South Ripley Solar Project Town of Ripley, Chautauqua County, New York EDR Project No: 19020

Viewpoint Information:

Viewpoint Number: 59

Distance to Nearest Visible Project Component: 132 feet Viewpoint Location: County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road) Landscape Similarity Zone: Rural Upland Viewer Type: Local Residents, Through-Travelers/Commuters Visually Sensitive Site: Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area Mitigation Planting Scheme: Module 4



Rating Panel Information:

Your Name: FAC Date: 21 DEC 2021 - NEW

Viewpoint Sensitivity: Scenic Quality: (Please rate existing scenic quality) Low Moderate High

 Viewer Exposure: (Please rate frequency and duration of view)

 Continuous
 Repeated/Regular

 Coccasional/Brief
 Rare

Viewer Description: (Please describe this view in your own words.)

OPEN PASTURE LAND WITH
UTILITY CORPORE PUNNING
PARAUEL TO PURDWAY N
THADEM TO LINESTOCK FENCE
COMMERCIAL FENCE IS IN
MIDGED WITH UTILITY CURLIDON
TRANSMISSION LINES DINDING
SKY. DENSE BACKGROND
VEGETATION CONCEALS
HURIZON LINE

Contrast Rating Score Chart

Insignificant	Minin	nal	Moderate Appreciable S				Strong
0	.5 1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4
Component	Sc	ore	Description of Contrast				
component	Project Components	Project w/Mitigation					
Landform	3	2.5	WITH BELLY DETALLATION				
Vegetation	2.5	2	SOME R BRARD R	EMOV, EMA,	AL; HAN	NOTER	2
Land Use	N	2.5	BERMC. APPERA	HANGE:	SS OPEN	S EDC	AG Th
Water	N/A	N/A	DITAL	ONES.	NOT CO	UNT	
Sky	3	2,5	BISECTI SKY NI	NG AN	10 CUTT 35TATO	ERNG N INS	ATA2
Viewer Activity	3	2.5	INOUSTR TO EX 10	VOUST	EN; AR	PAGEN	H (
TOTAL			Total all scores above				
AVERAGE			Average all scores abo	ve			

Page 17 of 26

Viewpoint 59

County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road) - NEW

Effectiveness of mitigation planting scheme (seasonal/variability, etc.):

THE PROPOSED MITTGATION PLANTING DIVERTS THE NEWER'S ATTENTION AND DIFECT VIEW INTO THE SUBSTATION. THE MITTGATION PLANTING WILL PRONDE ADDITIONAL SCREEN, NG POTENTIAL AS IT MATURES; HUMEVER, IT WOND BE MORE EFFECTIVE ON THE UPPER SUDJES OF THE BERM.

Variable factors that may have influenced rating (atmospheric conditions, seasonal, etc.):

MONNE THE PLANT, NE TO THE HIGH SIDE OF
THE LANDSLAPE BERM WOULD INCREASE THE
SCREENING LEVEL.
VEAF OFF CONDITIONS ON THE DECIDEDUS
MATERIALS WILL INCREASE USIBILITY TO
THE SUBSTATION COMPINENTS.

Perceived effect on scenic quality/viewer enjoyment: <u>THE PROPOSED SUBSTATION IS AN EXTENSION</u> <u>DE THE EXISTING SUBSTATION IN THE</u> <u>BACKGROUND (ONT OF MEN), THE COMPONENTS</u> <u>ARE NEATLY ORGAN, ZEO, WHICH HEIPS TO</u> <u>MITICATE THE INSTALLATIONS EFFECT, NUMBRER</u> <u>MITICATE THE INSTALLATIONS EFFECT, NUMBRER</u> <u>MVCH OF THE SKY IS TAKEN OF BY THE TOMERS</u> AS USUAL CONTER.

Page 18 of 26

South Ripley Solar Project Town of Ripley, Chautauqua County, New York EDR Project No: 19020

Viewpoint Information:

Viewpoint Number: 63S

Distance to Nearest Visible Project Component: 217 feet Viewpoint Location: County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road) Landscape Similarity Zone: Rural Upland Viewer Type: Local Residents, Through-Travelers/Commuters Visually Sensitive Site: Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area Mitigation Planting Scheme: Module 1/Module 4





Viewpoint Sensitivity: Scenic Quality: (Please rate existing scenic quality) Low Moderate High

Viewer Exposure: (Please rate frequency and duration of view) Continuous Repeated/Regular Occasional/Brief Rare



Viewer Description: (Please describe this view in your own words.) OPEN PASTIRE LAND WITH UMITED VEGETATION EXCEPT FOR FLISTAKS HERCERAL

IN MIDGRO AND BACKERP.
ELISTINE SUBSTATION IS
VISIBLE THROUGH LEAF. OFF
DEUDINUS TREES, AS NEW AS
UTTINTY TOWERS. SEMI-
NOVSTRIAL CANDSCAPE

Contrast Rating:

(Please rate the level of contrast between the existing view, Project components, and Project components with mitigation)

Contrast Rating Score Chart

Insignificant		Minimal		Moderate		Appreciable		Strong
0	.5	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4

Component	Score			
Component	Project Components	Project w/Mitgation	Description of Contrast	
Landform	3	2.5	BATTERY STURACE FOLLONS TOPO, BUT WALL IS HIGH CONTRAS	
Vegetation	2.5	2	NOPEMANAL, HANDYER WALL BISELTS VIEW TO BEAVER	
Land Use	2,5	2	SEMI-INDUSTRIAL NEW TO MOVE INDUSTRIAN NEW	
Water	NIA	NA	DITCH DDES NOT CONST	
Sky	2.5	2	THE SKY NEW	
Viewer Activity	S	2,5	USE AND NEW.	
TOTAL			Total all scores above	
AVERAGE			Average all scores above	

Page 19 cf 26

Viewpoint 63S

County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road) - NEW

Effectiveness of mitigation planting scheme (seasonal/variability, etc.):

THE FORE (MIDSRD INSTALLED SCHEED, NG VEGETATION SUCCESSFULLY SCREENS THE LAW PPOFILE BATTERY STOLAGE UNITS. HAVENER IT IS LESS SUCRESSFUL IN CONCEAUNG THE WALL. A SECOND LAYER OF SHEEING IN THE BACKERD WOND KEDUCE THE AMOUNT OF NSIBLE BATTELY STURAGE WITS, ESPECIALLY OUB

Variable factors that may have influenced rating (atmospheric conditions, seasonal, etc.):

A DARKER GRAY COLOR ON THE BATTERY
STOLAGE UNITS WOND DELFEASE THEIR
USVAL PROMENANCE
LEAF OFF CONDITIONS ON THE DELIPHOUS
SCHEENING WILL INCREASE VISUAL PERMEABLY
INTO THE SUBSTATION.

Perceived effect on scenic quality/viewer enjoyment:

INDUSTR	AL USE OF THE SITE IS FURTHER
EXPANDE	D WITH THE ABATTERY STURAGE
INSTAUL	TIDD AND TAL WALL. THE CONCEALED
VIEN DU	TO THE WAR INSTALLATION IS NOVALLY
OFF PUTT	NG- AND STOPS THE USWER'S CARE.

Page 20 of 26

South Ripley Solar Project Town of Ripley, Chautauqua County, New York EDR Project No: 19020

Viewpoint Information:

Viewpoint Number: 63SE

Distance to Nearest Visible Project Component: 218 feet Viewpoint Location: County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road) Landscape Similarity Zone: Rural Upland Viewer Type: Local Residents, Through-Travelers/Commuters Visually Sensitive Site: Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area Mitigation Planting Scheme: Module 1/Module 3/Module 4



Rating Panel Information: Your Name: KAC



Viewpoint Sensitivity: Scenic Quality: (Please rate existing scenic quality) Low Moderate High

Viewer Exposure: (Please rate frequency and duration of view) Continuous Repeated/Regular Occasional/Brief Rare

Viewer Description: (Please describe this view in your own words.)

OPEN PASTIRE CAND WITH
BISECTED NEWS DUE TO
EX. UTILITY LINES AND POLES.
A DEEP DITCH, FARM PENCE.
AND SCAUB WITH TRAILERS
DOMINATE AND DIRECT THE
NEW DOWN THE POAD. OPEN
MEADON 15 BISECTED BY A
DITEXT. LONGVEN CLOSED DUE
TO HEDGEFUN.

Contrast Rating: (Please rate the level of contrest between the existing view, Project components, and Project components with mitigation)

Contrast Rating Score Chart

Insignificant	Minin	nal	Moderate Appreciable				Strong
0	.5 1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4
Component	Sc	ore	Description of Contrast				
component	Project Components	Project w/Mitigation					
Landform	N.	2.5	FLAT TALL C	-DPD, DmpDA	HANEVE JENTS D	RIN	E ATS
Vegetation	3	2.5	THE E. SECOND	R. VEGO	ETATION REMOVAL	15 RE	Q,
Land Use	(N	2.5	BUTH	AND .	DEVELUT	ENAL L	LE.
Water	NIA	NM	DITEN	DUES X	JOT COLA	ノナ	
Sky	Cr.	2.5	SKY 15 SUBSTI	ATTON	EFED	WITH SALTS +	WAG
Viewer Activity	B	2.5	OPEN F TO HIG	PASTR	ELAND	DIS Z	UST-
TOTAL	2		Total all scores above				
AVERAGE			Average all scores ab	ove			

Page 21 of 26

Viewpoint 63SE

County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road) - NEW

Effectiveness of mitigation planting scheme (seasonal/variability, etc.):

THE MITIGATION PLANTING SOFTENS THE MIDGED NEW TO THE SUBSTATION WMPONTATS AND WALL; HOWEVER THE TALL SUBSTATION COMPONENTS, UTILITY POLES AND ARRESS ROAD DOM, NATE AND CUITTER THE SKY VIEW

Variable factors that may have influenced rating (atmospheric conditions, seasonal, etc.):

LEAF OFF CONDITIONS WILL ALLOW GREAFER

VISUAL PERMEABUTTY TO

Perceived effect on scenic quality/viewer enjoyment:

THE MIDSPO POSITION OF THE SUBSTATION EQUIPMENT PUTS THE INDUSTRIAL COMPONENTS UP LUBSE TO THE NEWER DEWING BY. THE LAFGE SCREENING WALLS ARE USVALL DEFENSIVE AND PROMDE NO ELTENDED NEN THEVEH TO THE BACKGROUND VEGETATION

Page 22 of 26

Viewpoint Information:

Viewpoint Number: 69

Distance to Nearest Visible Array: 417 feet Viewpoint Location: South Ripley Cemetery off of County Route 5 (NE Sherman Road)

Landscape Similarity Zone: Rural Upland

Viewer Type: Local Residents, Tourists/Recreational Users

Visually Sensitive Site: Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area, South Ripley

Cemetery

Mitigation Planting Scheme: Module 3



Minimal

1

Rating Panel Information: Your Name: KAC Date: 18 NAE 2021 ZINNE 2021-MT



15 VULY 2021-MITREV. Viewpoint Sensitivity: Scenic Quality: (Please rate existing scenic quality) LOV High

w	Moderate	
	1	

Viewer Exposure: (Please rate frequency and duration of view) Continuous Repeated/Regular Occasional/Brief Rare

Viewer Description: (Please describe this view in your own words.)

SMALL, PURAL CEMETERY
WITH MIKED CURRENT ATO
HISTORICAL MARKERS SET
AS THE FOREGROUND TO THE
REVERTING FIELD AND LARGE
DELLD. TREE HEDGERON IN THE
MIDTBEGRD. PEALEFUL
SETTING WITH CLEAN LINES
AND OPEN NEW TO SKY

Appreciable

3

Contrast Rating:

Insignificant

0

(Please rate the level of contrast between the existing view, Project components, and Project components with mitigation)

1.5

Contrast Rating Score Chart

.5

Moderate

2.5

2

	Sc	ore	Descriptions (Destruct
Component	Project Components	Project w/Mitigation	Description of Contrast
Landform	4	n)	FUATTENS JUP. ODD UNTAPUSITIUS TO CEMETERY MARKERS
Vegetation	4	n	LOSS OF MILED TEXTURE AND TYPE OF VEG IN CONTRAST TO MONN TURF
Land Use	4	3.5	INAPPROFIATE INDUSTRIAL INVASION TO A PLACE OF MEMORY & REFLECTION
Water	NA	NA	
Sky	0	0	NO IMPACT
Viewer Activity	4	Ŋ	By INSTALL INTRUSION INTO PLACE
TOTAL			Total all scores above OF MEMORY 1 T26V645+
AVERAGE			Average all scores above

Page 21 of 24

Strong

3.5

Viewpoint 69

South Ripley Cemetery off of County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road)

Effectiveness of mitigation planting scheme (seasonal/variability, etc.):

THE SCREEN PLANTING HELPS TO REDUCE THE

NSLAL DOMINANCE GRAY PANEL FACES THE HONEVER. IT DUES ENDIGNT TO REFES TABUSI THE SANKTHARY OUANTY TXIE CEMETER SLEEEN PLANTING LOSER IN PROXIMITY TO LEMETERY LAND WOND INCREASE BLEEBRINE CLAUTY.

Variable factors that may have influenced rating (atmospheric conditions, seasonal, etc.):

N/A

Perceived effect on scenic quality/viewer enjoyment:

GIVEN THE ADJACENT USE OF THE VIEWPOINT. THE

LEVEL OF IMPACT IS SIGNIFICANT AND IN

CONTRAST THE MEDATATIVE ASPECTS OF A

RURAL CEMETER

Page 22 of 24

Viewpoint Information:

Viewpoint Number: 75

Distance to Nearest Visible Array: 7,450 feet (1.41 miles) Viewpoint Location: County Route £22 Landscipe Similarity Zone: Rural Lpland Viewer Type: Local Residents, Through-Travelers/Commuters Visually Sensitive Site: None Identified huitgatien Planting Scheme: None Visible.



Contrast Rating:

(Please rate the level of contrast between the existing view Project components, and Project components with mitigation) Contrast Rating Score Chart

Insignificant	Minin	nal	Moderate		Appreciable		Strong	
0	.5 1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	
0	Sc	ore		Descr	intion of Contract			
Component	Project Components	Project w/Mitigation		Desci	iption of contrast			
Landform)	NA	SOLAL A TOPD	ARRAYS	Walk	WITH		
Vegetation	1	NA	CLEAR. APPER	NG IS I	JOT PER	pulat		
Land Use	/	N/A	STIL A	PURAL	- NEW			
Water	0	N/A	MOSTLY	NOR N				
Sky	0	N/A	NO IM	PACT	Ì			
Viewer Activity	/	a)A	MOSTZ	y HINK	DEN			
TOTAL			Total all scores above	9				
AVERAGE			Average all scores a	bove				
							Page 23 d	

Rating Panel Information: Your Name: KAC Date: 18 JUNE 2021 21 JUNE 2021-0077

eon

Viewpoint Sensitivity: Scenic Quality: (Please rate existing scenic quality) Low Moderate High

Viewer Exposure: (Please rate frequency and duration of view)
Continuous
Cocasional/Brief
Rare

Viewer Description: (Please describe this view in your own words.)
ATTRACTIVE PASTORAL VIEN
FROM A HIGH PUNT TO
THE AG. FIELD AND HOMESTER
WITH SINEWY ROAD MOUNG
TEROVERT THE MIDDLE. STRONG
CONTRAST OF VEGETATION
COUDES AND TEXTURES, SET
AGAINS THE CLEAR, BINE
SKA. QUINESSENTTAL PURAL
CHALACTER.

Viewpoint 75

County Route 622

Effectiveness of mitigation planting scheme (seasonal/variability, etc.):

MITIGATION PLANTING SCHEME: NONE USBIE

Variable factors that may have influenced rating (atmospheric conditions, seasonal, etc.):

THE LEAFON CONDITION WILL CHANGE THE NEW AND CONCEAL MORE ELEMENTS, INCLUDING

THE SOLAR ARRAYS.

Perceived effect on scenic quality/viewer enjoyment:

THE SCALE AND DISTANCE TO THE SULAR AREAYS MITTERTES THE POTENTIAL VISUAL EFFECTS FROM THIS NEW POINT. THE VISUAL INTEGRATY AND BEAVILY OF THE VIEW REMAINS INTACT.

