that may serve to restrict visibility (e.g., color, atmospheric/weather conditions, and distance from viewer) are not taken into consideration in the analysis, being located within the DSM viewshed does not necessarily equate to actual Facility visibility, nor does it indicate that adverse visual impacts will occur within these geographic locations.

As described in Section 5.1 of the VIA, vegetation and structures, in combination with topography, will serve to block views of the PV arrays from approximately 88.6% of the 2-mile VSA (i.e., 11.4% of the VSA is indicated as having potential PV array visibility). This limited visibility from the surrounding area is primarily attributable to the low profile/height of the proposed PV panels combined with topographic variation and an abundance of hedgerows and woodlots that obstruct long distance views. The near-foreground zone has the highest level of Facility visibility (4.4 sq. mi. or 31.1%). However, 2.9 sq. mi. (64.8%) of this potentially visible area occurs within the Facility Site itself. Therefore, near-foreground visibility will occur within approximately 10% or 1.5 square miles of the off-site near foreground.

In addition, a DSM viewshed analysis was conducted for the interconnection facility (the proposed collection substation and associated O&M building, POI switchyard, and BESS and adjacent O&M yard). The tallest proposed components of the collection substation and POI switchyard are the overhead gantry H-frame structures, with a maximum height of 70 feet. The analysis was run based on 18 representative sample points placed in the center and along the perimeters of the collection substation and POI switchyard, each with an assigned height of 70 feet. The maximum potential height of both the BESS and the O&M equipment storage containers located within the O&M yard (included as part of the BESS due to their small size and adjacency to the BESS) is 12 feet and these structures were similarly represented by seven sample points within the BESS facility site. Other data

sources and assumptions used in this viewshed analysis are as described above for the PV panel array viewshed analysis.

As described in the Section 5.1 of the VIA, the viewshed analysis suggests that vegetation, in combination with topography and structures will serve to block views of the proposed collection substation and BESS from approximately 99.6% of the 2-mile VSA (i.e., 0.4% of the Study Area is indicated as having potential visibility of the substation and BESS). Because the viewshed analysis considered the tallest structural components of these facilities, visibility is likely overstated since the overhead gantry structures at the collection substation and POI switchyard are approximately 30 feet taller than the majority of the above-ground interconnection equipment and have a relatively narrow profile that will be difficult to discern at distances beyond 1 mile. Areas indicated as having potential interconnection facility visibility are largely restricted to County Route 6 and neighboring residential properties.

A DSM viewshed analysis was also conducted for the proposed overhead collection lines. The viewshed analysis used pole locations obtained from preliminary design drawings and proposed pole heights ranging from 41 feet for to 75 feet (matching pole types and placement as defined in design drawings (see Appendix 5-C of the 94-c Application). All other data sources and assumptions used in this viewshed analysis are as described above for the PV panel array viewshed analysis. As indicated in the VIA, the viewshed analysis suggests that vegetation, in combination with topography and structures will serve to block views of the proposed overhead collection lines from approximately 94.3% of the 2-mile Study Area (i.e., 5.7% of the Study Area is indicated as having potential visibility of the overhead collection lines).

Per the requirements set forth in §900-2.9(a), the potential cumulative visual effect of the Facility as well as other energy projects built or proposed in the surrounding region was considered. Section 5.3.7 of the VIA addresses the potential cumulative visual impacts that may arise from interactions between the South Ripley Solar Project and other proposed renewable energy generation projects in the vicinity. Cumulative visual impacts resulting from multiple solar projects are unlikely to occur when considering a single viewer position because the nearest proposed facility, the Empire Solar Project, is located approximately 2.7 miles away from the South Ripley Facility. However, a sequential cumulative visual effect could occur if a traveler is driving a specific route that includes views of both solar projects proposed in the area. Given the fact that frequently traveled connector or arterial roads do not provide direct connection between these projects, any cumulative visual effects are likely to be minor.

(3) Sensitive Viewing Areas

As described above in Section 8(a)(10) of this Exhibit and in Section 3.6 of the VIA, the Applicant consulted a variety of data sources including digital geospatial data (summarized in the VIA report) and local planning documents to identify VSRs within the VSA. The Applicant also conducted a systematic program of public outreach to assist in the identification of VSRs. Copies of the correspondence sent by the Applicant as part of this process, as well as responses received from stakeholders, are included as Attachment F to the VIA.

