

Full Environmental Assessment Form
Part 2 - Identification of Potential Project Impacts

Project :

Date :

Part 2 is to be completed by the lead agency. Part 2 is designed to help the lead agency inventory all potential resources that could be affected by a proposed project or action. We recognize that the lead agency’s reviewer(s) will not necessarily be environmental professionals. So, the questions are designed to walk a reviewer through the assessment process by providing a series of questions that can be answered using the information found in Part 1. To further assist the lead agency in completing Part 2, the form identifies the most relevant questions in Part 1 that will provide the information needed to answer the Part 2 question. When Part 2 is completed, the lead agency will have identified the relevant environmental areas that may be impacted by the proposed activity.

If the lead agency is a state agency **and** the action is in any Coastal Area, complete the Coastal Assessment Form before proceeding with this assessment.

Tips for completing Part 2:

- Review all of the information provided in Part 1.
- Review any application, maps, supporting materials and the Full EAF Workbook.
- Answer each of the 18 questions in Part 2.
- If you answer “**Yes**” to a numbered question, please complete all the questions that follow in that section.
- If you answer “**No**” to a numbered question, move on to the next numbered question.
- Check appropriate column to indicate the anticipated size of the impact.
- Proposed projects that would exceed a numeric threshold contained in a question should result in the reviewing agency checking the box “Moderate to large impact may occur.”
- The reviewer is not expected to be an expert in environmental analysis.
- If you are not sure or undecided about the size of an impact, it may help to review the sub-questions for the general question and consult the workbook.
- When answering a question consider all components of the proposed activity, that is, the “whole action”.
- Consider the possibility for long-term and cumulative impacts as well as direct impacts.
- Answer the question in a reasonable manner considering the scale and context of the project.

1. Impact on Land			
Proposed action may involve construction on, or physical alteration of, the land surface of the proposed site. (See Part 1. D.1)		<input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
<i>If “Yes”, answer questions a - j. If “No”, move on to Section 2.</i>			
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may involve construction on land where depth to water table is less than 3 feet.	E2d	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may involve construction on slopes of 15% or greater.	E2f	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may involve construction on land where bedrock is exposed, or generally within 5 feet of existing ground surface.	E2a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may involve the excavation and removal of more than 1,000 tons of natural material.	D2a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may involve construction that continues for more than one year or in multiple phases.	D1e	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. The proposed action may result in increased erosion, whether from physical disturbance or vegetation removal (including from treatment by herbicides).	D2e, D2q	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. The proposed action is, or may be, located within a Coastal Erosion hazard area.	B1i	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. Impact on Geological Features The proposed action may result in the modification or destruction of, or inhibit access to, any unique or unusual land forms on the site (e.g., cliffs, dunes, minerals, fossils, caves). (See Part 1. E.2.g) <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> YES <i>If "Yes", answer questions a - c. If "No", move on to Section 3.</i>			
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. Identify the specific land form(s) attached: _____ _____	E2g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may affect or is adjacent to a geological feature listed as a registered National Natural Landmark. Specific feature: _____	E3c	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. Impacts on Surface Water The proposed action may affect one or more wetlands or other surface water bodies (e.g., streams, rivers, ponds or lakes). (See Part 1. D.2, E.2.h) <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> YES <i>If "Yes", answer questions a - l. If "No", move on to Section 4.</i>			
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may create a new water body.	D2b, D1h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may result in an increase or decrease of over 10% or more than a 10 acre increase or decrease in the surface area of any body of water.	D2b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may involve dredging more than 100 cubic yards of material from a wetland or water body.	D2a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may involve construction within or adjoining a freshwater or tidal wetland, or in the bed or banks of any other water body.	E2h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may create turbidity in a waterbody, either from upland erosion, runoff or by disturbing bottom sediments.	D2a, D2h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. The proposed action may include construction of one or more intake(s) for withdrawal of water from surface water.	D2c	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. The proposed action may include construction of one or more outfall(s) for discharge of wastewater to surface water(s).	D2d	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. The proposed action may cause soil erosion, or otherwise create a source of stormwater discharge that may lead to siltation or other degradation of receiving water bodies.	D2e	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. The proposed action may affect the water quality of any water bodies within or downstream of the site of the proposed action.	E2h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. The proposed action may involve the application of pesticides or herbicides in or around any water body.	D2q, E2h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. The proposed action may require the construction of new, or expansion of existing, wastewater treatment facilities.	D1a, D2d	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

I. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
----------------------------------	--	--------------------------	--------------------------

4. Impact on groundwater The proposed action may result in new or additional use of ground water, or may have the potential to introduce contaminants to ground water or an aquifer. <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> YES (See Part 1. D.2.a, D.2.c, D.2.d, D.2.p, D.2.q, D.2.t) <i>If "Yes", answer questions a - h. If "No", move on to Section 5.</i>			
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may require new water supply wells, or create additional demand on supplies from existing water supply wells.	D2c	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Water supply demand from the proposed action may exceed safe and sustainable withdrawal capacity rate of the local supply or aquifer. Cite Source: _____	D2c	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may allow or result in residential uses in areas without water and sewer services.	D1a, D2c	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may include or require wastewater discharged to groundwater.	D2d, E2l	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may result in the construction of water supply wells in locations where groundwater is, or is suspected to be, contaminated.	D2c, E1f, E1g, E1h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. The proposed action may require the bulk storage of petroleum or chemical products over ground water or an aquifer.	D2p, E2l	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. The proposed action may involve the commercial application of pesticides within 100 feet of potable drinking water or irrigation sources.	E2h, D2q, E2l, D2c	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5. Impact on Flooding The proposed action may result in development on lands subject to flooding. <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> YES (See Part 1. E.2) <i>If "Yes", answer questions a - g. If "No", move on to Section 6.</i>			
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may result in development in a designated floodway.	E2i	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may result in development within a 100 year floodplain.	E2j	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may result in development within a 500 year floodplain.	E2k	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may result in, or require, modification of existing drainage patterns.	D2b, D2e	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may change flood water flows that contribute to flooding.	D2b, E2i, E2j, E2k	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. If there is a dam located on the site of the proposed action, is the dam in need of repair, or upgrade?	E1e	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

g. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
----------------------------------	--	--------------------------	--------------------------