Page 24 of 24

South Ripley Solar Project Town of Ripley, Chautauqua County, New York EDR Project No: 19020

Viewpoint Information:

Viewpoint Number: 5 Distance to Nearest Visible Array: 167 feet Viewpoint Location: Intersection of County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road) and Miller Road Landscape Similarity Zone: Rural Upland Viewer Type: Local Residents, Through-Traveters/Commuters Visually Sensitive Site: Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area Mitigation Planting Scheme: Module 1/Module 2



Minimal

Rating Panel Information: Your Name: Kenneth Gifford Date: 06/18/2021



 Viewpoint Sensitivity:

 Scenic Quality: (Please rate existing scenic quality)

 Low
 Moderate

 High

 Viewer Exposure: (Please rate frequency and duration of view)

 ☑ Continuous
 □ Repeated/Regular

 □ Occasional/Brief
 □ Rare

Viewer Description: (Please describe this view in your own words.) Open view of an ag. field mid. ground, with a road and drainage area in the foreground, and dense trees/ shrubs in the background. A mature deciduous treeline is visible along the horizon. Views of open space over the ag. use are dominant from this angle. The composition is composed of several horizontal lines rather than a singular focal point; the sky, the deciduous treeline, and the brown ag. field / drainage and the road. Viewer appears level with project site. Tall wind structure noted on the right side of view. Partially cloudy sky observed

Annreciable

Contrast Rating:

(Please rate the level of contrast between the existing view, Project components, and Project components with mitigation)

Contrast Rating Score Chart

Insignificant

0	.5 1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	
Component	Sc	Score		Description of Osymptot				
Component	Project Components	Project w/Mitigation		Desci	iption of contras	L		
Landform	1.5	1.5	The appearance of t proposed plantings	he level open sp in the foregroun	ace is foreshortene d	d / distorted by th	ne array and	
Vegetation	3	3	The array and mitigation plantings block views of the ag. field and forest beyond. Sim. view is a significant shift in the vegetation typology. Forest clearing visible above array.					
Land Use	3	3	Ag. land use no longer present in view. Sim. land use and screening vegetation are a different type than existing view.					
Water	n/a	n/a	Water may be p not appear to be	resent in drai e effected by	nage swale in fo proposed elem	oreground, bu ents.	t does	
Sky	3	3	Contrast of sky a by array and mit	against tree li tigation plant	ne of forest bey ings.	ond apprecia	bly altered	
Viewer Activity	3	2.5	Local residence and travelers will likely experience a dramatic change in scenic quality in the sim. view compared to the open ag, aesthetic of the ex. condition. Mitigation plantings help to impro- the shift in aesthetics at the ednes of the array in the sim view.					
TOTAL			Total all scores above					
AVERAGE			Average all scores at	ove				

Moderate

Page 1 of 24

Strong

Viewpoint 5

Intersection of County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road) and Miller Road

Effectiveness of mitigation planting scheme (seasonal/variability, etc.):

Planting scheme helps to screen and break up the dense industrial aesthetic of the array

component's edges. The numerous evergreen trees shown will improve the view

n s Figation during the late fall, winter, and early spring. The deciduous plantings shown

wabbe less effective. The mitigation plantings extend above the view line of the array,

the approach is a strong planting strategy compared to lower shrubs or grass

alternatives. As the vegetation establishes over time, the screen effectiveness will improve. SDF SD

5

FS

Variable factors that may have influenced rating (atmospheric conditions, seasonal, etc.):

The relatively medium height of the volunteer plantings in the drainage area effects the rating of this view - bottom of array appears less impactful than if these plantings were cut down. The leaf-on condition of the trees in the forest in the background makes the skyline appear more dramatically altered in the sim. view conditions.

Perceived effect on scenic quality/viewer enjoyment:

The sim. view is less of a rural / ag. feeling than the existing. The array creates many more hard edges and metallic surfaces that hinder the open view and feel of the space. The mitigation planting help to soften these edges but further enclose the previously open space. The overall quality of the space feels more industrial and enclosed. For the traveler, the sim. view gives more of a sense of a closed corridor with less outward view are an energy of the space.

views across an open agricultural landscape.

Viewpoint Information:

Viewpoint Number: 15 Distance to Nearest Visible Array: 170 feet Viewpoint Location: County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road) Landscape Similarity Zone: Rural Upland Viewer Type: Local Residents, Through-Travelers/Commuters Visually Sensitive Site: Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area, South Ripley Cemetery

Mitigation Planting Scheme: Module 1/Module 3



Contrast Rating: (Please rate the level of contrast between the existing view, Project components, and Project components with mitigation)

Contrast Rating Score Chart

Insignificant	Minin	nal	Moderate		Appreciable		Strong		
0	.5 1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4		
Commonweat	Sc	ore		Deee	intian of Contract				
Component	Project Components	Project w/Mitigation		Descr	iption of Contrast				
Landform	0	0	The undulating tree line of rolli	The undulating topography in the mid. ground is not obscured. The tree line of rolling hills in the background is also not obscured.					
Vegetation	.5	.5	The array in the sim, view does obscure the small patches of grassland visible. Generally, the major vegetation elements remain unchanged.						
Land Use	1	1	There is a visible change to the grassland ag. land use that is partially obscured however, this original land use does not strongly influence the overall scenic quality.						
Water	n/a	n/a	Water is not im	mediately visil	ole in the view.				
Sky	.5	1	The added mass in the spatial feeling of	the mid. ground of the sky howeve	of the array and miti r, the skyline appear	igation plantings rs mostly unchar	s impacts nged.		
Viewer Activity	.5	.5	Sim. views at this angle do not greatly impact the broader feel and scenic quality from the existing image.						
TOTAL			Total all scores abov	'e					
AVERAGE			Average all scores a	bove					

Page 3 of 24

Viewpoint Sensitivity: Scenic Quality: (Please rate existing scenic quality) Low Moderate High

Rating Panel Information:

Date: 06/18/2021

Your Name: Kenneth Gifford

Viewer Exposure: (Please rate frequency and duration of view) Continuous Repeated/Regular Occasional/Brief Rare

Viewer Description: (Please describe this view in your own words.) Partially open view of grassland, obscured by a dense shrub hedge and roadside in the foreground, and a dense forest in the background with views of several more visible grass fields and residences beyond. The landform slopes away from the viewer and undulates / rolls upward in elevation in the background. The layering of these vegetation types and topographic movement create a dynamic scene. The overhead wire and ag. building in the mid. ground are well obscured by the foreground vegetation. The dense deciduous texture of the forest and the hedge provide a nice contrast against the partially cloudy sky above.

Viewpoint 15 County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road)

Effectiveness of mitigation planting scheme (seasonal/variability, etc.): Mitigation planting screen appears to partially obscure the visible parts of the array but not entirely. The mitigation plantings visually blend nicely into the existing shrub hedge that is partially obscuring the array view. The seasonal color that is noted in the mitigation plantings contrasts with the existing color and texture of the vegetated scene.

Variable factors that may have influenced rating (atmospheric conditions, seasonal, etc.):

The foreground shrub hedge row that is obscuring mid. ground view appears lush and un-maintained. The leaf-on condition at the time of this photo adds to the overall screening effectiveness and dense green texture in the foreground and forested background.

Perceived effect on scenic quality/viewer enjoyment:

The sim. views with mitigation plantings effectively blend into the existing

topography and vegetation screening. Some parts of the array are visible on the left

side of the view however these industrial elements do not greatly change the scenic

quality of this view, and thus not greatly impacting the viewer's enjoyment.

Page 4 of 24

Viewpoint Information:

Viewpoint Number: 16 Distance to Nearest Visible Array: 179 feet Viewpoint Location: County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road) Landscape Similarity Zone: Rural Upland Viewer Type: Local Residents, Through-Travelers/Commuters Visually Sensitive Site: Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area Mitigation Planting Scheme: Module 4



Minimal

Rating Panel Information: Your Name: Kenneth Gifford Date: 07/15/2021

 Viewpoint Sensitivity:

 Scenic Quality: (Please rate existing scenic quality)

 Low
 Moderate
 High

 Viewer Exposure: (Please rate frequency and duration of view)

 Continuous
 X

 Repeated/Regular

 Occasional/Brief
 Rare

Annreciable

Contrast Rating: unobstructed against the to (Please rate the level of contrast between the existing view, Project components, and Project components with mitigation)

Contrast Rating Score Chart

Insignificant

0	.5 1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4		
Component	Sc	ore		Description of Contrast					
Component	Project Components	Project w/Mitigation		Desci		51			
Landform	2.5	2.5	Physical grading is not grassland and forestee	t visible in sim. view l d treeline is now beir	nowever, the profile ig obstructed by the	of the rolling array and mitigation p	plantings.		
Vegetation	.5	1.5	The mitigation plantings introduce a new vegetative type compared o the existing conditions. Some grassland is also lost to the paving shown.						
Land Use	3	3	The land use appears to be a complete change from the existing condition. The grassland shown at the boundary of the project maintains some feeling of continuity from the existing view.						
Water	n/a	n/a	Water is not im	mediately obs	ervable in the	view.			
Sky	3	3	Sim. view eleme of the view.	ents changes t	he skyline geo	metry and oper	n feel		
Viewer Activity	2	2	Open feeling of	the view has o	changed as we	ll as sight distar	nce.		
TOTAL			Total all scores above						
AVERAGE			Average all scores a	bove					

Moderate

Page 5 of 24

Strong

Viewpoint 16 County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road)

Effectiveness of mitigation planting scheme (seasonal/variability, etc.): Mitigation plantings in the sim. view partially obscure some of the edges of the components. The planting scheme appears to be primarily trees. The mitigation trees in the locations shown contrast the existing grassland vegetation but seem to match in color and texture to the forested background. Parts of the array are still visible because mitigation plantings are not continuous along component edges. Some of the proposed trees appear with flowers which contrasts the existing vegetation types.

Variable factors that may have influenced rating (atmospheric conditions, seasonal, etc.):

The low height of the volunteer plantings in the drainage area effects the rating of this view. The leaf-on condition of the trees in the forested background makes the skyline appear in greater contrast in the sim. view conditions. The low cut of the grassland vegetation makes the mitigation plantings appear in greater contrast to existing conditions.

Perceived effect on scenic quality/viewer enjoyment:

The change in skyline geometry and the loss in the topographic undulation / profile line in the grassland makes the more industrial nature of the array field feel less enjoyable. The hard horizontal line of the array occurring in the mid. ground feels like a big contrast to the gentle rolling grassland line in the background of the existing view. The proposed scheme appears less open and more corridor-like.

Page 6 of 24

Viewpoint Information: Viewpoint Number: 20

Distance to Nearest Visible Array: 84 feet Viewpoint Location: NYS Route 76 (Sherman Road) Landscape Similarity Zone: Rural Upland Viewer Type: Local Residents, Through-Travelers/Commuters Visually Sensitive Site: NYS Route 76, Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area Mitigation Planting Scheme: Module 2/Module 4



Rating Panel Information: Your Name: Kenneth Gifford Date: 07/15/2021

Viewpoint Sensitivity:



 Scenic Quality:
 (Please rate existing scenic quality)

 Low
 Moderate
 High

 Viewer Exposure: (Please rate frequency and duration of view)

 Continuous
 X

 Repeated/Regular

 Occasional/Brief
 Rare

Viewer Description: (Please describe this view in your own words.) Expansive view of numerous rolling grasslands with layers of shrub and forested areas in the background that creates a mosaic effect and adds to the feeling of openness. A drainage area is noted in the foreground. Grassland vegetation height is not continuous between foreground and mid. ground, giving the sense we are viewing across multiple properties. Islands of thick tree and shrub vegetation with grassland surrounding in the mid. ground. Dense forested island at the center of the view acts as a focal point. Partially cloudy sky.

Contrast Rating:

(Please rate the level of contrast between the existing view, Project components, and Project components with mitigation)

Contrast Rating Score Chart

insignificant	MININ	hai	woderate		Appreciable		Strong		
0	.5 1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4		
Commonweat	Sc	ore		Description of Contract					
Component	Project Components	Project w/Mitigation		Descri	ption of Contras	L			
Landform	3	2.5	Notable change in the the arrays. The mitigati	perception of the rol on planting screens	lling topography and the array field on the	l skyline as it is being right side of the im	g obscured by age.		
Vegetation	2	2	Existing forested are seem to blend more	xisting forested area clearing noted. Mitigation plantings sem to blend more naturally with the tall volunteer plantings in the drainage area.					
Land Use	3	3	Overall change in land use perceptible in sim. views. The grassland appears continuous with the previous land use texture.						
Water	n/a	n/a	Water is not imr	mediately obse	ervable in the v	riew.			
Sky	2.5	3	The proposed an skyline geometr	rrays and mitig y and overall c	ation planting	s break the exi e existing view	isting		
Viewer Activity	3	3	Elements in the obscure much o	sim. view feel ı f the existing c	more industria draw distance.	l. Proposed ele	ements		
TOTAL			Total all scores above	Total all scores above					
AVERAGE			Average all scores at	ove					

Page 7 of 24

Viewpoint 20 NYS Route 76 (Sherman Road)

Effectiveness of mitigation planting scheme (seasonal/variability, etc.): Mitigation plantings screen most of the array field in this view, but not all. Many of the visible components occur in the background as a dark gray mass.

Mitigation plantings on the right side of the view blend with the tall volunteer planting in the drainage area and completely screen the large array field in the background. The mitigation plantings shorten the view and obscure project components, land form, and create a new skyline geometry.

Variable factors that may have influenced rating (atmospheric conditions, seasonal, etc.):

The tall volunteer planting in the drainage area helps to blend mitigation plants into the existing view. The leaf-on condition of the forest/ tree line provides a strong visual contrast against the rolling grassland in the foreground. A leaf-off condition might greater emphasize the change in skyline geometry. The grassland in the foreground is relatively low and this variable may alter the visibility of project components on the left side of the view.

Perceived effect on scenic quality/viewer enjoyment:

The loss of sight distance and land use change are notable. Mitigation plantings in the 5-7 year view create a semi-continuous visual buffer to the project components beyond. This perceived border of vegetation in the foreground softens the impact of the visual changes however, many of the changing parameters noted will negatively impact the viewer's enjoyment.

South Ripley Solar Project Town of Ripley, Chautauqua County, New York EDR Project No: 19020

Viewpoint Information:

Viewpoint Number: 24 (Please view images for this viewpoint side by side, and provide one rating for the full view) Distance to Nearest Visible Array: 654 feet Viewpoint Location: NYS Route 76 (Sherman Road) Landscape Similarity Zone: Rural Upland Viewer Type: Local Residents, Through-Travelers/Commuters

Visually Sensitive Site: NYS Route 76, Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area

Mitigation Planting Scheme: Module 1/Module 4



Rating Panel Information: Your Name: Kenneth Gifford Date: 07/15/2021



Viewpoint Sensitivity: Scenic Quality: (Please rate existing scenic quality) Low ☐ Moderate X High

Viewer Exposure: (Please rate frequency and duration of view) Continuous Repeated/Regular Occasional/Brief Rare

Viewer Description: (Please describe this view in your own words.) In the foreground, moderately open grassland with wildflowers, an overhead utility line, and relatively flat topography. On the South side, the mid. ground has a residence, some mature trees, and a linear berm with dense shrub vegetation that transitions into a deciduous forest in the background. The line created by the berm aligns with a tree line / hedgerow looking West. Beyond the mid. ground are long open views towards rolling hills, vegetated by deciduous forest which creates a unified skyline geometry. Sky is partially cloudy.

Contrast Rating:

(Please rate the level of contrast between the existing view, Project components, and Project components with mitigation)

Contrast Rating Score Chart

Insignificant	Minin	nal	Moderate	Appreciable Strong			Strong		
0	.5 1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4		
Commonweat	Sc	ore		Deser	ution of Contract				
Component	Project Components	Project w/Mitigation		Descri	ption of Contrast				
Landform	1	1	The array field obscure and the rolling hills be	The array field obscures most of the mid. ground hedge, creating relief between foreground and the rolling hills beyond. Physical elevation differences do not appear present.					
Vegetation	1	1	Similar to landform, s mitigation plantings.	similar to landform, some of the vegetation aesthetic is altered by the array field and nitigation plantings.					
Land Use	1.5	1.5	Land use does change however, much of the foreground grassland remains the same.						
Water	n/a	n/a	Water is not im	mediately obs	ervable in the v	iew.			
Sky	.5	.5	Skyline geometry of in sim. view occur in	background forest the far mid. ground	is not modified. Skyl I and do not effect t	ine perception ch he open feeling o	nanges of the scene		
Viewer Activity	1	1	The change to the industrial land use and the overall size of the component field will distract fron the long distance views beyond. This is minimized by the unchanged foreground grasslands.						
TOTAL			Total all scores above	e					
AVERAGE			Average all scores al	bove					

Viewpoint 24 NYS Route 76 (Sherman Road)

Effectiveness of mitigation planting scheme (seasonal/variability, etc.): The mitigation plantings partially screen the array field and appear semi-continuous compared to the linear components beyond. The top of the array field extends above the height of the plantings, leaving a dark horizontal line interrupting the scene. The plantings appear dark and contrast highly with the grassland foreground. There is not a similar hedgerow for these plantings to blend into, so the mitigation plantings do not look fully naturalized or developed traditionally from agricultural practices.