As indicated in Section 5.2 of the VIA, a total of 14 VSRs were identified within the VSA, with 11 of those showing potential Facility visibility according to the viewshed analysis (i.e., occurring within the Facility APE). These include two resources classified as Public Lands and Recreation Resources, two properties of historic significance, three high use public areas, and four resources identified through stakeholder outreach. As described in Section 4.1.1 of the VIA, the two VSRs that will have more direct views of the PV panel arrays based on the viewshed analysis (as well as field review and visual simulations) are the South Ripley Cemetery (Viewpoint 69) and the Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area (Viewpoints 5, 15, 16, 20, 24, 40, 44, 51, 56, 59, 63, and 69). Based on the results of the rating panel, the Facility will present moderate visual contrast with the existing landscape at these locations. In all instances, the proposed mitigation plantings reduce potential visual contrast to some degree, and it is anticipated that over the lifespan of the Facility, continued growth of the plantings will further reduce the visual contrast experienced at these locations. Additional discussion regarding potential visibility and visual impact of the Facility from VSRs within the VSA is included in Section 5.2 and Attachments A, C, and D of the VIA and in the Technical Memorandum.

(4) Viewpoint Selection

As described in Section 4.2.1 of the VIA, a total of 13 viewpoints were selected for the development of visual simulations. These viewpoints were selected based upon the following criteria:

- They provide open views of proposed PV panels or provide representative views of the screening effects of vegetation, topography, or structures from selected areas.
- They illustrate representative Facility visibility from specific VSRs.
- They illustrate typical views from LSZs where open views will be available.
- They illustrate typical views of the proposed Facility that will be available to representative viewer/user groups.
- They illustrate typical views of different amounts of PV panels, from a variety of viewer distances and directions, to illustrate the range of visual change that will occur with the Facility in place.
- The selected photos displayed appropriate composition, lighting, and exposure.

- Some of the locations were identified by the Town of Ripley.

In addition to the criteria identified above, proposed land uses were considered as part of the viewpoint selection process. The clearest indication of proposed land uses is provided by the local zoning ordinances, which describe allowable future uses within various districts. Therefore, the zoning districts for each town within the VSA were reviewed, and the districts mapped in order to inform the viewpoint selection process.

Agencies, municipal representatives, and local stakeholders were asked to help identify VSRs and determine an appropriate set of viewpoints for the development of visual simulations. Copies of correspondence sent by EDR as part of this process, as well as the responses received, are included as Attachment F of the VIA.

The visual simulations included as Attachment D in the VIA (Appendix 8-A) provide representative depictions of the appearance of the built Facility, including views that represent typical views from identified VSRs, adjacent roads, and residences. A summary of the selected viewpoint locations is presented in Table 8-1, below.

Table 8-1. Viewpoints Selected for Production of Visual Simulations

Viewpoint Number	Location and/or Visually Sensitive Resource	LSZ Represented	Viewer Group Represented	Viewing Distance	View Orientation ²
VP 5	County Route 6 and Miller Road Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area	Rural Residential/ Agricultural	Local Residents, Through-Travelers/Commuters	167 feet	SE
VP 15	County Route 6 Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area, South Ripley Cemetery	Rural Residential/ Agricultural	Local Residents, Through-Travelers/Commuters	170 feet	SW
VP 16	County Route 6 Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area	Rural Residential/ Agricultural	Local Residents, Through-Travelers/Commuters	179 feet	S
VP 20	NYS Route 76 NYS Route 76, Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area	Rural Residential/ Agricultural	Local Residents, Through-Travelers/Commuters	84 feet	SE
VP 24	NYS Route 76 NYS Route 76, Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area	Rural Residential/ Agricultural	Local Residents, Through-Travelers	654 feet	SW
VP 40	County Route 6 Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area	Rural Residential/ Agricultural	Local Residents, Through-Travelers	118 feet	S
VP 44	Sinden Road Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area	Rural Residential/ Agricultural	Local Residents, Through-Travelers	344 feet	W