6. Impacts on Air			
The proposed action may include a state regulated air emission source. (See Part 1. D.2.f., D.2.h, D.2.g) <i>If "Yes", answer questions a - f. If "No", move on to Section 7.</i>		<input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. If the proposed action requires federal or state air emission permits, the action may also emit one or more greenhouse gases at or above the following levels: i. More than 1000 tons/year of carbon dioxide (CO ₂) ii. More than 3.5 tons/year of nitrous oxide (N ₂ O) iii. More than 1000 tons/year of carbon equivalent of perfluorocarbons (PFCs) iv. More than .045 tons/year of sulfur hexafluoride (SF ₆) v. More than 1000 tons/year of carbon dioxide equivalent of hydrochloroflourocarbons (HFCs) emissions vi. 43 tons/year or more of methane	D2g D2g D2g D2g D2g D2h	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may generate 10 tons/year or more of any one designated hazardous air pollutant, or 25 tons/year or more of any combination of such hazardous air pollutants.	D2g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may require a state air registration, or may produce an emissions rate of total contaminants that may exceed 5 lbs. per hour, or may include a heat source capable of producing more than 10 million BTU's per hour.	D2f, D2g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may reach 50% of any of the thresholds in "a" through "c", above.	D2g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may result in the combustion or thermal treatment of more than 1 ton of refuse per hour.	D2s	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

7. Impact on Plants and Animals			
The proposed action may result in a loss of flora or fauna. (See Part 1. E.2. m.-q.) <i>If "Yes", answer questions a - j. If "No", move on to Section 8.</i>		<input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may cause reduction in population or loss of individuals of any threatened or endangered species, as listed by New York State or the Federal government, that use the site, or are found on, over, or near the site.	E2o	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may result in a reduction or degradation of any habitat used by any rare, threatened or endangered species, as listed by New York State or the federal government.	E2o	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may cause reduction in population, or loss of individuals, of any species of special concern or conservation need, as listed by New York State or the Federal government, that use the site, or are found on, over, or near the site.	E2p	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may result in a reduction or degradation of any habitat used by any species of special concern and conservation need, as listed by New York State or the Federal government.	E2p	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

e. The proposed action may diminish the capacity of a registered National Natural Landmark to support the biological community it was established to protect.	E3c	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. The proposed action may result in the removal of, or ground disturbance in, any portion of a designated significant natural community. Source: _____	E2n	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. The proposed action may substantially interfere with nesting/breeding, foraging, or over-wintering habitat for the predominant species that occupy or use the project site.	E2m	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. The proposed action requires the conversion of more than 10 acres of forest, grassland or any other regionally or locally important habitat. Habitat type & information source: _____	E1b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Proposed action (commercial, industrial or recreational projects, only) involves use of herbicides or pesticides.	D2q	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Other impacts: _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. Impact on Agricultural Resources			
The proposed action may impact agricultural resources. (See Part 1. E.3.a. and b.)		<input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
<i>If "Yes", answer questions a - h. If "No", move on to Section 9.</i>			
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may impact soil classified within soil group 1 through 4 of the NYS Land Classification System.	E2c, E3b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may sever, cross or otherwise limit access to agricultural land (includes cropland, hayfields, pasture, vineyard, orchard, etc).	E1a, E1b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may result in the excavation or compaction of the soil profile of active agricultural land.	E3b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may irreversibly convert agricultural land to non-agricultural uses, either more than 2.5 acres if located in an Agricultural District, or more than 10 acres if not within an Agricultural District.	E1b, E3a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may disrupt or prevent installation of an agricultural land management system.	E1 a, E1b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. The proposed action may result, directly or indirectly, in increased development potential or pressure on farmland.	C2c, C3, D2c, D2d	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. The proposed project is not consistent with the adopted municipal Farmland Protection Plan.	C2c	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Other impacts: _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

9. Impact on Aesthetic Resources The land use of the proposed action are obviously different from, or are in sharp contrast to, current land use patterns between the proposed project and a scenic or aesthetic resource. (Part 1. E.1.a, E.1.b, E.3.h.) <i>If "Yes", answer questions a - g. If "No", go to Section 10.</i>				<input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur		
a. Proposed action may be visible from any officially designated federal, state, or local scenic or aesthetic resource.	E3h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
b. The proposed action may result in the obstruction, elimination or significant screening of one or more officially designated scenic views.	E3h, C2b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
c. The proposed action may be visible from publicly accessible vantage points: i. Seasonally (e.g., screened by summer foliage, but visible during other seasons) ii. Year round	E3h	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>		
d. The situation or activity in which viewers are engaged while viewing the proposed action is: i. Routine travel by residents, including travel to and from work ii. Recreational or tourism based activities	E3h E2q, E1c	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>		
e. The proposed action may cause a diminishment of the public enjoyment and appreciation of the designated aesthetic resource.	E3h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
f. There are similar projects visible within the following distance of the proposed project: 0-1/2 mile 1/2 -3 mile 3-5 mile 5+ mile	D1a, E1a, D1f, D1g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
g. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		