Variable factors that may have influenced rating (atmospheric conditions, seasonal, etc.):

The grasslands in the foreground have wildflowers and was left to grow a medium height. The rating was heavily influenced by the stark contrast between the light foreground and the dark array field. Similarly, in the background deciduous forest, the leaf-on condition and the highlights from the sun provided great contrast to the proposed dark horizontal line.

Perceived effect on scenic quality/viewer enjoyment:

The shift in land use and the overall size of the array field will distract from

the long views beyond however, the foreground grassland that is remaining provides a good visual and physical buffer to the proposed components. The overall feeling of

the open ag. scene feels to be mostly preserved.

Page 10 of 24

Viewpoint Information:

Viewpoint Number: 40 Distance to Nearest Visible Array: 118 feet Viewpoint Location: County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road) Landscape Similarity Zone: Rural Upland Viewer Type: Local Residents, Through-Travelers/Commuters Visually Sensitive Site: Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area Mitigation Planting Scheme: Module 1



Rating Panel Information: Your Name: Kenneth Gifford Date: 06/21/2021



Viewpoint Sensitivity: Scenic Quality: (Please rate existing scenic quality) Low Moderate K High

Viewer Exposure: (Please rate frequency and duration of view) Continuous Repeated/Regular X Occasional/Brief Rare

Viewer Description: (Please describe this view in your own words.) Open Ag. grassland in the mid. ground with a large change in topography, sloping right to left. The topography creates a strong skyline geometry with rolling deciduous forests in the background providing depth to the scene, extending into the distance on the left side of the view. Small portions of the top of the tree line are also visible beyond the grassland geometry to the right. The foreground has a bright green lower maintained grass area with a distinct mow line and a tall scrub / shrub hedge bisecting the two grassland types. An overhead utility is noted in the scene, as well as a partially cloudy sky.

Contrast Rating: (Please rate the level of contrast between the existing view, Project components, and Project components with mitigation)

Contrast Rating Score Chart

Insignificant	Minin	nal	Moderate		Appreciable Strong					
0	.5 1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4			
Component	Sc	ore		Description of Contract						
Component	Project Components	Project w/Mitigation		Descri	ption of Contrast					
Landform	3	3	The mass of the a geometry of the r	The mass of the array components obscures the strong skyline geometry of the mid. ground and background grassland and forest types.						
Vegetation	2.5	2.5	Much of the mid. Mitigation plantir	Nuch of the mid. ground and background plantings are not obscured. Nitigation plantings are a contrasting texture to foreground hedge.						
Land Use	3	3	A large percentage of the view has shifted in land use type in the sim. view.							
Water	n/a	n/a	Water is not im	mediately obs	ervable in the v	iew.				
Sky	3	3	A large percent skyline geometi	age of the exis ry is obscured	ting mid. grou in the sim. view	nd and backg /.	ground			
Viewer Activity	2.5	2.5	Large changes i the existing hed	Large changes in land use, skyline / landform are notable however, the existing hedgerow shrub area does provide a physical buffer.						
TOTAL			Total all scores above							
AVERAGE			Average all scores al	bove						

Page 11 of 24

Viewpoint 40

County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road)

Effectiveness of mitigation planting scheme (seasonal/variability, etc.): Mitigation plantings only partially screen array field, with much of the array field still visible. The mitigation plantings blends into the foreground shrub hedge however there is a color/ texture difference between the existing and mitigation plantings. The absence of understory plantings leave much of the lower parts of the project components exposed.

Variable factors that may have influenced rating (atmospheric conditions, seasonal, etc.):

The various heights of the grasslands in the view create a strong compositional relationship with the skyline geometry that is obscured in the sim. views. The leaf-on condition and the height of the shrub hedge to remain greatly impacts the effectiveness of the mitigation plantings.

Perceived effect on scenic quality/viewer enjoyment:

The total land use change and overall loss of the existing skyline geometery will be notable by users of the site. The industrial look of the array component's rear construction is very visible and is a notable change from the open ag. feel from the existing. The existing shrub hedge to remain is a notable physical barrier to the site user.

Page 12 of 24

Viewpoint Information: Viewpoint Number: 44

Distance to Nearest Visible Array: 344 feet Viewpoint Location: Sinden Road Landscape Similarity Zone: Rural Upland Viewer Type: Local Residents

Visually Sensitive Site: Concord Grape Belt Heritage Area

Mitigation Planting Scheme: Module 1



Minimal

Contrast Rating:

Insignificant

(Please rate the level of contrast between the existing view, Project components, and Project components with mitigation)

Contrast Rating Score Chart

0	.5 1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4		
Component	Sc	ore	Description of Contrast						
Component	Project Components	Project w/Mitigation		Descri		51			
Landform	2	2	The mitigation plantin topographic variation However, the physica	ngs and the array field with color, line, and to I topography appears	changes the quality exture being notabl mostly unchanged.	/ and scenic nature of y different than the ex	the existing sting view.		
Vegetation	2	2	Similar to landform with a high contras	imilar to landform, the existing vegetation quality is greatly obscured ith a high contrasting texture although, much of the grassland type remains					
Land Use	3.5	3	Total change in land use type that comprises a majority of this view.						
Water	.5	.5	Ag. pond appe	ars mostly unch	anged / unob	ostructed			
Sky	.5	1.5	Mitigation plar	ntings alter skyli	ne geometery	/			
Viewer Activity	3	3	Overall scale of array field and land use change are notable. Mitigation do not provide strong relief from this change.						
TOTAL			Total all scores above						
AVERAGE			Average all scores a	above					

Moderate

Page 13 of 24

Strong



Scenic Quality: (Please rate existing scenic quality)

Viewer Exposure: (Please rate frequency and duration of view) Continuous Repeated/Regular Occasional/Brief Rare

Moderate High

Rating Panel Information:

Date: 07/15/2021

Viewpoint Sensitivity:

Low

Your Name: Kenneth Gifford

Viewer Description: (Please describe this view in your own words.) Open ag. grassland foreground and mid. ground with rolling topography sloping down then up and away from the viewer. The open grassland is interrupted by an ag. pond on the right side of the view. In the mid. ground, numerous tree / shrub hedges in an orthogonal layout, fragmenting the grassland into parcels. The mid. ground dense tree hedge adjoins the dense deciduous forest background with strong lines, further enforcing the orthogonal parcels and rolling topography. The forest background creates a strong skyline geometry against the partially cloudy sky.

Annreciable

Viewpoint 44 Sinden Road

Effectiveness of mitigation planting scheme (seasonal/variability, etc.): A large portion of the project components are screened by mitigation plantings. The plantings appear to be mostly trees that appear as a row rather than continuous. Plantings are in the foreground and have a dense leaf texture takes up much of the area in the center of the existing view. There are no similar vegetated areas in the foreground for the mitigation plantings to adjoin, making the trees seem less naturalized against the existing grassland.

Variable factors that may have influenced rating (atmospheric conditions, seasonal, etc.):

The height and bright green color of the grass gives the existing view a very scenic quality that contrasts highly with the array field and mitigation plantings in the sim. views. The bright sky and leaf-on condition of the forested background also contributes to this contrast.

Perceived effect on scenic quality/viewer enjoyment:

The array field is very large and much of it remains visible in mitigation planting views. The overall shift in land use type and color / texture change is notable. The topographic variation remains however, the contrasting industrial texture of the project components changes some of the scenic quality from the existing view. The components are set back from the road which allow for some physical buffer and maintains the general open feeling.

Viewpoint Information:

Viewpoint Number: 56 Distance to Nearest Visible Array: 139 feet Viewpoint Location: County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road) Landscape Similarity Zone: Rural Upland Viewer Type: Local Residents, Through-Travelers/Commuters Visually Sensitive Site: Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area Mitigation Planting Scheme: Module 2/Module 3

Rating Panel Information: Your Name: Kenneth Gifford Date: 06/21/2021



Viewpoint Sensitivity: Scenic Quality: (Please rate existing scenic quality) Low Moderate High

Viewer Exposure: (Please rate frequency and duration of view) Continuous Repeated/Regular Occasional/Brief Rare

Viewer Description: (Please describe this view in your own words.)

Open ag. field in the mid. ground with grassland strip in front. Foreground is a sparsely vegetated drainage area and road. Background extends far into the distance with rolling topography and dense deciduous forest undulating and rising above the viewer's eve line to create a strong horizontal skyline geometry. The view is composed of a series of low horizontal vegetation types in the foreground and mid. ground, contrasted by the spacious forest background. This creates a series of distinct natural color horizons against a clear blue sky.

Contrast Rating:

(Please rate the level of contrast between the existing view, Project components, and Project components with mitigation)

Contrast Rating Score Chart

Insignificant	Minin	nal	Moderate		Appreciable		Strong		
0	.5 1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4		
Commonweat	Sc	ore		Deser	intion of Contract				
Component	Project Components	Project w/Mitigation		Desci	iption of contrast				
Landform	2	3	All of the rolling obscured by the	g topography a e array field ar	and expansive v d mitigation pla	iews have be antings.	en		
Vegetation	3	3	The ag. field and forest beyond are no longer visible in the sim. view. Mitigation plantings introduce a new planting typology.						
Land Use	3.5	3.5	Total change in land use between existing and sim. views. No existing land uses are visible.						
Water	n/a	n/a	Water is not im	mediately obs	ervable in the vi	iew.			
Sky	3	3.5	Existing skyline	geometry has	been fully obsc	ured.			
Viewer Activity	3.5	3.5	Change in view extents, land use, and visibility of array components are notable. Overall feeling of open space has been disrupted.						
TOTAL			Total all scores abov	'e					
AVERAGE			Average all scores a	bove					

.. . .

Page 15 of 24

Viewpoint 56 County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road)

Effectiveness of mitigation planting scheme (seasonal/variability, etc.): Mitigation plantings fully screen the array field on the right side of the view, and do not screen on the left. Plantings extend above the skyline geometry of the components. There is no existing tree/ shrub vegetation to blend proposed plantings into however, the color and texture of the mitigation plantings contrast nicely against the low grass in the existing and sim. views.

Variable factors that may have influenced rating (atmospheric conditions, seasonal, etc.):

Drainage area plantings seem sparse and in leaf-off condition, mitigation screening

may be improved as swale establishes.

Perceived effect on scenic quality/viewer enjoyment:

The total land use change, and loss of the distance view are notable. Components and mitigation plantings are close to the viewer and create more enclosure where there was previously an open feel. The view into the components feels more industrial and cold. Viewer may be a bit more protected from the weather.

South Ripley Solar Project Town of Ripley, Chautauqua County, New York EDR Project No: 19020

Viewpoint Information: Viewpoint Number: 59

Distance to Nearest Visible Project Component: 132 feet Viewpoint Location: County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road) Landscape Similarity Zone: Rural Upland Viewer Type: Local Residents, Through-Travelers/Commuters Visually Sensitive Site: Concord Grape Belt Slate Heritage Area Mitigation Planting Scheme: Module 4



Minimal

Contrast Rating:

Insignificant

(Please rate the level of contrast between the existing view, Project components, and Project components with mitigation)

Contrast Rating Score Chart

0	.5 1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4		
Component	Sc	ore		Description of Contract					
component	Project Components	Project w/Mitigation		Desci					
Landform	2.5	2.5	Grading visib mitigation pla	le in the mid- intings obscu	ground. Proje re the existin	ect component g landform bey	is and yond.		
Vegetation	2	3	Project comp planting cont	Project components obscure existing plantings. Mitigation planting contrast with the existing veg. texture and layout					
Land Use	3	3	Complete change in land use. Effected areas take up much of the existing photo.						
Water	n/a	n/a	n/a						
Sky	3	3	Skyline geom	netry has bee and mitigation	n appreciably n plantings	altered by pro	oject		
Viewer Activity	2.5	2	The existing view is not particularly scenic. Mitigation plantings help to minimize the visual impact of project components						
TOTAL			Total all scores above						
AVERAGE			Average all scores a	above					

Moderate

Page 17 of 26

Strong

e

 Viewpoint Sensitivity:

 Scenic Quality: (Please rate existing scenic quality)

 Image: Scenic Quality: (Please rate existing scenic quality)

Rating Panel Information:

Your Name: Ken Gifford

Date: 12/21/2021

 Viewer Exposure: (Please rate frequency and duration of view)

 Continuous
 Repeated/Regular

 Occasional/Brief
 Rare

Viewer Description: (Please describe this view in your own words.) A somewhat open grassland mid. ground with dense deciduous forest in the background. Large overhead utility structures noted in the mid. ground that interrupt an otherwise continuous skyline geometry created by the forest edge. The foreground has a natural wood staked, metal fence and a few sparse woody shrubs. The topography of the site is minimal but does appear to slope towards the viewer. Deciduous vegetation appears in leaf-off condition. The edge of the low grassland field is a strong horizontal line in the view. The sky is clear and sunny.

Appreciable

Viewpoint 59 County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road)

Effectiveness of mitigation planting scheme (seasonal/variability, etc.): Mitigation plantings only partially screen project components. Plantings appear lush and green, this contrasts with the leaf-off deciduous plantings beyond. Most of the project components extend above the plantings and create strong contrast against the blue sky. Plantings appear as several massings with a break in the middle of the view that reveals the components beyond. The massing appear somewhat naturalized and parallel the existing fence and road, similar to a tree lines found along property lines in this land use type.

Variable factors that may have influenced rating (atmospheric conditions, seasonal, etc.):

The existing vegetation appears to be deciduous and in a leaf-off condition. This contrasts greatly with the

mitigation plantings and emphasizes the contrast in skyline geometry. Sky was clear and pale blue at the time

of the photo. This condition probably creates more contrast in the change in skyline geometry.

Perceived effect on scenic quality/viewer enjoyment:

The change is landform, skyline geometry, and land use are notable. The visible project components detract from the viewer's enjoyment however the existing scene isn't particularly scenic. The mitigation plantings help to buffer the negative impacts. The depth of view is foreshortened. The aesthetic is more industrial and the feeling is more corridor like.

Page 18 of 26

South Ripley Solar Project Town of Ripley, Chautauqua County, New York EDR Project No: 19020

Viewpoint Information:

Viewpoint Number: 63S Distance to Nearest Visible Project Component: 217 feet Viewpoint Location: County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road) Landscape Similarity Zone: Rural Upland Viewer Type: Local Residents, Through-Travelers/Commuters Visually Sensitive Site: Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area Mitigation Planting Scheme: Module 1/Module 4



Rating Panel Information: Your Name: Ken Gifford Date: 12/21/2021

Viewpoint Sensitivity: Scenic Quality: (Please rate existing scenic quality) 🗙 Low Moderate High

Viewer Exposure: (Please rate frequency and duration of view) Continuous Repeated/Regular Cccasional/Brief Rare

Viewer Description: (Please describe this view in your own words.) Somewhat open grassland mid. ground with a small topographic swale cutting through the foreground. The background shows a leaf-off deciduous forest with a continuous skyline geometry against a clear blue sky. Forest tree line is screening what appears to be utility structures beyond. The foreground contains a natural wood stake metal fence with woody shrubs at it's base. Grassland in the mid. ground has some areas of taller grass,fallen trees, shrubs, and a few single trees in the field on the right side of the view.

Contrast Rating:

(Please rate the level of contrast between the existing view, Project components, and Project components with mitigation)

Contrast Rating Score Chart

	Insignificant	Minin	nal	Moderate		Appreciable		Strong
	0	.5 1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4
Γ	C	Sc	ore		Deere			
	Component	Project Components	Project w/Mitigation		Descr	iption of Contrast		
ſ	Landform	1.5	1.5	Grading is visi	ble in the pr	oposed views		
	Vegetation	2	2.5	Project compo plantings contr	nents screer ast with exis	n existing vege ting vegetatio	etation. Mitiç n	gation
	Land Use	3	3	All of the land modified in the	use visible ir proposed vi	i the existing ii ew	mage has b	een
	Water	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	Sky	1	1	Structure on th skyline geome	ie left side o [.] try	f the image im	pacts the e	xisting
	Viewer Activity	1.5	1.5	The existing view is not particularly scenic. Landuse on notable			change is	
	TOTAL			Total all scores above				
	AVERAGE			Average all scores above				

.. . .

Page 19 of 26

Viewpoint 63S County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road)

Effectiveness of mitigation planting scheme (seasonal/variability, etc.): The mitigation plantings only partially screen the project components. The plantings appear green and lush, this contrasts with the mostly leaf-off deciduous treeline beyond. The plantings are in small clusters and in varied heights. This gives the plantings a somewhat naturalized look. Some of the gaps in the plantings reveal the project components beyond. The structure on the left side of the image extends above the plantings. The lawn is a continuous understory from the foreground to the background.