Viewpoint Number	Location and/or Visually Sensitive Resource	LSZ Represented	Viewer Group Represented	Viewing Distance	View Orientation ²
VP 56	County Route 6 Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area	Forest	Local Residents, Through- Travelers	139 feet	NE
VP 59	County Route 6 Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area	Rural Residential/ Agricultural	Local Residents, Through- Travelers	177 feet	S
VP 63S	County Route 6 Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area	Rural Residential/ Agricultural	Local Residents, Through- Travelers	225 feet	S
VP 63SE	County Route 6 Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area	Rural Residential/ Agricultural	Local Residents, Through- Travelers	240 feet	SE
VP 69	South Ripley Cemetery off of County Route 6 Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area, South Ripley Cemetery	Rural Residential/ Agricultural	Local Residents, Tourists/Recreation	417 feet	N
VP 75	County Route 622	Rural Residential/ Agricultural	Local Residents, Through- Travelers	7,450 feet	NE

²N = North, S = South, E = East, W = West

(c) Visual Contrast Evaluation

(1) Photographic Simulations

As described above in Section 8(a)(4) of this Exhibit and Section 4.2.2 of the VIA, EDR used high-resolution computer-enhanced image processing to create realistic photographic simulations of the proposed Facility from each of the 13 selected viewpoints. The photographic simulations are included as Appendix D of the VIA (see Appendix 8-A).

(2) Additional Simulations Illustrating Mitigation

As described above in Section 8(a)(4) of this Exhibit, the Applicant developed a Landscape Mitigation Planting Plan (Attachment 1 of the VIMMP) to minimize and mitigate the Facility's visual effect on the surrounding landscape. Simulations incorporating the Planting Plan were prepared to demonstrate and allow for evaluation of the efficacy of the proposed plantings in minimizing visual impacts. Simulations showing the plantings following five to seven years of growth, and during the leaf-off and leaf-on seasons are included in Attachment D of the VIA.

(3) Simulation Comparison

As described above in Section 8(a)(8) of this Exhibit, as well as Section 4.2.3 and Attachment E of the VIA, a panel of four registered landscape architects with experience in the visual/aesthetics field evaluated the visual impact of the proposed Facility as depicted in each of the 13 visual simulations. The rating panel members reviewed the

existing and proposed views, evaluated the contrast/compatibility of the Facility with various components of the landscape (landform, vegetation, land use, water, sky, and viewer activity), and assigned quantitative visual contrast ratings on a scale of 0 (insignificant) to 4 (strong). The average contrast score assigned by each rating panel member was calculated for each viewpoint, and a composite average score for each viewpoint was determined. The results of this evaluation process are summarized below in Table 8-2. Additional discussion regarding the results of rating panel evaluation is included in Sections 5.3.1, 5.3.2, and 5.3.4 and Appendix D of the VIA. Copies of the completed rating forms are included in Attachment E of the VIA.

Table 8-2. Summary of Rating Panel Results

Viewpoint Number	Distance to Nearest Visible PV Panel	Distance Zone	Landscape Similarity Zone	Viewer Groups			Contrast Rating Scores ¹					
				Local Residents	Through Travelers/Commuter	Tourists/Recreation	#1	#2	#3	#4	Average	Contrast Rating Result
Visual Simulations That Depict Facility Components (No Mitigation)												
5	167 ft	Near-Foreground	Rural Residential/Agricultural	•	•		1.9	2.8	3.8	2.7	2.8	Appreciable
15	170 ft	Near-Foreground	Rural Residential/Agricultural	•	•		0.9	1.4	0.9	0.5	0.9	Minimal
16	179 ft	Near-Foreground	Rural Residential/Agricultural	•	•		1.8	2.5	3.2	2.2	2.4	Moderate/ Appreciable
20	84 ft	Near-Foreground	Rural Residential/Agricultural	•	•		2.4	2.8	3.4	2.7	2.8	Appreciable
24	654 ft	Near-Foreground	Rural Residential/Agricultural	•	•		0.9	1.9	1.5	1.0	1.3	Minimal/Moderate
40	118 ft	Near-Foreground	Rural Residential/Agricultural	•	•		2.2	3.3	3.6	2.8	3.0	Appreciable
44	344 ft	Near-Foreground	Rural Residential/Agricultural	•	•		3.3	3.5	3.2	2.2	2.9	Appreciable
56	139 ft	Near-Foreground	Forest	•	•		2.9	2.9	3.3	3.0	3.0	Appreciable
59	177 ft	Near-Foreground	Rural Residential/Agricultural	•	•		2.0	3.7	3.0	2.4	2.8	Appreciable/ Strong
63S	225 ft	Near-Foreground	Rural Residential/Agricultural	•	•		2.7	3.0	2.2	1.8	2.4	Moderate/ Appreciable
63SE	240 ft	Near-Foreground	Rural Residential/Agricultural	•	•		3.0	3.3	2.8	2.3	2.9	Appreciable
69	417 ft	Near-Foreground	Rural Residential/Agricultural	•		•	3.2	3.0	2.8	2.5	2.9	Appreciable
75	4,450 ft	Foreground	Rural Residential/Agricultural	•	•		0.7	0.3	0.2	0.8	0.4	Insignificant/ Minimal
Total average rating for the visual simulations that depict Facility components (No Mitigation)											2.4	Moderate/ Appreciable