10. Impact on Historic and Archeological Resources The proposed action may occur in or adjacent to a historic or archaeological resource. (Part 1. E.3.e, f. and g.) <i>If "Yes", answer questions a - e. If "No", go to Section 11.</i>				<input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur		
a. The proposed action may occur wholly or partially within, or substantially contiguous to, any buildings, archaeological site or district which is listed on or has been nominated by the NYS Board of Historic Preservation for inclusion on the State or National Register of Historic Places.	E3e	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
b. The proposed action may occur wholly or partially within, or substantially contiguous to, an area designated as sensitive for archaeological sites on the NY State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) archaeological site inventory.	E3f	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
c. The proposed action may occur wholly or partially within, or substantially contiguous to, an archaeological site not included on the NY SHPO inventory. Source: _____	E3g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		

d. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. If any of the above (a-d) are answered “Moderate to large impact may occur”, continue with the following questions to help support conclusions in Part 3:			
i. The proposed action may result in the destruction or alteration of all or part of the site or property.	E3e, E3g, E3f	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. The proposed action may result in the alteration of the property’s setting or integrity.	E3e, E3f, E3g, E1a, E1b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. The proposed action may result in the introduction of visual elements which are out of character with the site or property, or may alter its setting.	E3e, E3f, E3g, E3h, C2, C3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

11. Impact on Open Space and Recreation			
The proposed action may result in a loss of recreational opportunities or a reduction of an open space resource as designated in any adopted municipal open space plan. (See Part 1. C.2.c, E.1.c., E.2.q.) <i>If “Yes”, answer questions a - e. If “No”, go to Section 12.</i>		<input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may result in an impairment of natural functions, or “ecosystem services”, provided by an undeveloped area, including but not limited to stormwater storage, nutrient cycling, wildlife habitat.	D2e, E1b E2h, E2m, E2o, E2n, E2p	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may result in the loss of a current or future recreational resource.	C2a, E1c, C2c, E2q	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may eliminate open space or recreational resource in an area with few such resources.	C2a, C2c E1c, E2q	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may result in loss of an area now used informally by the community as an open space resource.	C2c, E1c	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

12. Impact on Critical Environmental Areas			
The proposed action may be located within or adjacent to a critical environmental area (CEA). (See Part 1. E.3.d) <i>If “Yes”, answer questions a - c. If “No”, go to Section 13.</i>		<input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may result in a reduction in the quantity of the resource or characteristic which was the basis for designation of the CEA.	E3d	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may result in a reduction in the quality of the resource or characteristic which was the basis for designation of the CEA.	E3d	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

13. Impact on Transportation The proposed action may result in a change to existing transportation systems. <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> YES (See Part 1. D.2.j) <i>If "Yes", answer questions a - f. If "No", go to Section 14.</i>			
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. Projected traffic increase may exceed capacity of existing road network.	D2j	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may result in the construction of paved parking area for 500 or more vehicles.	D2j	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action will degrade existing transit access.	D2j	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action will degrade existing pedestrian or bicycle accommodations.	D2j	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may alter the present pattern of movement of people or goods.	D2j	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

14. Impact on Energy The proposed action may cause an increase in the use of any form of energy. <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> YES (See Part 1. D.2.k) <i>If "Yes", answer questions a - e. If "No", go to Section 15.</i>			
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action will require a new, or an upgrade to an existing, substation.	D2k	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action will require the creation or extension of an energy transmission or supply system to serve more than 50 single or two-family residences or to serve a commercial or industrial use.	D1f, D1q, D2k	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may utilize more than 2,500 MWhrs per year of electricity.	D2k	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may involve heating and/or cooling of more than 100,000 square feet of building area when completed.	D1g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Other Impacts: _____ _____			

15. Impact on Noise, Odor, and Light The proposed action may result in an increase in noise, odors, or outdoor lighting. <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> YES (See Part 1. D.2.m., n., and o.) <i>If "Yes", answer questions a - f. If "No", go to Section 16.</i>			
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may produce sound above noise levels established by local regulation.	D2m	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may result in blasting within 1,500 feet of any residence, hospital, school, licensed day care center, or nursing home.	D2m, E1d	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may result in routine odors for more than one hour per day.	D2o	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

d. The proposed action may result in light shining onto adjoining properties.	D2n	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may result in lighting creating sky-glow brighter than existing area conditions.	D2n, E1a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

16. Impact on Human Health

The proposed action may have an impact on human health from exposure to new or existing sources of contaminants. (See Part 1.D.2.q., E.1. d. f. g. and h.)
If "Yes", answer questions a - m. If "No", go to Section 17.

NO

YES

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action is located within 1500 feet of a school, hospital, licensed day care center, group home, nursing home or retirement community.	E1d	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The site of the proposed action is currently undergoing remediation.	E1g, E1h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. There is a completed emergency spill remediation, or a completed environmental site remediation on, or adjacent to, the site of the proposed action.	E1g, E1h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The site of the action is subject to an institutional control limiting the use of the property (e.g., easement or deed restriction).	E1g, E1h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may affect institutional control measures that were put in place to ensure that the site remains protective of the environment and human health.	E1g, E1h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. The proposed action has adequate control measures in place to ensure that future generation, treatment and/or disposal of hazardous wastes will be protective of the environment and human health.	D2t	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. The proposed action involves construction or modification of a solid waste management facility.	D2q, E1f	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. The proposed action may result in the unearthing of solid or hazardous waste.	D2q, E1f	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. The proposed action may result in an increase in the rate of disposal, or processing, of solid waste.	D2r, D2s	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. The proposed action may result in excavation or other disturbance within 2000 feet of a site used for the disposal of solid or hazardous waste.	E1f, E1g E1h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. The proposed action may result in the migration of explosive gases from a landfill site to adjacent off site structures.	E1f, E1g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l. The proposed action may result in the release of contaminated leachate from the project site.	D2s, E1f, D2r	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m. Other impacts: _____ _____			

17. Consistency with Community Plans			
The proposed action is not consistent with adopted land use plans. (See Part 1. C.1, C.2. and C.3.) <i>If “Yes”, answer questions a - h. If “No”, go to Section 18.</i>		<input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action’s land use components may be different from, or in sharp contrast to, current surrounding land use pattern(s).	C2, C3, D1a E1a, E1b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action will cause the permanent population of the city, town or village in which the project is located to grow by more than 5%.	C2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action is inconsistent with local land use plans or zoning regulations.	C2, C2, C3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action is inconsistent with any County plans, or other regional land use plans.	C2, C2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may cause a change in the density of development that is not supported by existing infrastructure or is distant from existing infrastructure.	C3, D1c, D1d, D1f, D1d, E1b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. The proposed action is located in an area characterized by low density development that will require new or expanded public infrastructure.	C4, D2c, D2d D2j	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. The proposed action may induce secondary development impacts (e.g., residential or commercial development not included in the proposed action)	C2a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Other: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