Variable factors that may have influenced rating (atmospheric conditions, seasonal, etc.):

The existing vegetation appears to be deciduous and in a leaf-off condition. This contrasts greatly with the mitigation plantings and emphasizes the contrast in skyline geometry. Sky was clear and pale blue at the time of the photo. This condition probably creates more contrast in the change in skyline geometry. Grass appears low / maintained in both the existing and proposed views.

Perceived effect on scenic quality/viewer enjoyment:

The existing view was not particularly scenic. The change in land use, vegetation, and overall aesthetic change

of the visible project components is notable. The mitigation plantings screen some of the proposed work

however many of the structures proposed are still very visible. The change feels more industrial and less rural

and the foreshortened views give the space a more corridor-like feeling.

Page 20 of 26

South Ripley Solar Project Town of Ripley, Chautauqua County, New York EDR Project No: 19020

Viewpoint Information:

Viewpoint Number: 63SE Distance to Nearest Visible Project Component: 218 feet Viewpoint Location: County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road) Landscape Similarity Zone: Rural Upland Viewer Type: Local Residents, Through-Travelers/Commuters Visually Sensitive Site: Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area Mitigation Planting Scheme: Module 1/Module 3/Module 4



Rating Panel Information: Your Name: Ken Gifford Date: 12/21/2021

 Viewpoint Sensitivity:

 Scenic Quality: (Please rate existing scenic quality)

 Image: Sensitivity of the senses of the sensitivity of the sensitivity of the sensit

 Viewer Exposure: (Please rate frequency and duration of view)

 Continuous
 Repeated/Regular

 Occasional/Brief
 Rare

Viewer Description: (Please describe this view in your own words.) Somewhat open grassland mid. ground with a small topographic swale cutting through. The background is a leaf-off deciduous forest with a continuous skyline geometry against a clear blue sky. Numerous wooden stake fences border the grassland lots in the mid. ground. There is a tall, bushy patch on the left side of the view with 2 trailers visible. The foreground contains a natural wood stake metal fence and wooden utility poles with woody shrubs at it's base and a drainage area that parallels a road.

Contrast Rating:

(Please rate the level of contrast between the existing view, Project components, and Project components with mitigation)

Contrast Rating Score Chart

Insignificant	Minin	nal	Moderate		Appreciable		
0	.5 1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4
Commente	Sc	ore		Deser			
Component	Project Components	Project w/Mitigation		Descri	ption of Contrast	l .	
Landform	1	1	Minor grading	is visible			
Vegetation	2	2	Most of the tre	eline in the e	xisting view is	s obscured	
Land Use	3	3	Most of the ex.	. land use ha	s changed		
Water	n/a	n/a	n/a				
Sky	3	3	Project compo	nents obscu	re skyline geo	ometry	
Viewer Activity	2.5	2.5	Land use and	skyline geom	etry changes	are notable.	
TOTAL			Total all scores above	9			
AVERAGE			Average all scores at	bove			

Page 21 of 26

Viewpoint 63SE

County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road)

Effectiveness of mitigation planting scheme (seasonal/variability, etc.):
The mitigation plantings only partially screen the project components. The plantings appear green and lush,
this contrasts with the mostly leaf-off deciduous treeline beyond, and the woody shrubs that parallel the road.
Plantings appear in clusters with an opening for the driveway connection. Most of the project components
extend above the plantings. The planting masses seem to blend in with the existing shrub massing on the left
side of the image.

Variable factors that may have influenced rating (atmospheric conditions, seasonal, etc.):

The existing vegetation appears to be deciduous and in a leaf-off condition. This contrasts greatly with the

mitigation plantings and emphasizes the contrast in skyline geometry. Sky was clear and pale blue at the time

of the photo. This condition probably creates more contrast in the change in skyline geometry. Grass is a

consistent understory from the foreground into the mid. ground.

Perceived effect on scenic quality/viewer enjoyment:

The height of the project components creates a strong change in landuse and skyline geometry. The existing view is not particularly scenic. Project components and mitigation plantings are set back from the viewer which minimizes these negative effects. The overall aesthetic has changed to be more industrial. The feeling is less open and more corridor like.

Page 22 of 26

South Ripley Solar Project Town of Ripley, Chautauqua County, New York EDR Project No: 19020

Viewpoint Information:

Viewpoint Number: 69 Distance to Nearest Visible Array: 417 feet Viewpoint Location: South Ripley Cemetery off of County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road) Landscape Similarity Zone: Rural Upland Viewer Type: Local Residents, Tourists/Recreational Users Visually Sensitive Site: Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area, South Ripley Cemetery

Mitigation Planting Scheme: Module 3



Contrast Rating:

(Please rate the level of contrast between the existing view, Project components, and Project components with mitigation)

Contrast Rating Score Chart

Insignificant	Minin	nal	Moderate		Appreciable		Strong
0	.5 1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4
Commonweat	Sc	ore		Deee	untion of Contract		
Component	Project Components	Project w/Mitigation		Desci	ription of Contrast		
Landform	1	1	Change in fores undulation.	t coverage fla	ttens the percep	otion of topo	graphic
Vegetation	3	3	Loss of dense de change from the	eciduous fore e existing viev	st on the right s v.	ide of the vie	w is an
Land Use	3.5	3.5	The scrub mid. grou the cemetery. The c	und in the existin hange shown in	g view is serving a b the project compon	ackdrop to ent area is notal	ble.
Water	n/a	n/a	Water is not im	mediately obs	ervable in the vi	iew.	
Sky	1	1	The loss of fore but this does no	st in the mid. ot subtract fro	ground changes om the overall fe	s the skyline of open	geometry ness.
Viewer Activity	4	3.5	Users of the cen introduction of	netery will str the industrial	ongly note the le aesthetics of the	oss of vegeta e component	ition and s.
TOTAL			Total all scores above	9			
AVERAGE			Average all scores a	bove			

Rating Panel Information:

Date: 07/15/2021

Viewpoint Sensitivity:

Low

Continuous

Occasional/Brief

Your Name: Kenneth Gifford

Scenic Quality: (Please rate existing scenic quality)

Moderate Migh

Viewer Exposure: (Please rate frequency and duration of view)

X Rare

Viewer Description: (Please describe this view in your own words.) Semi-open lawn and cemetery in foreground. Numerous headstones aligned with viewer's sight-line. Some deciduous trees noted on the left edge of the view. Mid. ground tall grass / shrub /scrub have a consistent red-brown coloration.

Background is a dense deciduous forest with a continuous

skyline geometry against the clear blue sky. Forest tree line

extends perpendicular towards the viewer on the right side of the image. 4 main horizontal layers of the composition are

green grass, red-brown scrub, brown forest, and blue sky.

Topography slopes gently away from viewer.

Repeated/Regular

Page 21 of 24

Viewpoint 69

South Ripley Cemetery off of County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road)

Effectiveness of mitigation planting scheme (seasonal/variability, etc.): Mitigation plantings only partially screen the array with the top portions still visible and

continuous in the view. Proposed plantings are dark and evergreen and

have a high contrast with the adjacent surrounding leaf-off deciduous vegetation.

Heights of mitigation plantings are varied however, the contrast in color and texture make plantings look less naturalized.

Variable factors that may have influenced rating (atmospheric conditions, seasonal, etc.):

The leaf-off condition of the deciduous forest creates a high contrast with the mitigation plantings. The height of the scrub greatly influences the effectiveness of the screening and overall impact of the project components. The clear sky matches in color the project components and minimizes the contrast with the existing scene.

Perceived effect on scenic quality/viewer enjoyment:

The component area is the visual backdrop for the cemetery in this view. The industrial aesthetic of the project components, the loss of the forest vegetation type, and the overall change to the scene composition strongly detracts from the cemetery user's scenic quality given the existing land use type.

Page 22 of 24

Viewpoint Information:

Viewpoint Number: 75 Distance to Nearest Visible Array: 7,450 feet (1.41 miles) Viewpoint Location: County Route 622 Landscape Similarity Zone: Rural Upland Viewer Type: Local Residents, Through-Travelers/Commuters Visually Sensitive Site: None Identified Mitigation Planting Scheme: None Visible.



 Viewpoint Sensitivity:

 Scenic Quality: (Please rate existing scenic quality)

 Low
 Moderate
 Migh

 Viewer Exposure: (Please rate frequency and duration of view)

 Continuous
 Repeated/Regular

 Occasional/Brief
 Rare



Minimal

Viewer Description: (Please describe this view in your own words.) Open scene where viewer's sight line travels a long distance across numerous land uses and vegetation types. Foreground is grassland w/ sparse woody shrubs and trees. In the mid. ground; a horizontal treeline, sprawling lawn/ grassland with a road bisecting it, islands of dense tree coverage in the center of the view, and residences on the right side of the view. The background is mostly deciduous forest coverage with grassy lots, and ag. building/ residences layered in the center of the image. Topography is gently rolling hills with a continuous skyline geometry against a partially cloud sky.

Contrast Rating:

(Please rate the level of contrast between the existing view, Project components, and Project components with mitigation)

Contrast Rating Score Chart

insignificant	WITTE	Idl	Moderate Appreciable 3				Subirg	
0	.5 1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	
Commonweat	Sc	Score		Description of Osymptot				
Component F Landform Vegetation Land Use Water	Project Components	Project w/Mitigation		Descri	ption of Contras	t		
Landform	.5	.5	Minor change in	visible land fo	orm in relation	to the total im	nage	
Vegetation	1	1	Some clearing is change the over	noted in the land the	background bund bund bund bund bund bund begin begin beind beind beind beind beind beind beind beind beind beind Description of the second bund beind b	ut does not sig e	nificantly	
Land Use	1	1	The array fields component to t	and forest clea he larger view	aring are visibl	e but are not a	major	
Water	0	0	A water body is appear to be im	visible in the c pacted by the	enter of the m project compo	nid. ground but onents / sim. w	t does not ork.	
Sky	.5	.5	Minimal change	to skyline geo	ometry in sim.	view.		
Viewer Activity	1	1	Viewer may noti significantly alte	ce change in la r their experie	and use type b nce.	out it does not		
TOTAL			Total all scores above)				
AVERAGE			Average all scores ab	ove				

Madanat

Page 23 of 24

Viewpoint 75 County Route 622

Effectiveness of mitigation planting scheme (seasonal/variability, etc.): Mitigation planting view not provided.

Variable factors that may have influenced rating (atmospheric conditions, seasonal, etc.):

Sim. photo taken during leaf-off conditions. Foliage may better screen project components. The level of reflectivity of project components may change the level of scenic difference. Array field are rendered very dark in this view which blends into the shadowed areas of forest cover.

Perceived effect on scenic quality/viewer enjoyment:

Sim. view changes a relatively small amount of the existing view. Project components

are visible however they do not dramatically alter the scenic quality or viewer

enjoyment of the scene because of the small footprint compared to the overall view.

Page 24 of 24

South Ripley Solar Project Town of Ripley, Chautauqua County, New York EDR Project No: 19020

Viewpoint Information:

Viewpoint Number: 5 Distance to Nearest Visible Array: 167 feet Viewpoint Location: Intersection of County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road) and Miller Road Landscape Similarity Zone: Rural Upland Viewer Type: Local Residents, Through-Travelers/Commuters Visually Sensitive Site: Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area Mitigation Planting Scheme: Module 1/Module 2



Rating Panel Information: Your Name: Sarah Hogan Date: 06/20/2021

 Viewpoint Sensitivity:

 Scenic Quality: (Please rate existing scenic quality)

 Low
 Moderate

 High

 Viewer Exposure: (Please rate frequency and duration of view)

 Continuous
 X

 Repeated/Regular

 Occasional/Brief
 Rare

Viewer Description: (Please describe this view in your own words.) <u>Country road with an open view of flat agricultural fields. A</u> <u>road and drainage ditch is in the foreground. The golden</u> <u>agricultural fields contrast with the dark green stand of mature</u> <u>trees in the background. The trees create a contrasting</u> <u>line along the horizon with the blue sky. The dark green color</u> <u>and texture of the mature trees creates a strong linear focal</u> <u>point and draws the eye to the center of the view. The sky</u> <u>and roadway are dominant features in this view. The road</u> <u>creates a strong line in the foreground.</u>

Contrast Rating:

(Please rate the level of contrast between the existing view, Project components, and Project components with mitigation)

Contrast Rating Score Chart

Insignificant	Minin	nal	Moderate		Appreciable		Strong	
0	.5 1	1.5	2 2.5 3 3.5					
Component	Sc	ore	Deceription of Contract					
Landform Vegetation	Project Components	Project w/Mitigation						
Landform	4	3	The agricultural a strong line in	The agricultural fields are relatively flat. The size of the panels creates a strong line in the middle ground.				
Vegetation	4	2	The panels block proposed vegeta	The panels block the view of the horizon and mature trees. The proposed vegetation helps soften the hard edge created by the panels.				
Land Use	3	3	The panels con cultural field.	ting land use	e of agri-			
Water	NA	NA	NA					
Sky	4	2.5	The panels crea The blue sky co	te a hard cont ntrasts with th	rasting line agai ie dark panels.	nst the sky ir	n this view.	
Viewer Activity	4	3	The panels will have a significant impact on the scenic qua proximity to the road; blocking the views across the field. T the panels		n the scenic quality of t icross the field. The mit	this view given the igation helps soft	eir close en the edge of	
TOTAL	19	13.5	Total all scores above					
AVERAGE	3.8	2.7	Average all scores a	bove				

Page 1 of 24

Viewpoint 5

Intersection of County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road) and Miller Road

Effectiveness of mitigation planting scheme (seasonal/variability, etc.): The planting mitigation breaks up the hard line created at the horizon between the contrasting panels and blue sky while softening the edge of the array. Some larger deciduous trees might help draw the eye up as a lot of the plantings seem small/unnatural. The evergreens feel out of place along the road side but understand their use for screening and are an effective strategy in screening the panels. Infilling with a more natural roadside hedgerow planting scheme might make help blend the plantings into the landscape more effectively.

Variable factors that may have influenced rating (atmospheric conditions, seasonal, etc.):

The bright blue sky contrasts significantly with the panels creating a hard line. If the sky were an overcast cloudy day it may have influenced the rating. The mitigation efforts help break up the form of the panels. Seasonal "leaf-off" conditions for the deciduous mitigation would have influenced my rating.

Perceived effect on scenic quality/viewer enjoyment:

The panels are highly visible from the road and dominate the middle ground. The scenic quality of the view across the agricultural field has been greatly impacted by the installation of this array. There is no longer an open view across the fields. The mature trees in the background are no longer visible. The view has a sense of enclosure now given the proximity of the panels to the road edge.

South Ripley Solar Project Town of Ripley, Chautauqua County, New York EDR Project No: 19020

Viewpoint Information:

Viewpoint Number: 15 Distance to Nearest Visible Array: 170 feet Viewpoint Location: County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road) Landscape Similarity Zone: Rural Upland Viewer Type: Local Residents, Through-Travelers/Commuters Visually Sensitive Site: Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area, South Ripley Cemelery

Mitigation Planting Scheme: Module 1/Module 3



Rating Panel Information: Your Name: Sarah Hogan Date: 06/20/2021

e

 Viewpoint Sensitivity:

 Scenic Quality: (Please rate existing scenic quality)

 Low
 Moderate

 High

 Viewer Exposure: (Please rate frequency and duration of view)

 Continuous
 Image: Repeated/Regular

 Occasional/Brief
 Rare

Viewer Description: (Please describe this view in your own words.) <u>Country roadside view of rolling hills with mature trees in the</u> <u>distance and along the horizon. Existing road side vegetation</u> <u>gives texture along the edge of the road. The road creates</u> <u>a strong line in this view. The utility pole creates a strong vertical</u> <u>line / element that protrudes the horizon creating a significant</u> <u>focal point in the view. An existing roof line contrasts with the</u> <u>green roadside vegetation and mature trees in the background.</u> <u>The sky is dominant and contrasts with the dark green horizon.</u> <u>The topography appears to be gently rolling hills and slopes</u> <u>away from the viewer.</u>

Contrast Rating: away from the viewer. (Please rate the level of contrast between the existing view, Project components, and Project components with mitigation)

Contrast Ratin	ng Score Chart						
Insignificant	Min	imal	Moderate		Appreciable		Strong
0	.5	1 1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4
Commonweat	S	core		Dee	ninting of Contract		
Component	Project Components	Project w/Mitigation]	Dese	cription of Contrast		
Landform	.5	0	The panels do rolling hill land	not project in I form.	to the horizon. Th	ey blend wit	h the
Vegetation	1	0	The existing road mitigation helps s	side vegetatior soften and bler	n does a great job so nd these panels into	creening the p the landscape	anels. The e.
Land Use	2	1	The land is pre ing with a farm	viously distur n/residence in	bed and has deve the view.	lopment alre	ady occur-
Water	NA	NA	NA				
Sky	0	0	The panels do the horizon an	not contrast v d buffered by	with the sky given the texture of the	their locatio e vegetation.	n below
Viewer Activity	1	.5	The panels have minin in the middle ground. buffering the hard an	mal to insignificant . The existing veget gular lines of the pa	impact on the scenic qua ation that helps soften th anels.	lity of this view giv e panels within the	ven their locatio e landscape by
TOTAL	4.5	х	Total all scores abo	ve			
AVERAGE	.9	.3	Average all scores	above			

Page 3 of 24

Viewpoint 15 County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road)

Effectiveness of mitigation planting scheme (seasonal/variability, etc.): The height of the existing road side vegetation helps effectively screen the panels. The mitigation efforts help soften the harsh line created by the top of the panels. The utility pole and overhead wires draw the eye up. The contrasting roof line and structures in the distance help draw your way away from the panels.