Viewpoint Number	Distance to Nearest Visible PV Panel	Distance Zone	Landscape Similarity Zone	Viewer Groups			Contrast Rating Scores ¹					
				Local Residents	Through Travelers/Commuter	Tourists/Recreation	#1	#2	#3	#4	Average	Contrast Rating Result
Visual Simulations That Depict More Mature Mitigation Plantings (5-7 years post-installation)												
5	167 ft	Near-Foreground	Rural Residential/Agricultural	•	•		1.4	1.5	2.7	2.6	2.1	Moderate
15	170 ft	Near-Foreground	Rural Residential/Agricultural	•	•		0.4	1.1	0.3	0.6	0.6	Insignificant/Minimal
16	179 ft	Near-Foreground	Rural Residential/Agricultural	•	•		1.6	1.4	2.9	2.4	2.1	Moderate
20	84 ft	Near-Foreground	Rural Residential/Agricultural	•	•		1.3	1.6	1.9	2.7	1.9	Moderate
24	654 ft	Near-Foreground	Rural Residential/Agricultural	•	•		0.9	1.8	1.3	1.0	1.3	Minimal/ Moderate
40	118 ft	Near-Foreground	Rural Residential/Agricultural	•	•		1.9	2.5	3.6	2.8	2.7	Moderate/ Appreciable
44	344 ft	Near-Foreground	Rural Residential/Agricultural	•	•		2.1	2.3	1.6	2.0	2.0	Moderate
56	139 ft	Near-Foreground	Forest	•	•		2.2	2.1	3.2	3.3	2.7	Moderate/ Appreciable
59	177 ft	Near-Foreground	Rural Residential/Agricultural	•	•		2.4	3.3	3.3	2.7	2.9	Appreciable
63S	225 ft	Near-Foreground	Rural Residential/Agricultural	•	•		2.2	1.8	1.7	1.9	1.9	Moderate
63SE	240 ft	Near-Foreground	Rural Residential/Agricultural	•	•		2.5	2.8	2.5	2.3	2.5	Moderate/ Appreciable
69	417 ft	Near-Foreground	Rural Residential/Agricultural	•		•	2.5	2.6	2.6	2.4	2.5	Moderate/ Appreciable
Total average rating for the simulations that depict plantings at 5-7 years post-installation											2.1	Moderate

Contrast Rating Scale: 0.0 – 0.2 (Insignificant), 0.3 – 0.7 (Insignificant/Minimal), 0.8 – 1.2 (Minimal), 1.3 – 1.7 (Minimal/Moderate), 1.8 – 2.2 (Moderate), 2.3 – 2.7 (Moderate/Appreciable), 2.8 – 3.2 (Appreciable), 3.3 – 3.7 (Appreciable/Strong), 3.8 – 4.0 (Strong).

As Table 8-2 indicates, the average composite contrast ratings for the 13 visual simulations ranged from 0.4 to 3.3 without the mitigation plantings in place, and 0.6 to 2.9 with plantings in place after five to seven years of growth. The results of this evaluation are summarized below. Rating panel results suggest that immediately following installation, the Facility will result in moderate/appreciable visual contrast with the existing landscape, as indicated by the overall average contrast score of 2.4. With established mitigation plantings in place, the total average contrast score across all viewpoints dropped to 2.1, indicating moderate visual contrast. This suggests that the proposed mitigation, although useful in screening/softening views of the Facility will not substantially reduce the overall visual contrast presented by the Facility. However, from specific affected viewpoint locations, the effectiveness of the mitigation plantings was quite variable.