18. Consistency with Community Character			
The proposed project is inconsistent with the existing community character. (See Part 1. C.2, C.3, D.2, E.3) <i>If “Yes”, answer questions a - g. If “No”, proceed to Part 3.</i>		<input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may replace or eliminate existing facilities, structures, or areas of historic importance to the community.	E3e, E3f, E3g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may create a demand for additional community services (e.g. schools, police and fire)	C4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may displace affordable or low-income housing in an area where there is a shortage of such housing.	C2, C3, D1f D1g, E1a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may interfere with the use or enjoyment of officially recognized or designated public resources.	C2, E3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action is inconsistent with the predominant architectural scale and character.	C2, C3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Proposed action is inconsistent with the character of the existing natural landscape.	C2, C3 E1a, E1b E2g, E2h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Project :

Date :

Full Environmental Assessment Form
Part 3 - Evaluation of the Magnitude and Importance of Project Impacts
and
Determination of Significance

Part 3 provides the reasons in support of the determination of significance. The lead agency must complete Part 3 for every question in Part 2 where the impact has been identified as potentially moderate to large or where there is a need to explain why a particular element of the proposed action will not, or may, result in a significant adverse environmental impact.

Based on the analysis in Part 3, the lead agency must decide whether to require an environmental impact statement to further assess the proposed action or whether available information is sufficient for the lead agency to conclude that the proposed action will not have a significant adverse environmental impact. By completing the certification on the next page, the lead agency can complete its determination of significance.

Reasons Supporting This Determination:

To complete this section:

- Identify the impact based on the Part 2 responses and describe its magnitude. Magnitude considers factors such as severity, size or extent of an impact.
- Assess the importance of the impact. Importance relates to the geographic scope, duration, probability of the impact occurring, number of people affected by the impact and any additional environmental consequences if the impact were to occur.
- The assessment should take into consideration any design element or project changes.
- Repeat this process for each Part 2 question where the impact has been identified as potentially moderate to large or where there is a need to explain why a particular element of the proposed action will not, or may, result in a significant adverse environmental impact.
- Provide the reason(s) why the impact may, or will not, result in a significant adverse environmental impact
- For Conditional Negative Declarations identify the specific condition(s) imposed that will modify the proposed action so that no significant adverse environmental impacts will result.
- Attach additional sheets, as needed.

Determination of Significance - Type 1 and Unlisted Actions

SEQR Status: Type 1 Unlisted

Identify portions of EAF completed for this Project: Part 1 Part 2 Part 3

Upon review of the information recorded on this EAF, as noted, plus this additional support information

and considering both the magnitude and importance of each identified potential impact, it is the conclusion of the _____ as lead agency that:

A. This project will result in no significant adverse impacts on the environment, and, therefore, an environmental impact statement need not be prepared. Accordingly, this negative declaration is issued.

B. Although this project could have a significant adverse impact on the environment, that impact will be avoided or substantially mitigated because of the following conditions which will be required by the lead agency:

There will, therefore, be no significant adverse impacts from the project as conditioned, and, therefore, this conditioned negative declaration is issued. A conditioned negative declaration may be used only for UNLISTED actions (see 6 NYCRR 617.d).

C. This Project may result in one or more significant adverse impacts on the environment, and an environmental impact statement must be prepared to further assess the impact(s) and possible mitigation and to explore alternatives to avoid or reduce those impacts. Accordingly, this positive declaration is issued.

Name of Action:

Name of Lead Agency:

Name of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency:

Title of Responsible Officer:

Signature of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency:

Date:

Signature of Preparer (if different from Responsible Officer)

Date:

For Further Information:

Contact Person:

Address:

Telephone Number:

E-mail:

For Type 1 Actions and Conditioned Negative Declarations, a copy of this Notice is sent to:

Chief Executive Officer of the political subdivision in which the action will be principally located (e.g., Town / City / Village of)

Other involved agencies (if any)

Applicant (if any)

Environmental Notice Bulletin: <http://www.dec.ny.gov/enb/enb.html>

Attachment A -

Part 3 – Evaluation of the Magnitude and Importance of Project Impacts

Ellis Tract Community Solar Project
State Environmental Quality Review
Full Environmental Assessment Form

Action: Ellis Tract Community Solar Project

Location: Stevenson Road, Turkey Hill Road and Dodge Road.
Town of Dryden, NY
Tax Parcel No. North: 56.-5-19.2, 56.-5-31, 57.-1-6, 57.-1-7.1
South: 67.-1-3, 67.-1-7.2, 67.-1-4

Lead Agency: Town of Dryden Town Board

Description: This project involves the construction of eight 2MWac and two 1MWac solar photo-voltaic arrays for generation of 18 MWac of clean energy for sale to local NYSEG rate payers through net metering bill credits under the community distributed generation program. The arrays will be installed on the seven parcels listed above owned by Cornell University totaling approximately 294 acres. Sun 8 PDC, LLC is proposing to subdivide the seven parcels to create ten separate lots which they will lease from Cornell University to construct ten solar photo-voltaic arrays. The ten arrays will be fenced and the total enclosed area will be approximately 110 acres.

Solar arrays will consist of photo-voltaic modules mounted on galvanized metal racking systems anchored into the ground using helical ground screws. Arrays will be fenced and electric transformers will be installed on concrete pads. Gravel access drives will be constructed to access each site and the transformers. No significant land grading is proposed but tree clearing will be required to remove shading from the arrays.