Variable factors that may have influenced rating (atmospheric conditions, seasonal, etc.):

"Leaf off" conditions would have influenced my rating given more visibility of the solar panels. Seasonal color may have influenced the rating creating more contrasting colors_ against the dark panels.

Perceived effect on scenic quality/viewer enjoyment:

Minimal/insignificant impact to the viewer during "leaf out" conditions. The panels are screened by the existing road side vegetation and the proposed mitigation helps create a texture that softens the hard lines/edge of the panels in the middle ground.

Page 4 of 24

South Ripley Solar Project Town of Ripley, Chautauqua County, New York EDR Project No: 19020

Viewpoint Information:

Viewpoint Number: 16 Distance to Nearest Visible Array: 179 feet Viewpoint Location: County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road) Landscape Similarity Zone: Rural Upland Viewer Type: Local Residents, Through-Travelers/Commuters Visually Sensitive Site: Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area Mitigation Planting Scheme: Module 4



Rating Panel Information: Your Name: Sarah Hogan Date: 07/17/2021

Viewpoint Sensitivity: Scenic Quality: (Please rate existing scenic quality) Low X Moderate High

Viewer Exposure: (Please rate frequency and duration of view) Continuous Repeated/Regular Occasional/Brief Rare

Viewer Description: (Please describe this view in your own words.) Open road side view over green fields in the middle ground. There appears to be low growing roadside vegetation (drainage ditch/swale) before transitioning to a consistently green textured field. Dark green mature trees create a strong horizon from left to right before fading into the green field. There is an existing power line that contrasts with the sky above the horizon. The sky is partly cloudy. The topography appears to be slightly rolling.

Viewpoint 16 County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road)

Effectiveness of mitigation planting scheme (seasonal/variability, etc.):

The mitigation plan is effective at breaking up the consistent view of the panels. The plan benefits from under story

shrubs and evergreens to help screen the view the panels. The plan would recommend benefit from recreating a

roadside hedgerow with varying heights of deciduous and evergreen trees mixed with medium to large

shrubs.

Variable factors that may have influenced rating (atmospheric conditions, seasonal, etc.):

"Leaf off" conditions would have influenced my rating given more visibility of the solar panels. The panels are less

contrasting against the green fields and roadside vegetation. Seeing the panels and mitigation during the non-growing

season against tan/brown fields or even snow covered ground may have influenced my rating.

Perceived effect on scenic quality/viewer enjoyment:

The panels are visible from the road and dominate the middle ground. The scenic quality of the view across the field

has been moderately impacted by the installation of this array. There is no longer an open view across the fields. The

mature trees in the background are no longer visible. The horizon is impacted by the hard lines of the panels. The

panels are still visible and the lines contrast against the sky even with mitigation.



(Please rate the level of contrast between the existing view, Project components, and Project components with mitigation)

Contrast Rating Score Chart

Insignificant	Minim	nal	Moderate		Appreciable		Strong
0	.5 1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4
Commente	Sc	ore		Deser	ation of Contract		
Component	Project Components	Project w/Mitigation					
Landform Vegetation Land Use	3	2	The panels, fence and service road are relatively flat. The panels dominant the v and prohibit the views across the filed towards the mature trees and horizon.				
Vegetation	3	3	The mitigation helps shrubs and evergree	break up the stro n trees help buffe	ng horizontal lines o r the views to the p	of the panels. Th anels and fencin	e under-story g/access road
Land Use	3	3	The panels contras	t significantly with	the existing land us	se of open agric	ultural fields
Water	NA	NA	NA				
Sky	3	3	The sky contrasts	with the form of t	he panes and propo	osed vegetation	
Viewer Activity	4	3.5	The panels signifi	cantly change the	view across the op	en field.	
TOTAL	16	14.5	Total all scores above	9			
AVERAGE	3.2	2.9	Average all scores al	bove			

Page 5 of 24

South Ripley Solar Project Town of Ripley, Chautauqua County, New York EDR Project No: 19020

Viewpoint Information: Viewpoint Number: 20

Distance to Nearest Visible Array: 84 feet Viewpoint Location: NYS Route 76 (Sherman Road) Landscape Similarity Zone: Rural Upland Viewer Type: Local Residents, Through-Travelers/Commuters Visually Sensitive Site: NYS Route 76, Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area Mitigation Planting Scheme: Module 2/Module 4



Rating Panel Information: Your Name: Sarah Hogan Date: 07/17/2021

e

 Viewpoint Sensitivity:

 Scenic Quality: (Please rate existing scenic quality)

 Low
 Moderate

 High

 Viewer Exposure: (Please rate frequency and duration of view)

 Continuous
 X

 Repeated/Regular

 Occasional/Brief
 Rare

Viewer Description: (Please describe this view in your own words.) Open view of rolling green fields from edge of existing road. Pockets of mature tree stands occur in the middle ground and background create a rolling horizon line. The dark green trees contrast with the blue, partly clouded sky. The view is dominated by the green fields and roadside vegetation in the foreground. There are pockets of shrubs and defined lines of grassland vegetation.

Contrast Rating:

(Please rate the level of contrast between the existing view, Project components, and Project components with mitigation)

Contrast Rating Score Chart

Insignificant	Minin	nal	Moderate		Appreciable		Strong		
0	.5 1	1.5	2	2 2.5 3 3.5 4					
Comment	Sc	ore		Deser					
Component	Project Components	Project w/Mitigation]	Description of Contrast					
Landform	4	2	The strong lines of	of the panels cont	trast against the ro	olling topopgraphy			
Vegetation	3	1	XX						
Land Use	4	4	The panels contra	st with the existin	ig land use of oper	n agricultural fields.			
Water	NA	NA	NA						
Sky	2	.5	The hard lines of the helps buffer this co	ne panels contras ontrast.	t with the bright bl	ue sky. The mitigati	on definitle		
Viewer Activity	4	2	The panels and wit	th mitigation mod	erately change the	e view across the lar	ndscape.		
TOTAL	17	9.5	Total all scores above						
AVERAGE	3.4	1.9	Average all scores ab	ove					

Page 7 of 24

Viewpoint 20 NYS Route 76 (Sherman Road)

Effectiveness of mitigation planting scheme (seasonal/variability, etc.):

The panel and fence visibility is greatly reduced in this view. The planting types and textures feel out of place (more

ornamental) creating more contrast between the existing vegetation within the view. The panels have been effectivily

screened.

Variable factors that may have influenced rating (atmospheric conditions, seasonal, etc.):

"Leaf off", non growing season and winter conditions would have influenced my rating creating more contrast between

grass fields, existing vegetation and the panels.

Perceived effect on scenic quality/viewer enjoyment:

The visibility of the panels and fence has been greatly reduced by the mitigation. The existing vegetation and rolling

topography help offset the contrast.

Page 8 of 24

South Ripley Solar Project Town of Ripley, Chautauqua County, New York EDR Project No: 19020

Viewpoint Information:

Viewpoint Number: 24 (Please view images for this viewpoint side by side, and provide one rating for the full view) Distance to Nearest Visible Array: 654 feet Viewpoint Location: NYS Route 76 (Sherman Road) Landscape Similarity Zone: Rural Upland Viewer Type: Local Residents, Through-Travelers/Commuters

Visually Sensitive Site: NYS Route 76, Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area

Mitigation Planting Scheme: Module 1/Module 4



Rating Panel Information: Your Name: Sarah Hogan Date: 07/17/2021

Viewpoint Sensitivity: Scenic Quality: (Please rate existing scenic quality) Low X Moderate High

Viewer Exposure: (Please rate frequency and duration of view) Continuous Repeated/Regular Occasional/Brief Rare

Viewer Description: (Please describe this view in your own words.) Open view across green field from existing road edge. Mature trees create a horizon in the distance/background. An existing barn and storage buildings can be seen in the middle ground to the right of the view. An existing home can be seen in the middle ground to the left of the view. There are four existing utility poles that create strong vertical lines. The utility poles draw the eye to the middle ground of the view. The green fields and blue sky are dominant features.

Contrast Rating:

(Please rate the level of contrast between the existing view, Project components, and Project components with mitigation)

Contrast Rating Score Chart

Insignificant	Minin	nal	Moderate	erate Appreciable		Strong					
0	.5 1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4				
Comment	Sc	ore		Deese	intion of Contract						
Component P Landform Vegetation Land Use	Project Components	Project w/Mitigation		Description of Contrast							
Landform	1	1	Land form is ge land form in this	ently rolling. Pa s view	anels do not see	m to contras	t with the				
Vegetation	/egetation 1 0 The dark colored middle ground vegetation helps camoufla panels. The proposed plantings feel insignificant in screen					lage the ning.					
Land Use	3	3	The panels contrast with the existing land use of open f								
Water	NA	NA	NA								
Sky	.5	.5	The panels are have minimal of	e located bene contrast agains	ath the middle g at the blue sky/h	round veget orizon.	ation and				
Viewer Activity	2	2	The location of view	f the panels in	the distance fee	els less intru	sive in this				
TOTAL	7.5	6.5	Total all scores abov	e							
AVERAGE	1.5	1.3	Average all scores a	bove							

Page 9 of 24

Viewpoint 24 NYS Route 76 (Sherman Road)

Effectiveness of mitigation planting scheme (seasonal/variability, etc.):

In this view the plantings seem dark against the solar array, unnatural to the surrounding green fields and minimal.

The dark middle ground vegetation helps camouflage the panels.

Variable factors that may have influenced rating (atmospheric conditions, seasonal, etc.):

Lighting conditions during the time of day this view was taken. The partly cloudy sky appears to cast shadows on the

trees in the middle ground appearing darker than they truly are. Leaf off conditions and seasonal weather (snow,

golden fields, etc) would have influenced this rating.

Perceived effect on scenic quality/viewer enjoyment:

The size of the array field impacts the scenic quality of this view, however the location of the array field set off the

road a distance and buffered by the grassland reduces the impact of this installation.

Page 10 of 24

South Ripley Solar Project Town of Ripley, Chautauqua County, New York EDR Project No: 19020

Viewpoint Information:

Viewpoint Number: 40 Distance to Nearest Visible Array: 118 feet Viewpoint Location: County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road) Landscape Similarity Zone: Rural Upland Viewer Type: Local Residents, Through-Travelers/Commuters Visually Sensitive Site: Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area Mitigation Planting Scheme: Module 1



Viewpoint Sensitivity: Scenic Quality: (Please rate existing scenic quality) Low X Moderate High

Viewer Exposure: (Please rate frequency and duration of view) Continuous Repeated/Regular Occasional/Brief Rare



Viewer Description: (Please describe this view in your own words.) Open view from road side edge. Existing lawn shoulder along road before transitioning to roadside vegetation. A golden agricultural field rises in the middle ground to create a horizon against the blue sky in the center of the image. The existing roadside vegetation creates a focal point as it breaks ups the horizon from mature trees on the left in the far distance to golden agricultural fields. An existing utility pole can be seen with overhead wires. The topography has dramatic rise in elevation from left to right in this view.

Contrast Rating:

(Please rate the level of contrast between the existing view, Project components, and Project components with mitigation)

Contrast Rating Score Chart

Insignificant	Minin	nal	Moderate	Appreciable Stro		Strong	
0	.5 1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4
Comment	Sc	ore		Deere	inting of Contract		
Component	Project Components	Project w/Mitigation		Desci	iption of Contrast		
Landform	4	4	The panels inhibit the topography. The pane dramatic impact.	views towards the h Is are installed on th	orizon and contrast wit ne rising topography cr	th the surrounding eating a more	g
Vegetation	2	2	The mitigation draw the eye av	doesn't seem vay from the p	effective. The for panels.	reground pla	antings help
Land Use 4 4 The panels contrast with the surround land use of			se of agricul	tural fields			
Water	NA	NA	NA				
Sky	4	4	The panels hard	d lines contras	t against the blu	ie sky	
Viewer Activity	4	4	The location of the view.	the panels risi	ng with the land	l form greatl	y impact
TOTAL	18	18	Total all scores abov	re			
AVERAGE	3.6	3.6	Average all scores a	bove			

Page 11 of 24

Viewpoint 40 County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road)

Effectiveness of mitigation planting scheme (seasonal/variability, etc.): The mitigation plantings do not seem effective. The sparsely screen the panels and

adjacent fence and seem out of place with regards to the plant species in the sim.

Variable factors that may have influenced rating (atmospheric conditions, seasonal, etc.):

Leaf off conditions and seasonal weather (snow, golden fields, etc) would have

influenced this rating.

Perceived effect on scenic quality/viewer enjoyment:

The size of the array field rising with the land form greatly impacts the scenic quality of t

his view. The installation needs more mitigation to help screen the panels.

Page 12 of 24

South Ripley Solar Project Town of Ripley, Chautauqua County, New York EDR Project No: 19020

Viewpoint Information: Viewpoint Number: 44

Distance to Nearest Visible Array: 344 feet Viewpoint Location: Sinden Road Landscape Similarity Zone: Rural Upland Viewer Type: Local Residents

Visually Sensitive Site: Concord Grape Belt Heritage Area

Mitigation Planting Scheme: Module 1



 Viewpoint Sensitivity:

 Scenic Quality: (Please rate existing scenic quality)

 Low
 Moderate

 High

 Viewer Exposure: (Please rate frequency and duration of view)

 Continuous
 Image: Repeated/Regular

 Occasional/Brief
 Rare



Viewer Description: (Please describe this view in your own words.) Gravel road in the foreground. Rolling green farm fields with a pond, farm equipment, fence and cattle in the middle ground. Existing power lines contrast against the blue sky. Mature trees create a strong contrasting horizon in the middle ground. Existing hedgerows also can be seen creating linear vegetation within the view. The topography appears to be gentle and sloping away from the gravel road then up to the horizon.