A full discussion of the panel rating results is included in Sections 5.3.1, 5.3.2, and 5.3.4 of the VIA. Additional information on the individual contrast ratings is available in Attachment D and Attachment E of the VIA (Appendix 8-A).

(d) Visual Impacts Minimization and Mitigation Plan

The VIMMP (Appendix 8-B) describes minimization and mitigation strategies taken to decrease the visual impact of the proposed Facility. Potential mitigation strategies include component relocation/rearrangement, camouflage/disguise, low profile, downsizing, use of alternative technology, non-specular material, lighting, and screening. The minimization and mitigation measures described in the VIMMP are summarized below.

(1) Advertisements

Advertisements, conspicuous lettering, or logos identifying the Facility owner, solar panel manufacturer, or any other supplier entity (other than warning and safety signs), will not be displayed at the Facility Site.

(2) Electrical Collection System

The electrical collection system has been sited underground, to the extent practicable; however, the Facility will include approximately 4.6 miles of overhead collection lines where underground installation is not feasible due to engineering and environmental constraints. As described in the VIMMP and summarized below, the implementation of mitigation strategies for the Facility including, reduction in the number of proposed PV arrays, the low profile of the individual panels, use of non-specular materials, minimal required site lighting, minimal use of signage where necessary, and the development of a comprehensive landscape mitigation plan.

(3) Transmission Facilities

As described in the Landscape Mitigation Planting Plan, a custom planting plan is proposed to minimize visual impacts resulting from the proposed collection substation, POI switchyard, and BESS.

(4) Conductors

All overhead electrical lines will utilize non-specular conductors.

(5) Wind Facilities Equipment

The proposed Facility is not a wind facility and therefore, the requirements of §900-2.9(d)(5) are not applicable.

(6) Shadow Flicker for Wind Facilities

The proposed Facility is not a wind facility and therefore, the requirements of §900-2.9(d)(6) are not applicable.

(7) Glare for Solar Facilities

As discussed in Section (a)(9) above, a Solar Glare Assessment (Attachment 3 of the VIMMP) was prepared to evaluate the potential for glare from the Facility. As part of this assessment, the Applicant utilized the Solar Glare Hazard Assessment Tool (SGHAT) in establishing a baseline of the glare likely to be produced by the Facility. The Solar Glare Assessment found that while there is the potential for glare to be received by eight non-participating residential receptors and portions of three public roadways, solar glare exposure in these locations will be limited and will be minimized and mitigated through the installation of the proposed vegetation screening and other mitigation measures. As a result of design of the Facility and the mitigation measures proposed by the Applicant, it is anticipated that any glare produced by the Facility would not result in complaints, impede traffic movements, or create safety hazards.

(8) Planting Plans

The Applicant has developed a comprehensive Landscape Mitigation Planting Plan (Attachment 1 of the VIMMP) that uses four different planting schemes (modules) that can be applied along the perimeter of the Facility as appropriate to minimize the Facility's visual effect on the surrounding landscape. In addition, a custom planting plan is proposed to minimize visual impacts resulting from the proposed collection substation, POI switchyard, and BESS. The Landscape Mitigation Planting Plan was developed as a site-specific solution appropriate to the scale of the Facility, the sensitivity and proximity of surrounding receptors, and the degree of natural screening vegetation already present. As illustrated in the visual simulations and confirmed through the visual contrast rating

(see Section 4.2.3 and Attachment D of the VIA) the conceptual planting plans provide effective screening and/or integration of the Facility into the surrounding landscape.

In accordance with Section 900-6.4(1)(3), the Applicant will retain a qualified landscape architect, arborist, or ecologist to inspect the visual screening plant modules for up to two years following installation. The inspector will identify plants that require replacement (e.g., dead, unhealthy, or in otherwise poor condition) and will remove and install replacement plantings within two years of initial installation.

(9) Lighting Plan

As described in Section (a)(5) above, the Applicant has developed a Lighting Plan (Attachment 2 of the VIMMP) that describes the security and exterior lighting design of the proposed Facility. No lighting will be installed as part of the PV arrays. The only light sources that are anticipated to be installed for the Facility are safety/security lighting at the collection substation and associated O&M building, POI switchyard, BESS, and the adjacent O&M yard comprised of equipment storage containers. Illumination at the Facilities is designed to comply with applicable State and local standards. All proposed exterior lighting will be placed at the lowest practical height and will utilize shielded fixtures with no drop-down vertical elements to minimize light trespass and off-site spillage. Additionally, all lighting will utilize automatic activation dependent on light sensitive switches (with manual activation as a potential alternative) to minimize the duration of required lighting.