The Town Board will consider granting a Special Use Permit and Site Plan approval for the project. The Town's Director of Planning will review and approve Minor Subdivisions for the creation of the ten array parcels and the Town Zoning Board of Appeals will be considering an Area Variance to waive the 50-foot setback requirement from the subdivision parcel lines to the solar arrays. Other potential Regional, State or Federal agencies that may issue a funding approval or environmental permit include the Tompkins County Industrial Development Agency (IDA), New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA), New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) and United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). The proposed action is Type 1 pursuant to 6 NYCRR 617 State Environmental Quality Review.

Part 2 of the Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF) was completed based on information contained in Part 1 of the Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF) and the following documents:

- Site Plan Drawings
- Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment

- Aquatic Resources Report
- Habitat Assessment and Preliminary Impacts Determination
- Visual Impact Statement
- Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
- Ecological Assessment
- Phase 1 Archeological Investigation Report

In addition to the documents listed above, information submitted by Involved Agencies, the general public, and information presented by the applicant at Town Board meetings was reviewed and considered. The FEAF workbook provided guidance in determining the appropriate responses to questions 1-18 of Part 2.

Using the Part 2 guidance, the Board determined that there would be no impact to the environmental resources evaluated in Questions 2 (Geologic Features), 4 (Groundwater), 5 (Flooding), 6 (Air), 12 (Critical Environmental Areas), 13 (Transportation) and 14 (Energy). Each of these were checked “No”.

The Board determined that questions 1 (Land), 3 (Surface Water), 7 (Plants & Animals), 8 (Agricultural Resource), 9 (Aesthetic Resources), 10 (Historic and Archeological Resources), 11 (Open Space & Recreation), 15 (Noise, Odor, Light), 16 (Human Health), 17 (Consistency with Community Plans) and 18 (Consistency with Community Character) warranted further evaluation and were checked “Yes”. Although each principal question was checked “Yes”, further evaluation resulted in nearly all the subset of questions in each category receiving a “No, or small impact may occur” response.

The Board determined that a ‘Moderate to large impact may occur’ relative to 3 (Impacts on Surface Water), 9 (Aesthetic Resources), 17 (Consistency with Community Plans) and 18 (Consistency with Community Character).

1. Impact on Land

Brief description of the impact on land:

Seven different tax map parcels, all owned by Cornell University and totaling approximately 299 acres will be encumbered to create the ten solar array sites. The north sites (Group N) sites are a contiguous combination of cropland and fenced pastures bounded on the north by Mount Pleasant Road, on the east by Turkey Hill Road and private residences, on the south by Stevenson Road and on the west by the Cornell University composting facility. The cropland and fenced pastures are separated by a narrow hedgerow running east/west. Drawing C-101 titled Group “N” Existing Site Conditions indicates the land generally slopes to the west and southwest away from Turkey Hill road between 4-12%. An unpaved dirt road with an existing curb cut on the north side of Stevenson Road will be used to access all of the Group N sites.

The south (Group S) sites are essentially two distinct project areas, S1-S3 located along Dodge Road and S4-S5 along Turkey Hill Road. The two south project areas are physically connected only by a 40-foot wide utility corridor across a vacant parcel also owned by Cornell University. Land characteristics of the Group S sites includes a mix of cropland, successional shrubland, successional old fields, successional northern hardwoods plantation, planted evergreens and shallow emergent marsh. Taken together, the Group S

sites are generally bounded on the north by tributaries and wetlands connected to Cascadilla Creek, on the east by Turkey Hill Road, on the south by a NYSEG overhead electric corridor, and on the west by Dodge Road. The land generally slopes to the north toward Cascadilla Creek between 2-9%. Street access for S1-S3 sites can occur along all of the Dodge Road frontage while the S4-S5 site will utilize an existing access road and curb cut on Turkey Hill Road.

The installation of the solar panels will utilize earth screws to minimize any grading requirements. Depth to bedrock is reported in Part 1 of the FEAF at greater than 5 feet per on-site screw foundation tests.

No significant grading is proposed for the arrays, however, excavation for roughly 7,200 feet of 12-foot wide gravel access drives and 10 transformer/inverter concrete pads (300 square feet each) is expected. Trench excavation for installing roughly 9,000 feet of buried electric cables will also be necessary. The metal racking system supporting the photo-voltaic modules will be anchored into the ground using helical ground screws. According to the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) dated June 2017 and prepared by Maser Engineering, the project will disturb 33 acres of soil primarily from the removal of tree stumps and ultimately convert approximately 2.06 acres of land to impervious surfaces in the form of access drives and inverter pads. The SWPPP also identifies temporary and permanent erosion control measures to stabilize disturbed soils.

Based on the information contained in Part 1 of the FEAF and supplemental documents each of the following criteria are deemed to be of ‘no impact’:

- a. *The proposed action may involve construction on land where depth to water table is less than 3 feet.*
- b. *The proposed action may involve construction on slopes of 15% or greater.*
- c. *The proposed action may involve construction on land where bedrock is exposed, or generally within 5 feet of existing ground surface.*
- d. *The proposed action may involve the excavation and removal of more than 1,000 tons of natural material.*
- e. *The proposed action may involve construction that continues for more than one year or in multiple phases.*
- f. *The proposed action may result in increased erosion, whether from physical disturbance or vegetation removal (including from treatment by herbicides).*
- g. *The proposed action is, or may be, located within a Coastal Erosion hazard area.*

Based on the information contained in Part 1 of the FEAF and supplemental documents each of the following criteria are deemed to be of ‘small impact’:

- h. *Other impacts: Construction of Access Drives*

The typical detail for construction of the 12-foot wide access drives, as illustrated on Drawing C-114 titled Miscellaneous Details indicates that 8 inches of crushed stone will be placed on geotextile fabric. Without changing the contours of the land adjoining either side of the access drive it will be necessary to excavate existing soil to a depth of 8 inches for placement of the fabric and stone. The temporary erosion and sediment controls required by the SWPPP and Drawings C-104 and C-110 titled Group “N” Erosion and

Sediment Control Plan and Group “S” Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, respectively will minimize the impacts of exposed subgrade soils to erosion, therefore, no significant adverse impacts to land are anticipated as a result of the proposed action.