Contrast Rating:

(Please rate the level of contrast between the existing view, Project components, and Project components with mitigation)

Contrast Rating Score Chart

0 .5 1 1.5 2 2.5 3 3.5 4 Component Score Description of Contrast Landform 2 1 The panels work with the land form, however the mature trees in background have been cleared to accommodate the panels Vegetation 4 1 Significant amount of mature trees have been removed to accommodate the panel installation. Mitigation efforts very effective closer to the roadside edge. Land Use 4 4 The panels contrast with the farming land use. Water .5 .5 An agriculture pond is minimally impacted Sky 2 1 The sky is minimally impacted. The mitigation is effective being closer to the road. Viewer Activity 4 2 The view is moderatly impacted. The mitigation is effective being closer to the road. Viewer Activity 4 2 The view is moderatly impacted. The mitigation is effective being closer to the road. Viewer Activity 4 2 The view is moderatly impacted. The mitigation is effective being closer to the road. Viewer Activity 4 2 The view is moderatly impacted. The mitigation is effective being closer to the road. AVERAGE 2.75 1.58	Insignificant	Minin	nal	Moderate		Appreciable		Strong
Score Description of Contrast Project Components Project WI/Mitigation Description of Contrast Landform 2 1 The panels work with the land form, however the mature trees in background have been cleared to accommodate the panels Vegetation 4 1 Significant amount of mature trees have been removed to accommodate the panel installation. Mitigation efforts very effective closer to the roadside edge. Land Use 4 4 The panels contrast with the farming land use. Water .5 .5 An agriculture pond is minimally impacted Sky 2 1 The sky is minimally impacted with tree removals the amount of sky increases in this view. Viewer Activity 4 2 The view is moderatly impacted. The mitigation is effective being closer to the road. Viewer Activity 4 2 The view is moderatly impacted. The mitigation is effective being closer to the road. TOTAL 16.5 9.5 Total all scores above AVERAGE 2.75 1.58 Average all scores above	0	.5 1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4
Component Project Components Project w/Mitigation Description of Contrast Landform 2 1 The panels work with the land form, however the mature trees in background have been cleared to accommodate the panels Vegetation 4 1 Significant amount of mature trees have been removed to accommodate the panel installation. Mitigation efforts very effective closer to the roadside edge. Land Use 4 The panels contrast with the farming land use. Water .5 .5 An agriculture pond is minimally impacted Sky 2 1 The sky is minimally impacted with tree removals the amount of sky increases in this view. Viewer Activity 4 2 The view is moderatly impacted. The mitigation is effective being closer to the road. TOTAL 16.5 9.5 Total all scores above AVERAGE 2.75 1.58 Average all scores above	Comment	Sc	ore		Deere	intion of Continent		
Landform 2 1 The panels work with the land form, however the mature trees in background have been cleared to accommodate the panels Vegetation 4 1 Significant amount of mature trees have been removed to accommodate the panel installation. Mitigation efforts very effective closer to the roadside edge. Land Use 4 4 The panels contrast with the farming land use. Water .5 .5 An agriculture pond is minimally impacted Sky 2 1 The sky is minimally impacted with tree removals the amount of sky increases in this view. Viewer Activity 4 2 The view is moderatly impacted. The mitigation is effective being closer to the road. TOTAL 16.5 9.5 Total all scores above Average 2.75 1.58 Average all scores above	Insignificant 0 Component F Landform Vegetation Land Use Water Sky Viewer Activity TOTAL AVERAGE	Project Components	Project w/Mitigation		Desci	iption of Contrast		
Vegetation 4 1 Significant amount of mature trees have been removed to accommodate the panel installation. Mitigation efforts very effective closer to the roadside edge. Land Use 4 4 The panels contrast with the farming land use. Water .5 .5 An agriculture pond is minimally impacted Sky 2 1 The sky is minimally impacted with tree removals the amount of sky increases in this view. Viewer Activity 4 2 The view is moderatily impacted. The mitigation is effective being closer to the road. TOTAL 16.5 9.5 Total all scores above Average 2.75 1.58 Average all scores above	Landform	2	1	The panels work work work to accept the panels work work work work work work work work	vith the land form ccommodate the p	, however the mature panels	e trees in backg	round have
Land Use 4 4 The panels contrast with the farming land use. Water .5 .5 An agriculture pond is minimally impacted Sky 2 1 The sky is minimally impacted with tree removals the amount of sky increases in this view. Viewer Activity 4 2 The view is moderatly impacted. The mitigation is effective being closer to the road. TOTAL 16.5 9.5 Total all scores above AVERAGE 2.75 1.58 Average all scores above	Vegetation	4	1	Significant amount installation. Mitigat	of mature trees h ion efforts very eff	ave been removed to fective closer to the r	o accommodate oadside edge.	e the panel
Water .5 .5 An agriculture poind is minimally impacted Sky 2 1 The sky is minimally impacted with tree removals the amount of sky increases in this view. Viewer Activity 4 2 The view is moderatly impacted. The mitigation is effective being closer to the road. TOTAL 16.5 9.5 Total all scores above AVERAGE 2.75 1.58 Average all scores above	Land Use	4	4	The panels con	trast with the	farming land use		
Sky 2 1 The sky is minimally impacted with tree removals the amount of sky increases in Utilis view. Viewer Activity 4 2 The view is moderatly impacted. The mitigation is effective being closer to the road. TOTAL 16.5 9.5 Total all scores above AVERAGE 2.75 1.58 Average all scores above	Water	.5	.5	An agriculture pon	d is minimally imp	acted		
Viewer Activity 4 2 The view is moderatly impacted. The mitigation is effective being closer to the road. TOTAL 16.5 9.5 Total all scores above AVERAGE 2.75 1.58 Average all scores above	Sky	2	1	The sky is minimal \this view.	ly impacted with t	ree removals the am	ount of sky inci	reases in
TOTAL 16.5 9.5 Total all scores above AVERAGE 2.75 1.58 Average all scores above	Viewer Activity	4	2	The view is modera	atly impacted. The	e mitigation is effectiv	ve being closer	to the road.
AVERAGE 2.75 1.58 Average all scores above	TOTAL	16.5	9.5	Total all scores abov	/e			
	AVERAGE	2.75	1.58	Average all scores a	bove			



Effectiveness of mitigation planting scheme (seasonal/variability, etc.):

The mitigation is effective. The plantings would benefit from a road side hedgerow application. Although effective at

screening the panels, some of the planting species feel out of place.

Variable factors that may have influenced rating (atmospheric conditions, seasonal, etc.):

Leaf off conditions and seasonal weather (snow, golden fields, etc) would have influenced this rating.

Perceived effect on scenic quality/viewer enjoyment:

The scenic quality is impacted. The size of the array/panels and mitigation is expansive over the existing landscape.

Page 13 of 24

South Ripley Solar Project Town of Ripley, Chautauqua County, New York EDR Project No: 19020

Viewpoint Information:

Viewpoint Number: 56 Distance to Nearest Visible Array: 139 feet Viewpoint Location: County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road) Landscape Similarity Zone: Rural Upland Viewer Type: Local Residents, Through-Travelers/Commuters Visually Sensitive Site: Concord: Grape Bell State Heritage Area Mitigation Planting Scheme: Module 2/Module 3 Rating Panel Information: Your Name: Sarah Hogan Date: 06/20/2021



 Viewpoint Sensitivity:

 Scenic Quality: (Please rate existing scenic quality)

 Low
 Moderate

 High

 Viewer Exposure: (Please rate frequency and duration of view)

 Continuous
 Image: Repeated/Regular

 Occasional/Brief
 Rare



Viewer Description: (Please describe this view in your own words.) Open view from an existing road. The trees are not in leaf and view is dominated by the blue sky and even horizon. Appears to be mown lawn area between the golden agricultural fields and mature trees in the middle ground. There are power lines in the middle ground but they blend in with the mature trees in the middle ground.

Viewpoint 56 County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road)

Effectiveness of mitigation planting scheme (seasonal/variability, etc.): Mitigation is effective but views towards the panels and fencing can still be seen on

the left hand side of the view.

Variable factors that may have influenced rating (atmospheric conditions, seasonal, etc.):

Leaf on conditions and seasonal weather (snow, green fields, etc) would have influenced this rating. Sky conditions (gray sky/overcast/cloudy) would have influenced this rating.

Contrast Rating:

(Please rate the level of contrast between the existing view, Project components, and Project components with mitigation)

Contrast Rating Score Chart

Insignificant	Minin	nal	Moderate		Appreciable		Strong		
0	.5 1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4		
Commente	Sc	ore	Description of Contract						
Component	Project Components	Project w/Mitigation		Description of Contrast					
Landform	3.5	3.5	The land form ar by the installatio	nd views towar n	rds the horizon	are greatly in	npacted		
Vegetation	1	.5	Existing vegetation has been cleared to accommodate						
Land Use	4	4	The panels cont	2.					
Water	NA	NA	NA						
Sky	4	4	The panels have	a strong cont	rast against the	e sky			
Viewer Activity	4	4	The view has been greatly impacted/disrupted by the pa			d by the pane	I		
TOTAL	16.5	16	Total all scores above						
AVERAGE	3.3	3.2	3.2 Average all scores above						
							Page 15 of		

Perceived effect on scenic quality/viewer enjoyment:

The scenic quality is greatly impacted. The size of the array/panels is expansive over the

existing landscape. The panels proximity to the road enclose the view and prohibit

any views into the background

South Ripley Solar Project Town of Ripley, Chautauqua County, New York EDR Project No: 19020

Viewpoint Information:

Viewpoint Number: 59 Distance to Nearest Visible Project Component: 132 feet Viewpoint Location: County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road) Landscape Similarity Zone: Rural Upland Viewer Type: Local Residents, Through-Travelers/Commuters

Visually Sensitive Site: Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area Mitigation Planting Scheme: Module 4



Rating Panel Information: Your Name: Sarah Hogan Date: 12/22/2021



 Viewpoint Sensitivity:

 Scenic Quality: (Please rate existing scenic quality)

 X
 Low
 Moderate
 High

 Viewer Exposure: (Please rate frequency and duration of view)

 Continuous
 Repeated/Regular

 Occasional/Brief
 Rare

Viewer Description: (Please describe this view in your own words.)

Open view from an existing road. The trees are not in leaf. The middle ground is comprised of mature trees and an existing transmission line corridor. A fence runs horizontal within the view designating the transmission line corridor. The vertical poles and power lines are noticeable against the blue sky. The foreground has an existing (previously disturbed field) with a timber post/wire fence. The topography seems to rise gently across the field towards the transmission line corridor.

Contrast Rating:

(Please rate the level of contrast between the existing view, Project components, and Project components with mitigation)

Contrast Rating Score Chart

Insignificant	Minin	nal	Moderate Appreciable		Strong						
0	.5 1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4				
C	Sc	ore	Development Operation								
Component	Project Components	Project w/Mitigation	Description of Contrast								
Landform	4	3.5	Landform has be installation.	Landform has been manipulated significantly for the proposed installation.							
Vegetation	4	3	Proposed structure blocks effective at screening the however, the mitigation do	Proposed structure blocks existing vegetation and background. The placement of proposed mitigation is not effective at screening the structure it appears the plantings are lower in elevation than the proposed structure however, the mitigation does help soften views towards the proposed fencing.							
Land Use	3	2	The use is contrasting to the existing ag, gields								
Water	NA	NA	NA								
Sky	4	4	Structure, poles and wires greatly contrasts with the blue sky.								
Viewer Activity	4	4	The view has been greatly impacted/disrupted by the proposed structure								
TOTAL	19	16.5	Total all scores above								
AVERAGE	3.8	3.3	Average all scores above								

Page 17 of 26

Viewpoint 59 County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road)

Effectiveness of mitigation planting scheme (seasonal/variability, etc.):

The mitigation planting scheme helps soften the proposed installation fencing, however, given the scale of the structure, the plantings are not effective at screening. The plantings appear to be placed lower in elevation. The proposed structure appears to sit on fill or there is a berm in the foreground. The mitigation may benefit from sliding up the berm in elevation.

Variable factors that may have influenced rating (atmospheric conditions, seasonal, etc.):

There are no variable factors that would have influenced my rating.

Perceived effect on scenic quality/viewer enjoyment:

The structure and land use for this development greatly impacts the view. The size of the structure and proximity to the road have diminished the quality of this view significantly. The scale of the proposed structure and installation over powers any scenic quality.

Page 18 of 26

South Ripley Solar Project Town of Ripley, Chautauqua County, New York EDR Project No: 19020

Viewpoint Information:

Viewpoint Number: 63S

Distance to Nearest Visible Project Component: 217 feet Viewpoint Location: County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road) Landscape Similarity Zone: Rural Upland Viewer Type: Local Residents, Through-Travelers/Commuters Visually Sensitive Site: Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area Mitigation Planting Scheme: Module 1/Module 4



Rating Panel Information: Your Name: Sarah Hogan Date: 12/22/2021

 Viewpoint Sensitivity:

 Scenic Quality: (Please rate existing scenic quality)

 ⊠ Low
 ☐ Moderate
 ☐ High

 Viewer Exposure: (Please rate frequency and duration of view)

 Image: Continuous
 Image: Repeated/Regular

 Image: Occasional/Brief
 Image: Rare

Viewer Description: (Please describe this view in your own words.)

Open view from existing road. The trees are not in leaf. The middle ground is comprised of mature trees buffering an existing substation. The substation equipment is slightly visible through the mature trees. The foreground has an existing (previously disturbed field) with a timber post/wire fence. The topography seems to rise gently across the field towards the substation.

Contrast Rating:

(Please rate the level of contrast between the existing view, Project components, and Project components with mitigation)

Contrast Rating Score Chart

Insignificant	Minin	nal	Moderate		Appreciable		Strong				
0	.5 1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4				
Commente	Sc	ore	Description of Contract								
Component	Project Components	Project w/Mitigation									
Landform	1	1	Land form is mini	Land form is minimally impacted							
Vegetation	3	2.5	Minimal vegetation v proposed wall but de	was cleared. The oes effectively hel	proposed mitigatio p soften the hard I	n is contrasting in ines of the propos	color to the sed structures				
Land Use	1	.5	Land use appears compatible with utility corridor and substation in background.								
Water	NA	NA	NA								
Sky	3	2	The size of the w sky. The instal l at	vall and color of tion is noticeable	the wall is contra	asting with the t	oright blue				
Viewer Activity	3	2.5	The view has been installation. The h	en significantly in hard lines and co	mpacted/disrupte	ed by the propo ures are quite c	sed wa ll an ontrasting				
TOTAL	11	8.5	Total all scores above								
AVERAGE	2.2	1.7	Average all scores above								

Page 19 of 26

Viewpoint 63S

County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road)

Effectiveness of mitigation planting scheme (seasonal/variability, etc.):

Mitigation plantings help break up the view towards the structures and soften the hard contrast of the tall screen wall and structure in the background. The evergreen plantings are effective at assisting in screening but given their dark evergreen color, they are contrasting to the surrounding landscape and installation.

Variable factors that may have influenced rating (atmospheric conditions, seasonal, etc.):

There are no variable factors that would have influenced my rating.

Perceived effect on scenic quality/viewer enjoyment:

The structure for this development greatly impacts the view. The size of the structure and proximity to the road have diminished the quality of this view. The scale of the proposed installation is contrasting but there is an existing substation in close proximity to this development.

Page 20 of 26

South Ripley Solar Project Town of Ripley, Chautauqua County, New York EDR Project No: 19020

Viewpoint Information:

Viewpoint Number: 63SE

Distance to Nearest Visible Project Component: 218 feet Viewpoint Location: County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road) Landscape Similarity Zone: Rural Upland Viewer Type: Local Residents, Through-Travelers/Commuters Visually Sensitive Site: Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area Mitigation Planting Scheme: Module 1/Module 3/Module 4



Rating Panel Information: Your Name: Sarah Hogan Date: 12/22/2021



Viewpoint Sensitivity: Scenic Quality: (Please rate existing scenic quality) 🛛 Low Moderate High

Viewer Exposure: (Please rate frequency and duration of view) Continuous Repeated/Regular Occasional/Brief Rare

Viewer Description: (Please describe this view in your own words.)

Open and previously disturbed agricultural field. There appears to be a drainage ditch in the middle ground with mature trees/vegetation in the background. The topography appears to be relatively flat. The existing road, fencing, roadside vegetation, and utility poles create dominant lines in this view. There are two semi-trailers in the middle ground that draw the viewers eye towards to the center of the image.

Contrast Rating:

(Please rate the level of contrast between the existing view, Project components, and Project components with mitigation)

Contrast Rating Score Chart

Insignificant	Minimal		Moderate Appreciable		Strong				
0	.5 1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4		
Component	Sc	ore	Description of Contract						
Component	Project Components	Project w/Mitigation	Description of Contrast						
Landform	1	1	Minimal contrast There is no signif	Minimal contrast with the existing land form. The project area is relatively flat. There is no significant change in grade.					
Vegetation	4	3.5	There is significant however the propos	There is significant clearing of existing vegetation. The mitigation helps soften the screen v however the proposed installation is contrasting with sky and surrounding landscape.					
Land Use	1	.5	Minimal to insignificant contrast in land use. The site has been preivously disturbed with semi-trailer storage.						
Water	NA	NA	NA						
Sky	4	4	The proposed installation significantly contrasts the sky. The poles/lines protrude into the horizon line.						
Viewer Activity	4	3.5	The view has been	greatly impacte	ed/disrupted by the pr	oposed installati	ion		
TOTAL	14	12.5	Total all scores above						
AVERAGE	2.8	2.5	Average all scores above						

Page 21 of 26

Viewpoint 63SE County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road)

Effectiveness of mitigation planting scheme (seasonal/variability, etc.):

The mitigation planting scheme helps soften the proposed fencing/wall fencing, however, given the size and scale of the proposed installation and structure, the plantings are not effective at screening.

Variable factors that may have influenced rating (atmospheric conditions, seasonal, etc.):

There are no variable factors that would have influenced my rating.

Perceived effect on scenic quality/viewer enjoyment:

The quality of this view has changed significantly. There is no longer an open view across the field. The installation's overhead lines and poles are highly visible given their size and scale. However, the existing power poles provide the same level of contrast to the sky.