REFERENCES

- American Trails. 2018. *National Recreation Trails* [website]. Available at: <https://www.americantrails.org/national-recreation-trails> (Accessed August 28, 2020).
- Bureau of Land Management. 1984. *Visual Resource Management Program*. Department of the Interior. U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Bureau of Land Management. 1999. *Visual Resource Management*. Department of the Interior Government Printing Office.
- Federal Highway Administration. 2020. *America's Byways* [website]. Available at: <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/byways/> (Accessed August 28, 2020). U.S. Department of Transportation.
- National Park Service (NPS). 2020a. *Find a Park in NY* [website]. Available at: <http://www.nps.gov/state/ny/index.htm> (Accessed August 28, 2020). U.S. Department of the Interior.
- NPS. 2020b. *National Heritage Areas* [website]. Available at: <https://www.nps.gov/subjects/heritageareas/index.htm> (Accessed August 28, 2020).
- NPS. 2020c. *National Historic Landmarks* [website]. Available at: <https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalhistoriclandmarks/nhldata.htm> (Accessed August 28, 2020).
- NPS. 2020d. *National Natural Landmarks in New York* [website]. Available at: <https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nlandmarks/state.htm?State=NY> (Accessed August 28, 2020).
- NPS. 2020e. *National Register of Historic Places* [website]. Available at: <https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/index.htm> (Accessed August 28, 2020). U.S. Department of the Interior.
- NPS. 2020f. *National Trails System* [website]. Available at: <https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationaltrailssystem/index.htm> (Accessed August 28, 2020). U.S. Department of the Interior.
- National Register of Historic Places. 2020a. *Historic Districts* [website]. Available at: <http://www.nationalregisterofhistoricplaces.com/districts.html> (Accessed August 28, 2020).
- National Register of Historic Places. 2020b. *State Listings* [website]. Available at: <http://www.nationalregisterofhistoricplaces.com/state.html> (Accessed August 28, 2020).
- National Wild and Scenic Rivers. 2020. *Explore Designated Rivers* [website]. Available at: <https://rivers.gov/map.php> (Accessed August 28, 2020).
- Nature Conservancy, The (TNC). 2020. *New York: Places We Protect* [website]. Available at: <https://www.nature.org/en-us/get-involved/how-to-help/places-we-protect/?s=edmestonnewyork> (Accessed August 28, 2020).
- New York Natural Heritage Program (NYNHP). 2020. *New York Protected Areas Database* [website]. Available at: <http://www.nypad.org/> (Accessed August 28, 2020).

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC). 2019. Program Policy: Assessing and Mitigating Visual Impacts. DEP-00-2. Division of Environmental Permits, Albany, NY.

NYSDEC. 2020a. *Critical Environmental Areas* [website]. Available at: <http://www.dec.ny.gov/permits/6184.html> (Accessed August 28, 2020).

NYSDEC. 2020b. *List of New York State Wildlife Management Areas* [website]. Available at: <https://www.dec.ny.gov/outdoor/7768.html> (Accessed August 28, 2020).

NYSDEC. 2020c. *List of State Forests By Region* [website]. Available at: <http://www.dec.ny.gov/lands/34531.html> (Accessed August 28, 2020).

NYSDEC. 2020d. *Environmental Education Centers and Programs* [website]. Available at: <http://www.dec.ny.gov/education/74.html> (Accessed August 28, 2020).

NYSDEC. 2020e. *New York's Forest Preserve* [website]. Available at: <http://www.dec.ny.gov/lands/4960.html> (Accessed August 28, 2020).

NYSDEC. 2020f. *Part 591: Procedures for the selection, review, approval and funding of state projects under the 1986 Environmental Quality Bond Act* [website]. Available at: [https://govt.westlaw.com/nycrr/Browse/Home/NewYork/NewYorkCodesRulesandRegulations?guid=If1120df0b5a011dda0a4e17826ebc834&originationContext=documenttoc&transitionType=Default&contextData=\(sc.Default\)&bhcp=1](https://govt.westlaw.com/nycrr/Browse/Home/NewYork/NewYorkCodesRulesandRegulations?guid=If1120df0b5a011dda0a4e17826ebc834&originationContext=documenttoc&transitionType=Default&contextData=(sc.Default)&bhcp=1) (Accessed August 28, 2020).