3. Impacts on Surface Water

Brief description of impacts on surface water:

The USFWS National Wetland Inventory (NWI) identifies eight mapped wetlands within close proximity to the site boundaries. The majority of these NWI wetlands are associated with Cascadilla Creek, or the tributaries, and include four riverine (R4SBC) features, two freshwater emergent wetlands (PEM1A and PEM1E), one freshwater forested/shrub (PSS4A) feature, and one freshwater pond (PUBHh). There are no NYSDEC delineated freshwater wetlands on either the north or south sites. Sites N1-N3 drain to Fall Creek while N4-N5 and all of the Group S sites drain to Cascadilla Creek. Cascadilla Creek is a perennial stream and classified by NYSDEC as Class C. Class C fresh surface waters are best used for fishing and are suitable for fish, shellfish and wildlife propagation and survival. These waters are also suitable for primary and secondary contact recreation. Fall Creek is classified by NYSDEC as a Class A stream which includes as a best usage a source of water supply for drinking.

The applicant has submitted an Aquatic Resources Report (Report) dated April 2017 and prepared by Tetra Tech, Inc. which summarizes the results of a survey conducted for the purpose of determining the presence and extent of wetlands meeting either the criteria for federal designation according to USACE or NYSDEC Freshwater Wetlands. Within the boundaries of the Group N and Group S sites, the survey identified thirteen wetland areas totaling approximately 22.9 acres that meet the criteria for USACE wetland identification. The wetlands identified include three palustrine forested (PFO) features, twelve freshwater emergent wetland (PEM) features, three palustrine scrub-shrub (PSS) feature, and two freshwater pond (PUBHh) feature. Three of the wetlands in the Group S sites (ID No. W9a/W10a, W11a and W12a) are described in the Report as being “Part of a very large wetland complex off-site”. The footprints of these three specific wetlands adjoin the previously mapped NWI wetlands. No NYSDEC Freshwater Wetlands Program wetland features or 100-foot adjacent areas were located in the immediate proximity or within the site boundary. Fourteen streams were identified during the survey. Twelve unnamed streams are tributaries to Cascadilla Creek and two in the Group N sites are tributaries to Fall Creek.

Based on the information contained in Part 1 of the FEAF and supplemental documents each of the following criteria are deemed to be of ‘no impact’:

- a. *The proposed action may create a new water body.*
- b. *The proposed action may result in an increase or decrease of over 10% or more than 10 acre increase or decrease in the surface area of any body of water.*
- c. *The proposed action may involve dredging more than 100 cubic yards of material from a wetland or water body.*
- e. *The proposed action may create turbidity in a waterbody, either from upland erosion, runoff or by disturbing bottom sediments.*

- f. The proposed action may include construction of one or more intake(s) for withdrawal of water from surface water.*
- g. The proposed action may include construction of one or more outfall(s) for discharge of wastewater to surface water(s).*
- h. The proposed action may cause soil erosion, or otherwise create a source of stormwater discharge that may lead to siltation or other degradation of receiving water bodies.*
- i. The proposed action may affect the water quality of any water bodies within or downstream of the site of the proposed action.*
- j. The proposed action may involve the application of pesticides or herbicides in or around any water body.*
- k. The proposed action may require the construction of new, or expansion of existing, wastewater treatment facilities.*

Based on the information contained in Part 1 of the FEAF and supplemental documents each of the following criteria are deemed to be of ‘moderate to large impact’:

- d. The proposed action may involve construction within or adjoining a freshwater or tidal wetland, or in the bed or banks of any other water body.*

Drawings C-102 and C-108 titled Proposed Site Plan indicate minor disturbance will occur within the area of delineated wetlands and/or streams for the installation of electric lines, access roads and solar arrays. Drawings C-104 and C110 titled Erosion and Sediment Control Plan include the layout of the array perimeter fencing and access drives relative to the boundaries of the delineated wetlands and streams. Based on these drawings, the installation of solar panel arrays and fencing is shown to encroach into delineated wetlands in the N5 site and each of the Group S sites.

Drawings C-105 and C-111 titled Tree Removal Plan depict the tree clearing limits in forested areas. Forested wetland areas (PFO) have been identified east of sites N1-N3 and east of sites S4 and S5. Trees within the forested wetlands east of sites N1-N3 will be managed following a selective clearing/removal protocol proposed by the applicant. Selective clearing will consist of reviewing each grove of trees to determine the hazard posed. Trees that pose shade or fall hazard will be cut or cleared. Roots and stumps for trees being cut outside the footprint of solar arrays will be left in place. Within the selective clearing limits, the applicant is proposing three tiers of removal. The first tier is the area nearest the fenced arrays in which all vegetation taller than 10 feet will be removed. Within the second tier, all trees taller than 20 feet will be removed and in the third tier only trees taller than 30 feet will be removed. Such clearing within the forested wetlands will occur with non-mechanized means and tree stumps will not be uprooted. Where machinery is required within wetland areas timber mats will be utilized to minimize the disturbance.

Construction activities will cause soil disturbance on approximately 33 acres of land which requires filing a Notice of Intent with NYSDEC to obtain coverage under SPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharge from Construction Activity (GP-0-15-002). A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) dated June 2017 and prepared by Maser Engineering describes temporary erosion and sediment control practices

that will be utilized during construction within the site to protect wetlands and waterbodies from unintentional discharges of sediment laden runoff.

The applicant has documented there will be no discharge of dredged or fill material into wetlands or waters of the United States. This includes mechanized clearing, ditching, channelization or other types of excavation. Accordingly, the U.S. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers (Buffalo District) issued a letter on June 23, 2017 to the applicant stating that “a Department of the Army (DA) permit is not required”. Similarly, the NYSDEC provided a jurisdictional determination on April 28, 2017 stating: “*No Official NYSDEC Freshwater Wetlands are mapped at this location. Therefore, no NYS Freshwater Wetlands permit will be required*”. Access drives will not encroach into delineated wetlands although solar panel arrays and fencing with encroach into delineated wetlands. When delineated wetlands are to be crossed for installation of the solar array panels and agricultural fence, the applicant will be utilizing temporary timber mats to support equipment and minimize disturbance impacts to the wetland soils.