Page 22 of 26

South Ripley Solar Project Town of Ripley, Chautauqua County, New York EDR Project No: 19020

Viewpoint Information:

Viewpoint Number: 69
Distance to Nearest Visible Array: 417 feet
Sevent Location: South Ripley Cemetery off of County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road)
Landscape Similarity Zone: Rural Upland
Viewer Type: Local Residents, Tourists/Recreational Users
Visually Sensitive Site: Concord Grape Belt State Heritage Area, South Ripley
Cemetery

Mitigation Planting Scheme: Module 3

Existing Conditions

Rating Panel Information: Your Name: Sarah Hogan Date: 07/17/2021



Viewpoint Sensitivity: Scenic Quality: (Please rate existing scenic quality)

 Viewer Exposure: (Please rate frequency and duration of view)

 Continuous
 Repeated/Regular

 Occasional/Brief
 X Rare

Viewer Description: (Please describe this view in your own words.)
The foreground includes headstones and appear to be
a cemetery. There is mown lawn in the foreground the
topography is gentle slopes. The cemetery transitions from
mown lawn to field with mature trees in the middle ground.
Mature trees bound the cemetery on the right hand side
creating a strong tree line that bisects the mature trees in
the distant background. The blue sky is a dominant feature in this
view. The white headstones draw the eye towards the foreground.

Contrast Rating:

(Please rate the level of contrast between the existing view, Project components, and Project components with mitigation)

Contrast Rating Score Chart

	Insignificant	Minimal		Moderate Appreciable				Strong		
	0	.5 1 1.5		2	2.5	3	3.5	4		
(Commenced	Sc	ore	Description of Contract						
	Component	Project Components	Project w/Mitigation		Descrip	tion of Contrast				
	Landform	2	2	The panels highlight the change in land form/topography						
	Vegetation	3	2	A significant a	A significant amount of mature trees have been cleared					
	Land Use	4	4	Land use is co	ontrasting					
	Water	NA	NA	NA						
	Sky	1	1	Minimal contra	ast to the sky					
	Viewer Activity	4	4	Those who vis	sit the cemeter	y will notice th	e panels.			
	TOTAL	14	Total all scores above							
	AVERAGE	2.8	Average all scores above							

Page 21 of 24

Viewpoint 69

South Ripley Cemetery off of County Route 6 (NE Sherman Road)

Effectiveness of mitigation planting scheme (seasonal/variability, etc.):

The plantings are partially effective and could benefit by moving them up the slope towards the cemetery. The panels

contrast against the dark evergreens/vegetation.

Variable factors that may have influenced rating (atmospheric conditions, seasonal, etc.):

Leaf on conditions and seasonal weather (snow, green fields, etc) would have influenced this rating. Sky conditions

(gray sky/overcast/cloudy) would have influenced this rating.

Perceived effect on scenic quality/viewer enjoyment:

The scenic quality is greatly impacted by the harsh lines and development of the panels. The land use of the

cemetery is contrasting yet compatible. If plantings were moved up closer to the cemetery to create a sense of

enclosure to the user's of the cemetery while screening the panels would be beneficial.

Page 22 of 24

South Ripley Solar Project Town of Ripley, Chautauqua County, New York EDR Project No: 19020

Viewpoint Information:

Viewpoint Number: 75 Distance to Nearest Visible Array: 7,450 feet (1.41 miles) Viewpoint Location: County Route 622 Landscape Similarity Zone: Rural Upland Viewer Type: Local Residents, Through-Travelers/Commuters Visually Sensitive Site: None Identified Mitigation Planting Scheme: None Visible, Rating Panel Information: Your Name: Sarah Hogan Date: 06/20/2021



 Viewpoint Sensitivity:

 Scenic Quality: (Please rate existing scenic quality)

 Low
 Moderate
 High

 Viewer Exposure: (Please rate frequency and duration of view)

 Continuous
 Image: Repeated/Regular

 Occasional/Brief
 Rare



Viewer Description: (Please describe this view in your own words.)
<u>The foreground has an existing agricultural field buffered</u>
by roadside vegetation. The trees are not in leaf. The landscape
is visually broken up by a road traversing in the middle
ground, buildings and agricultural fields scattered throughout
the middle ground and power poles can be seen along the
road and a body of water (pond) in the center of the view.
Mature trees define the horizon. The topography appears to be
gently rolling hills.

Contrast Rating:

(Please rate the level of contrast between the existing view, Project components, and Project components with mitigation)

Contrast Rating Score Chart

Insignificant	Minin	nal	Moderate	rate Appreciable			Strong			
0	.5 1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4			
Comment	Sc	ore		Deseri	ation of Continen					
Component	Project Components	Project w/Mitigation	Description of Contrast							
Landform	0	х	Insignificant change to the land form							
Vegetation	0	х	Minor clearing in	Vinor clearing in the distance.						
Land Use	1	х	Contrasting to the surround land use of agricultural fields, farms, open fields, etc.							
Water	0	х	A pond is visible in the middle ground but not impacted by the array							
Sky	0	х	panels do not contrast with the blue sky							
Viewer Activity	0	х	The viewer may notice the array if they are looking for them but over- all they are insignificant to the overall view composition.							
TOTAL	.5	х	Total all scores above							
AVERAGE	.17	X	Average all scores above							

-

Viewpoint 75

County Route 622

Effectiveness of mitigation planting scheme (seasonal/variability, etc.): No mitigation plantings have been provided.

Variable factors that may have influenced rating (atmospheric conditions, seasonal, etc.):

Leaf on conditions and seasonal weather (snow, green fields, etc) would have

influenced this rating.

Perceived effect on scenic quality/viewer enjoyment:

The arrays are visible but the overall scenic quality is maintained.

Page 23 of 24

Page 24 of 24



Kellie Anne Connelly, PLA

Principal, Landscape Architecture & Planning

Principal Landscape Architect, Terraink, Inc., Arlington, MA, 2010 -

Visiting Professor, Site Design and Grading Seminar; Rhode Island

Project Manager, Shadley Associates, Lexington, MA, 2007 – 2008.

Adjunct Professor, SUNY College of Environmental Science and

Forestry, Syracuse, NY, 2003 - 2007.

Project Manager, Visual Expert, EDR Companies, Syracuse, NY, 2003 -

Landscape Architect, Reisen Design Associates, Cambridge, MA, 1999 -

Landscape Architect, Jacques Whitford Company, Inc., Woburn, MA,

Project Manager, Pressley Associates, Inc., Cambridge, MA, 1995 -

Instructor, Rhode Island School of Design, Providence, RI, 2014 - 2018.

Project Manager, Gregory Lombardi Design, Inc., Cambridge, MA, 2008 -

employment history

Present.

2010.

2007.

2003.

1998.

1998 - 1999.

School of Design

education

Harvard University Graduate School of Design, Master of Landscape Architecture, 2000. SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry, Bachelor of Landscape Architecture, 1995. SUNY College of Technology at Alfred, Associate in Applied Science, 1991.

professional certification

Commonwealth of Massachusetts WBE | Federal DBE Certification

Registered Landscape Architect, State of New York, License #1875 Registered Landscape Architect, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, License #1214

publications

"Protecting the Rural Landscape: Visual Quality Guidelines for Plymouth, Massachusetts and the New England Region." Graduate School of Design, Harvard University. Cambridge, Massachusetts

"Toward a Joint Palestine-Israel Industrial Development in al-Shoka and Karem Shalom: An Assessment of Location and Future Planning Flexibility." Graduate School of Design, Harvard University. Cambridge, Massachusetts

Studio Works Seven. Graduate School of Design, Harvard University. Cambridge, Massachusetts

representative project experience

South Ripley Solar Project, NY - Evaluate visual impacts | rating panel for solar arrays in Chautauqua County, New York.

High Street Solar Array, RI - Mitigate visual impacts from solar arrays in a decommissioned stone quarry parcel in Ashaway, Rhode Island.

Palmer Circle Solar, RI - Mitigate visual impacts from solar arrays in a residential parcel in Hope Valley, Rhode Island.

Comolli Solar, RI - Evaluate visual impacts from solar arrays in a decommissioned stone quarry parcel in Hopkinton, Rhode Island.

Atlantic Shores Wind Project, NJ - Evaluate visual impacts | rating panel for wind turbines in outer continental shelf on coast of New Jersey.

Maxson Hill Road Solar, RI - Mitigate visual impacts from solar arrays in a wooded parcel in Hopkinton, Rhode Island.

Sunrise Wind Project - Evaluate visual impacts, rating panel for wind turbines in outer continental shelf on coast of New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts.

Heritage Wind Project, NY - Evaluate visual impacts, rating panel for wind turbines in Barre and Orleans County, New York.

Horseshoe Solar, NY - VIA Report Provided, field survey and viewshed evaluation for a visual impact assessment in Livingston and Monroe County, New York.

Amherst Solar, MA - Visual impacts from solar arrays in a decommissioned golf course in Amherst, Massachusetts.

Plymouth Solar, MA - Screening Planting Plan Mitigate visual impacts from solar arrays in a wooded parcel in Plymouth, Massachusetts.

Revolution Wind Project, MA & RI - Evaluate visual impacts, rating panel for wind turbines in the Atlantic Ocean off the coast of Massachusetts and Rhode Island.

Skipjack Wind Project, MD - Evaluate visual impacts, rating panel for wind turbines in the Atlantic Ocean off the coast of Maryland.

Alle-Cat Wind Project, NY - Evaluate visual impacts, rating panel for wind turbines in Allegany, Cattaraugus and Wyoming Counties, New York.

Canisteo Wind Project, RI - Evaluate visual impacts, rating panel for rating panel for wind turbines in Steuben County, New York.

South Fork Wind Project, NY & RI - Evaluate visual impacts, rating panel for wind turbines in the Atlantic Ocean off the coast of New York and Rhode Island.

Baron Wind, NY - Evaluate visual impacts, rating panel for wind turbines in Steuben County, New York.

Timbermill Wind, NC - Evaluate visual impacts, rating panel for wind turbines in Perquimans Chowan Counties, North Carolina.

Lighthouse Wind, NY - Evaluate visual impacts, rating panel for wind turbines in Somerset and Yates Counties, Western New York.

Offshore MD - Evaluate visual impacts, rating panel for wind turbines offshore of Maryland.

Moosehead Lake Recreational Resource Assessment, ME - Investigation coordination of recreational resources in the Moosehead Lake Region, Maine.

Antrim Wind Power, NH - Provided Expert Witness with Court Testimony. Authored a Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) for a 28.8-MW, 9-turbine wind farm project in the Town of Antrim, Hillsborough County, New Hampshire. The VIA described the visible components of the proposed project, defined the visual character of the study area, and inventoried and evaluated existing visual resources. The study also evaluated potential project visibility within the study area, identified key views and assessed visual impacts associated with the proposed wind power project.

Block Island Wind Farm, RI - Evaluated visual impacts for wind turbines and transformer station improvements on Block Island, Rhode Island.

Howard Wind Farm, NY - Evaluated visual impacts for wind turbines in Steuben County, New York.

Allegheny Wind, PA - Evaluated visual impacts for wind turbines in Cambria and Blair Counties, Pennsylvania.

New England East-West Solution (NEEWS) - Evaluated visual impacts for transmission line and transformer station improvements in New England.

Interstate Reliability - Evaluated visual impacts for transmission line and transformer station improvements in NE.

Maxson Hill Road Solar, RI - Mitigate visual impacts from solar arrays in a wooded parcel of Hopkinton, Rhode Island.

Southern Rhode Island Transmission Project – Prior to Terraink, Expert Witness with Court Testimony that was not challenged. Oversaw preparation of the Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) and the Supplemental Tower Hill Tap Line VIA prepared for the proposed upgrade and extension of approximately 26 miles of an existing L-190 115 kilovolt transmission line in southern Rhode Island. Coordinated fieldwork, defined landscape similarity zones and viewer groups, identified sensitive resources/receptors, supervised the development of viewshed maps and visual simulations, participated in the preparation of the VIA report and provided expert witness testimony on visual issues.

Tompkins County Public Safety Communications System - Prior to Terraink, directed preparation of Visual Impact Assessment component of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) prepared for the siting of nine new towers for wireless communications in Tompkins County, New York. Coordinated fieldwork, defined landscape similarity zones and viewer groups, identified sensitive resources/receptors, supervised the development of viewshed maps and visual simulations and participated in the preparation of the VIA report.

New York State Statewide Wireless Network - Prior to Terraink, participated in the preparation of the Generic Visual Impact Assessment (GVIA) report component of the DEIS prepared for the siting of wireless communications towers throughout New York State. Defined landscape similarity zones and viewer groups, identified sensitive resources/receptors, supervised the development of visual simulations and participated in the preparation of the GVIA report.

Visual Impact Assessment, Top Notch Wind Power Project - Prior to Terraink, evaluated visual impacts for Fairfield, Norway and Little Falls in Herkimer County, New York. The VIA report described visible components of the proposed project, defined the visual character of the study area, and inventoried and evaluated visual resources and viewer groups. The study also evaluated potential project visibility within the study area, identified key views and assessed visual impacts associated with the proposed wind power project. Visual Impact Assessment, Cohocton Wind Power Project - Prior to Terraink, evaluated visual impacts for Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) report for an 82 MW, 41-turbine project proposed in the Town of Cohocton in Steuben County, New York. The VIA report described visible components of the proposed project, defined the visual character of the study area, and inventoried and evaluated visual resources and viewer groups. The study also evaluated potential project visibility within the study area, identified key views and assessed visual impacts associated with the proposed wind power project.

Visual Impact Assessment, Marble River Wind Farm - Prior to Terraink, assessed visual impacts for Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) report from 200 MW, 109-turbine project proposed for a 19,310-acre site in the Town of Clinton and Ellenburg in Clinton County, New York. The VIA report described visible components of the proposed project, defined the visual character of the study area, and inventoried and evaluated visual resources and viewer groups. The study also evaluated potential project visibility within the study area, identified key views and assessed visual impacts associated with the proposed wind power project.

Visual Impact Assessment, Jordanville Wind Power Project - Prior to Terraink, coordinated study and prepared Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) report for a proposed 150 MW 75-turbine project proposed in the Towns of Stark and Warren in Herkimer County, New York. The VIA report described visible components of the proposed project, defined the visual character of the study area, and inventoried and evaluated visual resources and viewer groups. The study also evaluated potential project visibility within the study area, identified key views and assessed visual impacts associated with the proposed wind power project.

Visual Impact Assessment, Dairy Hills Wind Farm - Prior to Terraink, evaluated visual impacts for Visual impact Assessment (VIA) report for a 160 MW, 80-turbine project proposed in the Towns of Castile, Covington, Perry, and Warsaw in Wyoming County, New York. The VIA report described visible components of the proposed project, defined the visual character of the study area, and inventoried and evaluated visual resources and viewer groups. The study also evaluated potential project visibility within the study area, identified key views and assessed visual impacts associated with the proposed wind power project.



Jocelyn Gavitt, PLA

Principal

education

SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry, Master of Science in Landscape Architecture, 2007.

Cornell University, Bachelor of Science in Landscape Architecture, 1993. University of Copenhagen, Denmark International Study Program, 1992.

professional certification

Registered Landscape Architect, New York State License #1768-1

Registered Landscape Architect, North Carolina State License #910

presentations / publications

"Cultural Ecosystem Services as Part of Greenspace Management." GGavitt, J.M. and Smardon, R.C., 2019. Calculating Cultural Ecosystem Services as part of Greenspace Management?. Journal of International Business Research and Marketing, 4(4), pp.7-12.

Presented at the 5th Fabos Greenspace Conference at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst March 30th 2019 Community Participatory Practices: Case Study, Oneida, NY. April 2015, Upstate ASLA Conference, Saratoga Springs, NY

employment history

Principal, Gavin Associates, Cazenovia, NY, 2003-Present.

Visiting Instructor, Department of Landscape Architecture, SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry, 2004-Present.

Principal, Trinity Architecture and Planning, Inc. Winston-Salem, NC, 1999-2001.

Landscape Architect/Project Manager, Architectural Design Associates, PA, Winston-Salem, NC, 1997-1999.

Landscape Architect/Project Manager, GS Miller Landscape Architecture, Winston-Salem, NC, 1995-1997.

Landscape Architect/Intern, Pashek Associates, PA, Pittsburgh, PA, 1993-1995.