NYSDEC. 2020g. *DECinfo Locator* [website]. Available at: <https://www.dec.ny.gov/pubs/109457.html> (Accessed August 28, 2020).

NYSDEC. 2020h. *Wild, Scenic and Recreational Rivers* [website]. Available at: <http://www.dec.ny.gov/permits/32739.html> (Accessed August 28, 2020).

NYSDEC. 2020i. *Public Fishing Rights Maps, Waters with Public Fishing Rights* [website]. Available at: <http://www.dec.ny.gov/outdoor/9924.html> (Accessed August 28, 2020).

NYSDOS. 2020. *Scenic Areas of Statewide Significance* [website]. Available at: <http://www.dos.ny.gov/opd/programs/consistency/scenicass.html> (Accessed August 28, 2020). Office of Planning and Development.

New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT). 2020a. *Bicycling in New York* [website]. Available at: <https://www.dot.ny.gov/bicycle> (Accessed August 28, 2020).

NYSDOT. 2020b. *New York State Scenic Byways* [website]. Available at: <https://www.dot.ny.gov/scenic-byways> (Accessed August 28, 2020).

NYSHPO. 2020. *Cultural Resource Information System (CRIS)* [website]. Available at: <https://cris.parks.ny.gov/Login.aspx?ReturnUrl=%2f> (Accessed August 28, 2020).

NYS Office of Information Technology Services. 2020. *NYS GIS Clearinghouse* [website]. Available at: <http://gis.ny.gov/> (Accessed August 28, 2020).

NYSOPRHP. 2014. *NYS Heritage Areas System* [shapefile]. File "NYSHeritageAreas" accessed from <https://gis.ny.gov/gisdata/inventories/details.cfm?DSID=1188> (Accessed August 28, 2020).

NYSOPRHP. 2018a. *New York State Historic Sites and Park Boundary* [shapefile]. File “oprhp18” accessed from <https://gis.ny.gov/gisdata/inventories/details.cfm?DSID=430> (Accessed August 28, 2020).

NYSOPRHP. 2018b. *State Park Trails* [shapefile]. File “OPRHP_trls18” received via email April 8, 2019 from Cristina Croll at New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation.

NYSOPRHP. 2019. *National Register of Historic Places listings in New York State* [shapefile]. File received via email April 8, 2019 from Christina Croll at New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation.

NYSOPRHP. 2020a. *Heritage Areas* [website]. Available at: <https://parks.ny.gov/historic-preservation/heritage-areas.aspx> (Accessed August 28, 2020).

NYSOPRHP. 2020b. *State Parks* [website]. Available at: <http://parks.ny.gov/parks/> (Accessed August 28, 2020).

NYSOPRHP. 2020c. *Trails* [website]. Available at: <https://parks.ny.gov/recreation/trails/> (Accessed August 28, 2020).

New York State Senate (NYS Senate). 2020. *Consolidated Laws: Heritage Areas* [website]. Available at: <https://www.nysenate.gov/legislation/laws/PAR/TG> (Accessed May 2, 2021)

Smardon, R.C., J.F. Palmer, A. Knopf, K. Grinde, J.E. Henderson and L.D. Peyman-Dove. 1988. *Visual Resources Assessment Procedure for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers*. Instruction Report EL-88-1. Department of the Army, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Washington, D.C.

Sullivan, R. G., Abplanalp, J. 2013. Utility-Scale solar Energy Facility Visual Impact Characterization and Mitigation Study Project Report. Doe Solar Sit 7 Glare, Visual Impacts and Mitigations. Argonne National Laboratory.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2020. *National Wildlife Refuge Locator* [website]. Available at: <https://www.fws.gov/refuges/friends/friendsLocatorMaps/index.html> (Accessed August 28, 2020).

United States Forest Service (USFS). 2013. *Find National Forests and Grasslands* [website]. Available at: <https://www.fs.fed.us/recreation/map/finder.shtml> (Accessed August 28, 2020).

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

USGS. 2019. *NLCD 2016 Land Cover Conterminous United States*. Sioux Falls, South Dakota.