Based on the above information, no significant adverse impacts on surface waters are anticipated as a result of the proposed action.

7. Impacts on Plants and Animals

Brief description of impacts on plants and animals:

An ecological assessment field survey was conducted by a Tetra Tech, Inc. qualified biologist on March 28, 2017 to observe and record the presence and extents of natural communities, vegetation, hydrology and soils. The seven ecological communities identified on the site during the survey, and further described in the Ecological Assessment Report (EAR), include the following:

1. Cropland
2. Successional old field
3. Successional Northern Hardwoods
4. Shrub swamp
5. Shallow emergent marsh
6. Successional shrublands
7. Hardwood plantation

A letter dated March 1, 2017 from the New York Natural Heritage Program (NYNHP) stated there are “no records of rare or state-listed animals or plants, or significant natural communities at the project site or in its immediate vicinity”. NYNHP documents only those locations of natural communities where the community type is rare in New York State; or, for more common community types, where the community at that location is a high-quality example and meets specific, documented criteria for state significance in terms of size, undisturbed and intact condition, and the quality of the surrounding landscape. The USFWS did indicate that the federally-threatened northern long-eared bat may occur within the boundary of the site and/or may be affected by the project. USFWS did not identify any bald eagle nests or records in the vicinity.

An additional field survey was completed by the qualified biologist on June 13, 2017 to “ensure the site was evaluated in the heart of the growing season, and identify any significant changes or additional analysis required due to the change of seasons”. Tetra Tech, Inc. documented their findings in an Addendum dated June 16, 2017. Additional species of vegetation noted during the site visit, generally herbaceous plants, included: true forget-me-not (*Myosotis scorpioides*), spotted jewelweed (*Impatiens capensis*), swamp buttercup (*Ranunculus caricetorium*), great bladder sedge (*Carex intumescens*), fringed sedge (*Carex crinita*), hop sedge (*Carex lupulina*) and broom sedge (*Carex scoparia*). Additional fauna largely consisted of the presence of common migratory song birds. Song birds that were either directly observed or identified by call included the common yellowthroat (*Geothlypis trichas*), blue-winged warbler (*Vermivora cyanoptera*), American redstart (*Setophaga ruticilla*), red-winged blackbird (*Agelaius phoeniceus*), gray catbird (*Dumetella carolinensis*), wood thrush (*Hylocichla mustelina*), ovenbird (*Seiurus aurocapilla*), yellow warbler (*Setophaga petechial*), scarlet tanager (*Piranga olivacea*), red-tailed hawk (*Buteo jamaicensis*) and wild turkey (*Meleagris gallopavo*). As stated by Tetra Tech, Inc. “none of the species identified were rare, endangered or threatened and so would not warrant further permitting or coordination with regulatory agencies”.

Each of the ten solar sites will be secured within a 7-foot tall agricultural fence which is constructed of 6-foot knotted fence fabric with a single string wire on top. The fence fabric is attached to wood posts. No barbed wire or razor wire is being proposed. The fence style will allow small animals to pass freely through the arrays while restricting larger predatory animals, such as coyotes. There are currently multiple fields in the Group N sites that are fenced and used for pasture. This existing fencing will be removed completely for the solar array installations. A single 45-foot wide wildlife corridor is proposed between the N3 and N4 sites. This corridor will include and retain the existing east/west hedgerow. Wildlife corridors are also proposed between sites S1 and S2 and between sites S2 and S3.

Based on the information contained in Part 1 of the FEAF and supplemental documents each of the following criteria are deemed to be of ‘no impact’:

- a. *The proposed action may cause reduction in population or loss of individuals of any threatened or endangered species, as listed by New York State or the Federal government, that use the site, or are found on, over, or near the site.*
- d. *The proposed action may result in a reduction or degradation of any habitat used by any species of special concern and conservation need, as listed by New York State or the Federal government.*
- e. *The proposed action may diminish the capacity of a registered National Natural Landmark to support the biological community it was established to protect.*
- f. *The proposed action may result in the removal of, or ground disturbance in, any portion of a designated significant natural community.*
- g. *The proposed action may substantially interfere with nesting/breeding, foraging, or over-wintering habitat for the predominant species that occupy or use the project site.*
- i. *Proposed action (commercial, industrial or recreational projects, only) involves use of herbicides or pesticides.*

Based on the information contained in Part 1 of the FEAF and supplemental documents each of the following criteria are deemed to be of ‘small impact’:

- b. *The proposed action may result in a reduction or degradation of any habitat used by any rare, threatened or endangered species, as listed by New York State or the federal government.*
- c. *The proposed action may cause reduction in population, or loss of individuals, of any species of special concern or conservation need, as listed by New York State or the Federal government, that use the site, or are found on, over, or near the site.*

The USFWS indicated that the federally-threatened northern long-eared bat (NLEB) could potentially be affected by the project, as all forested habitats are potential habitat for NLEB. The majority of the project occurs in open areas (or impacts narrow hedgerows), but potential habitat for the NLEB is proposed to be cleared. No winter habitats were identified in either the NYSDEC environmental resource mapper or the USFWS IPaC search, it is unlikely that any hibernacula are in the vicinity of the Project. Further, the NYSDEC listing of NLEB occupied habitat dated May 18, 2017 does not identify any summer or winter locations in Tompkins County. The final USFWS 4(d) Rule for the NLEB indicates that if maternity roosts and their 150-foot buffer are avoided during June and July (i.e. pup season), and no hibernacula are identified within 0.25 mile of the project, tree clearing poses no impact to the NLEB species. The applicant has voluntarily committed to not clearing NLEB roosting habitat on the site from May 1 to August 31. This window encompasses the majority of the primary active season for the NLEB. In addition, NYSDEC has provided a jurisdictional determination that the project will not likely result in the “take” of a threatened or endangered species.