Landscape Architect/Intern, Fallingwater, Mill Run, PA, 1993.

representative project experience

Energy Project Visual Impact Assessments - Provided expert visual assessment for Environmental Design Research, PC on the following projects:

- Sunrise Wind, Outer Continental Shelf
- Heritage Wind, Orleans County, NY
- Revolution Wind, Coastal New England
- High Bridge Wind, Chenango County, NY
- Mohawk Solar, Montgomery County, NY
- Bluestone Wind, Broome County, NY
- Allegany, Cattaraugus and Wyoming Counties, NY
- Canisteo Wind, Steuben County, NY
- South Fork Wind Farm, Offshore, Atlantic
- Galloo Island, NY
- Baron Wind, NY
- Timbermill Wind, NC

- Clear River Energy Transmission, RI
- Cassadaga Wind Project, Chautauqua County, NY
- Merrimack Valley Reliability Project, NH & MA
- New England East-West Solution (NEEWS), New England States
- Block Island Wind Project, MA
- Allegany Wind Project, Cattaraugus County, NY
- Rhode Island Reliability Project, RI
- Howard Wind Project, Steuben county, NY
- NY Regional Interconnect, NY
- Dutch Hill Wind Project, Cohocton, NY

Local Waterfront Revitalization Plan, Cazenovia, NY - Preparation of a Waterfront Revitalization Plan for the Village and Town of Cazenovia through funding from the LWRP program. Compiled inventory and analysis, conducted public meetings, designed projects to meet community needs.

Village of Manlius, NY, Main Street Revitalization - Coordination with village board and committee. Design and implementation of streetscape improvements including custom furniture, lighting, paving.

Town of Eaton Park Masterplan, Morrisville, NY - Conceptual drawings, site documentation and cost estimates for Village Park funding proposal.

North Center Street Park, East Syracuse, NY - Conceptual and Design Development Drawings for Village Park, done in conjunction with O'Brien and Gere.

Downtown Revitalization Initiative, Cazenovia, NY - Development of plans and submission for grant funding for several projects in the village. Worked in conjunction with CACDA executive director.

Arise at the Farm, Chittenango, NY - Drainage and planning drawings for working therapeutic horse farm.

Mattituck Laurel Civic Association, Long Island, NY - Led SUNY ESF studio in master plan study for hamlet of Mattituck, addressing traffic issues and connectivity of village center to water. Continuing to consult with community to prioritize and fund projects.

Cazenovia Lake Valuation Study, NY - Study conducted with Richard Smarden, PhD to value the benefit revenue streams to the Cazenovia community associated with the presence of a healthy lake. Methods included literature review, data collection, surveys and real estate comparisons through GIS data bases.

Vineyard Haven Resiliency Planning Study, Martha's Vineyard, MA - Coordinated planning effort with Vineyard Haven interest groups through SUNY ESF studio process. Study focused on resiliency strategies for land planning in the sensitive flood plain areas of Vineyard Haven.

Scajaquada Creek Corridor, Buffalo, NY - Coordinated design and planning effort partnering Buffalo Niagara Waterrkeeper's and student designers from SUNY ESF. Project proposed to daylight existing stream, reestablish habitat in an urban setting, and revitalize a post industrial superblock through smart growth redevelopment.

Creekside Playground Design and Project Implementation - Coordinated community planning process for natural playground through SUNY ESF studio process. Presently working as consultant with community to develop plans and coordinate implementation of playground.

Oneida Flats Planning Study, NY - Utilized community participatory methods to include residents and city in master plan visioning process for flooded neighborhood. Included extensive research, analysis and information sharing.

Oneida Rail Trail Conceptual Plan, NY - Studio based design project: Conceptualization of segments of the proposed Oneida Rail Trail. Project included organized community participation.

GoCaz.com, **Economic Development Project**, **Cazenovia**, **NY** - Creation, coordination and implementation of GoCaz.com, a program to promote outdoor recreational activities in and around the Cazenovia area. Project includes grant writing assistance, interactive GIS website, mobile phone adaptation design, trail mapping, signage design, and marketing.

International Boxing Hall of Fame, Canastota, NY - Created a master plan and wrote a grant that was funded through NYS Economic Development Funds for \$1M. Assisted in securing legislation for site to be turned over from NYS Thruway Authority to LDC.



Sarah Hogan, PLA Senior Project Manager

education

Bachelor of Landscape Architecture, State University of New York College of Environmental Science & Forestry, 2003

registration

Registered Landscape Architect: NY #002463

professional affiliations

American Society of Landscape Architect - Member

Town of Henrietta Conservation - Board Member

employment history

Senior Project Manager, Environmental Design & Research, Landscape Architecture, Engineering & Environmental Services, DPC, Rochester, NY 2019 - present

Project Manager, Environmental Design & Research, Landscape Architecture, Engineering & Environmental Services, DPC, Rochester, NY 2018 - 2019

Project Manager & Landscape Architect, Fisher Associates PE, LS, LA, DPC, Rochester, NY, 2015-2018

Landscape Architect, Stantec, Rochester, NY, 2004-2015

representative project experience

Upstate Cancer Center at Verona, SUNY Upstate Medical University, Verona, NY – Sarah managed a site planning feasibility study for a new singlestory 30,000 SF medical facility in Verona, NY. The team reviewed zoning regulations, site development regulations, grading, drainage and wetland impacts as related to the proposed development. A conceptual site plan including stormwater management practices was produced to inform the overall project design and budget. The feasibility study informed the Client that the existing site was cost prohibitive and additional lands were acquired to accommodate the development and reduce impacts to the adjacent natural resources.

Weiskotten Hall Monument Sign, SUNY Upstate Medical, Syracuse, NY- EDR was retained by SUNY Upstate Medical to provide professional landscape architecture services for a proposed monument sign in the newly renovated Weiskotten Hall Courtyard. The sign was custom designed and includes LED lighting and a brick masonry base that matches the existing courtyard walls. EDR prepared the sign design, hardscape, and planting design as well as the visualization graphics for the Client as the project team worked through the design process. Sarah provided project management throughout the entire project and worked closely with the Client and design team to create a sign that enhances the Weiskotten Hall building and courtyard for all users.

Maplewood Nature Center, Rochester, NY - The City of Rochester has proposed the development of a Nature Center in the Maplewood Park. The existing building is currently utilized for the City's Training Center would be rehabilitated/programmed for the proposed use. The proposed Nature Center is easily accessible by private and public transportation and has the potential to become a regional draw. EDR worked with the Client/Owner to develop a comprehensive site design inclusive of a new parking area/drop off, outdoor classroom/teaching area, inclusive playground, outdoor seating and event space. EDR incorporated the following green infrastructure elements into the design; naturalized pond edge, solar panel shade structure, bioretention/rain garden area to harvest/clean the roof and parking lot stormwater runoff. EDR prepared a schematic master plan for the site, cost estimating and visualization graphics to convey the City of Rochester's vision and allow for future marketing/fundraising efforts. Sarah provided project management throughout the entire project and worked closely with the design team and Client to create a master plan that aligns with the City of Rochester's vision.

Cooper Hall Site Improvements, SUNY Brockport, Brockport, NY - EDR prepared contract documents for the proposed site improvements at Cooper Hall. The site's existing hardscape had long surpassed its life expectancy. EDR replaced existing sidewalks, provided accessible entrances to the existing building and provided drainage improvements to enhance the overall functional design. Sarah provided day to day coordination on this project with design staff and the Client in efforts to deliver a quality final product, meet schedule and project budget.

Michigan Street Baptist Church, Buffalo, NY - EDR worked with the Buffalo Niagara Freedom Station Coalition, Inc. (BNFSC) and the Community Foundation for Greater Buffalo to provide a landscape master plan study, inclusive of a conceptual site / landscape master plan and visualization graphics for the Michigan Street Baptist Church (MSBC). The nonprofit organization, Buffalo Niagara Freedom Station Coalition (BNFSC), was formed in 2001 to preserve and promote the heritage of the MSBC, a historic and iconic building at the heart of the Michigan Street African American Heritage Corridor in Buffalo, NY. The BNFSC was recently awarded a grant from the National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom program. EDR assisted BNFSC in the development of a site master plan, visualization graphics and cost estimating. Sarah provided day to day coordination on this project with design staff and the Client in efforts to deliver a quality final product, meet schedule and project budget.

Hutchison Hall, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY - The University of Rochester (Owner) plans to construct a four-story, 8,500-square foot building addition to the existing Hutchison Hall. EDR provided landscape architecture and civil engineering services associated with the site improvements including

new hardscape, plantings, and new utility connections. Sarah provided project management throughout the entire project and worked with the Client to create a project that respected the Owner's construction budget.

Brooks Memorial Hospital Site Feasibility & Landscaping Plan, Buffalo, NY – EDR worked with Brooks Memorial Hospital to evaluate several parcels for the new construction of a 100,000-sf hospital on approximately 25 acres. The improvements will include 350 parking spaces grouped around the building, a helipad, a mobile MRI unit, a service and loading dock area, stormwater management detention basins, and internal roadways for access. The hospital will serve the Dunkirk/Fredonia area, Northern Chautauqua and Southern Erie Counties and will replace the existing, aging hospital currently in use. The EDR design team prepared the conceptual site plan, environmental delineation and cultural resources survey given the sites location within a culturally sensitive area. Our team reviewed the sites grading to minimize cut/fill and construction costs, utility connections and overall landscaping aesthetics.

Erie County Shoreline Trail Site Improvements, Buffalo, NY – EDR is currently working on this project as a subconsultant for interpretive signage design. Our team of landscape architects and graphic artists are working with the Erie County and local stakeholders to develop a series of interpretive signs for use along the rehabilitated Erie County Shoreline Trail. Sarah's current role includes project management and working with the design team to create a visually aesthetic design that embraces the Client's vision.

Perinton Pocket Community, Perinton, NY - Our team worked with a local developer to develop 125 acres of land into a pocket community with an agricultural influence. The pocket community is a planned development with smaller scale residences centered around a common space shared by all residents in order to promote a close-knit sense of community. The clustered development would be surrounded by agricultural lands (hay, orchards, vegetables gardens) for use by the community and offer a variety of housing types ranging from barn loft apartments to small scale farmhouses to traditional farmhouse size residences in an effort to accommodate a range of housing prices for the local community. EDR worked with the local developer through design charrettes to create a design that balances the Client's vision, budget and Town zoning requirements. EDR prepared a site master plan and supporting visualization graphics for us in Town approvals and future marketing materials. Sarah's role included project management and working with the design team create an environmentally sensitive design that embraces the Client's vision.



Kenneth Gifford, PLA, SITES® AP, ASLA

Landscape Architect

education

Bachelor of Landscape Architecture, State University of New York College of Environmental Science & Forestry, Syracuse, NY, 2011

registration / certifications

Licensed Landscape Architect Sustainable Sites Initiatives (SITES) Accredited Professional

employment history

Landscape Architect, Environmental Design & Research, Landscape Architecture, Engineering & Environmental Services, D.P.C., Syracuse, NY, 2021-present

Landscape Designer, Weber Thompson, Seattle, WA, 2018-2021

Landscape Designer, Land North Studio, Hammond, NY, 2016-2018

Graphic Designer, Land Manager, & Stained-Glass Apprentice, Glass Goat at River Farm Road, Hammond, NY, 2016-2021

professional affiliations

Member, American Society of Landscape Architects Member, WASLA Student and Emerging Professional Committee

representative project experience

Orange Grove, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY - Collaborated with project team to design, document, and oversee campus improvements at Syracuse University. The project focused on enhancing the pedestrian experience, ADA accessibility, utility services, and maintenance operations. The built work successfully blends into the historic quad's aesthetic and function.

Skaneateles Lake Country Club Waterfront Master Plan, Skaneateles, NY- Provided site planning and design related design studies and conceptual design details options for redevelopment of the lake shoreline.

Campus Wide Exterior Signage System, Syracuse University Main Campus, Syracuse, NY- Assisted with development of a new consistent signage design package that includes standards for the identification of buildings, wayfinding for vehicles and pedestrians, identification of parking lots, unification of guard booths, street name signage, and identification of campus gateways. One of the project goals is to develop a durable low maintenance family of signage that is cost-effective, yet, still unique and impactful.

Fairfield Inn & Suites, Town of DeWitt, NY- EDR provided site design and municipal permitting services for a new, 106-room hotel in the Town of DeWitt. Project work included the design of utilities, parking lot, site lighting, planting, and grading and drainage. EDR prepared a Site Plan Review package and helped guide the project through the Town of DeWitt Planning Board approval process and prepared the project SWPPP.

Homewood Suites, Town of DeWitt, Onondaga County, NY- Worked with a team to provide the site design and permitting for a new 4-story, 80-room hotel in the Town of DeWitt including siting the building, grading and stormwater design, layout of parking and pedestrian pavements, utilities, erosion and sedimentation plan, and planting design. The project site is located within the Pioneer Business Park, which has an existing detention pond system that was designed to provide peak-flow mitigation for all development in the subdivision. One of the challenges of this project was to meet the current NYSDEC water quality and runoff reduction goals prior to releasing stormwater flows into the existing detention pond system, located across the street from the site. This was achieved through the use of a green roof, tree plantings, stormwater planters, and a hydro-dynamic separator. EDR prepared a Site Plan Review package and helped guide the project through the Town of DeWitt Planning Board approval process and prepared the project SWPPP.

Weighlock Café, Dewitt, NY – Working with a team to provide design development, contract documentation and approved planning board site drawings with improvements to the outdoor seating and parking.

Owasco River Multi-Modal Trail Corridor Plan, Auburn, NY- As a sub-consultant to Clough Harbor and Associates (CHA), managed and participated in a team setting to design and develop site plans and details in the preparation of alternative planning related studies, public and agency approvals, and a final conceptual master plan for a 6-mile trail from Wadsworth Park to Owasco Lake in Auburn, New York.

Northwood School, Lake Placid, NY- Northwood School, founded in 1905, is an independent, co-educational college preparatory school in the Adirondack Park serving approximately 175 students in grades 9-12. The project scope included the construction of two new classroom buildings and the conversion of a vehicular road into a pedestrian corridor connecting student dorms to the academic buildings. EDR's scope of work included siting the two buildings, layout of the new walk and lighting, stormwater management design, SWPPP preparation, and planting design.

New Liberal Arts Building, SUNY Brockport, Brockport, NY- Coordinated the design and construction of site improvements for a new 61,000 square foot academic building. The design preserves an existing grove of shade trees and existing open lawn areas precious to outdoor student activities. Working as a sub-consultant for SWBR, the site improvements include concrete walkways, plazas, benches, bike racks, a pedestrian bridge, a shared use fire access and pedestrian walkway, lighting, and a delivery/service drive.

Eastover Road New Electrical Substation Project, National Grid, Rensselaer County, NY- Assisted with production of report for compliance with the requirements of Part 102 of the Public Service Law. Team member to help accomplish scope of work for the State Environmental Quality Review compliance including environmental data collection and studies necessary to complete the Part 102 report (including visual impact assessment, background data collection, wetland delineation, Phase 1A Cultural Resources Survey, with NYS Department of Agriculture & Markets, and preparation of an Environmental Assessment Forum -- including Part 3 narrative).

CNY Biotechnology Research Accelerator, SUNY Upstate Medical Center & SUNY ESF, Syracuse, Onondaga County, NY- Completed Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) inspections at the construction site of a new 50,000 SF medical research facility on 14-acre site. Work included on-site SWPPP monitoring and preparation of weekly SWPPP reports. Reviewed contractor submittals for water, sanitary sewer, and storm drainage utilities for project specification compliance.

Five Mile Substation, National Grid, Humphrey, NY- Assisted with the siting of the substation and design of grading, stormwater management, erosion and sedimentation controls, planting for substation screening, and SWPPP preparation.

Snooks Pond, Congel Residence, Manlius, NY- Designed, scheduled, and managed with a focus on use of paperless design practices, use of sustainable design and building practices in the Town of Manlius. Assisted in the coordination of National Grid, NYSDEC and ACOE permitting and approvals.

SUNY Oneonta Parking Project, Oneonta, NY – Primary drafter with EDR team to improve storm water grading, planting, and utility plans in coordination with Delta Engineering and DASNY.

SUNY Buffalo South Campus, Buffalo, NY - The study analyzed the feasibility of a housing and neighborhood revitalization strategy developed by the University, the city of Buffalo and the towns of Amherst and Tonawanda. The housing revitalization strategy is part of a comprehensive effort that also includes attention to public education, safety and commercial development. The housing strategy focuses on improving the attractiveness of the neighborhood and the area's housing stock by undertaking a large-scale effort to acquire, rehabilitate, and re-occupy homes to remove blighting influences and stabilize entire blocks.

Gateways & Exterior Signage, SUNY Oswego, Oswego, NY- EDR prepared four concept designs for new wayfinding and identifications signage for the SUNY Oswego campus. The selected concept was then developed into a comprehensive signage family that included variations of campus gateway identification signs (some with internal LED lights and digital display panels), wayfinding signs, and identification signs for buildings and parking lots. Six of the sign types from the concept family were selected for implementation in 2014-2015. EDR worked closely with campus staff and signage consultants to develop the detailed design for each sign type. EDR also assisted in analyzing and developing the appropriate content for each sign and determining the most suitable location for each one. Detailed planting plans with masonry walls were also designed as part of the project in order to enhance and better identify the major gateways into the campus.