Additional species of fauna have been observed in the Dodge Road area as reported to the Town in a letter from Gin and Nari Mistry dated March 15, 2017. The letter identifies eighteen mammals and over eighty bird species that have reportedly been observed in the project vicinity in addition to those identified in Part 1 of the FEAF. Within the Mistry mammal and bird list, some of the species have been identified in the New York State lists of Threatened Species or Species of Special Concern. Threatened Species in their list include the Northern Harrier and Bald Eagle. Species of Special Concern include the Horned Lark, Osprey, Sharp-Shinned Hawk and Cooper’s Hawk.

The presence of Purple Trillium (*Trillium ecetum*) in the Dodge Road area was mentioned in a letter dated April 30, 2017 from Joleen Multari. Neither the Ecological Assessment Report nor the Addendum indicate *Trillium* being observed during the March 28th or June 13th field surveys. In response to this observation, the Town Engineer contacted Mr. Nicholas Conrad with the New York Natural Heritage Program (NYNHP) on May 18, 2017 to specifically discuss the significance of *Trillium*. Mr. Conrad responded that Purple Trillium (*Trillium ecetum*) as well as White Trillium (*Trillium grandiflorum*) are considered an “exploitable vulnerable native plant” which is not rare, threatened or endangered.

In addition to the NYNHP letter referenced above, the NYSDEC issued a letter dated May 11, 2017 regarding a jurisdictional determination for endangered species stating: “*The Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) has determined that your proposal to construct solar photovoltaic facilities located at Ellis Tracts and 2150 Dryden Toad in the Town of Dryden is not likely to result in the*

“take” of a threatened or endangered species. Although Henslow’s Sparrow, Northern Harrier, Sedge Wren, and Northern Long-eared Bat are known to occur (or occurred) at or near the project locations, DEC Wildlife staff have determined that your proposed action will not result in a take. Therefore no permit is required at this time pursuant to the implementing regulations (6NYCRR Part 182) of the New York State Endangered Species Act (Article 11-0535).” Further, per NYSDEC reference documents “An incidental take permit is not required for activities affecting species of special concern”.

Based on the information contained in Part 1 of the FEA and supplemental documents each of the following criteria are deemed to be of ‘moderate impact’:

- h. The proposed action requires the conversion of more than 10 acres of forest, grassland or any other regionally or locally important habitat. Habitat type & information source: 29.8 +/- ac of forest to be cleared and converted to meadow or shrubland.*

The project proposes to impact approximately 29.8 acres of forested land for the installation of solar arrays, to prevent shading of the panels and to remove fall hazards. As identified on Drawings C-105 and C111 titled Tree Cutting Plan, the areas of tree cutting activity occurs in hedgerows, in an isolated hardwood plantation, within and along the perimeter of the successional northern hardwoods, and within plantation evergreens. The 3.2 acres of plantation hardwoods to be cleared within site S4 are described in the EAR as *“A stand of planted white ash (Fraxinus americana)...This stand appears to be some sort of experimental treatment. It does not appear to be maintained”*. The 1.4 acres of plantation evergreens to be cleared along the west line of Dodge Road is a portion of a much larger spruce grove that extends further west and south. The largest contiguous area of tree clearing occurs in site S4 and is 6.4 acres of successional shrubland. Per the EAR these are *“shrublands that occur on sites that have been cleared (for farming, logging, development, etc.) or otherwise disturbed. This community has at least 50% cover of shrubs (NYNHP 2014). Species observed within the successional shrubland communities within the Site include grey dogwood, honeysuckle (Lonicera spp.), European buckthorn (Rhamnus cathartica), and multiflora rose”*.

The applicant has stated in writing a preference *“to only clear trees that are deemed to be either a fall hazard or pose a shading concern, within permissible environmental constraints. Consistent with its normal approach, SUN8 agrees to review each grove of trees for potential fall hazards or shading concerns before clearing; only those trees that fit the criteria of either being a fall hazard or a shading concern will selectively be removed”*. The timing of clearing of the forested land has been voluntarily restricted by the applicant to avoid potential impact to habitat of the NLEB. As described above, selective clearing is being proposed in areas outside of the site fences to minimize the need for clear cutting.

Given the applicants proposal to perform selective tree cutting in the forested wetland together with the voluntary commitments for tree clearing calendar restrictions, the impacts on plants and animals are anticipated to be small as a result of the proposed action.

8. Impact on Agricultural Resources

Brief description of impact on agricultural resources:

None of the property being utilized for the solar array sites is located within an agricultural district. The nearest land within the Tompkins County Agricultural Districts #1 is approximately 0.6 miles northeast of the N1 site on Mt. Pleasant Road. A total of approximately 67.5 acres of land between the Group N and Group S sites are being actively managed as agricultural fields either as pasture or for the production of row crops and hay. These fields have been delineated in the Ecological Assessment Report as the "Cropland" ecological community. The soil groups mapped by NRCS within these fields include Bath, Braceville, Canandaigua, Chenango, Darien, Erie, Eel, Hudson, Ilion, Langford, Madalin, Muck, Niagara, Ovid, Red Hood, Rhinebeck and Wayland. Within these fields soils that are considered by the NY Department of Agriculture and Markets to be highly productive soils are: Braceville, Chenango, Eel, Gudson, Langford and Niagara soils. The applicant has determined that approximately 30.4 acres of these highly productive soils fall within the proposed fenced areas of the solar arrays.

Based on the information contained in Part 1 of the FEAF and supplemental documents each of the following criteria are deemed to be of 'no impact':

- b. The proposed action may sever, cross or otherwise limit access to agricultural land (includes cropland, hayfields, pasture, vineyard, orchard, etc).*
- c. The proposed action may result in the excavation or compaction of the soil profile of active agricultural land.*
- e. The proposed action may disrupt or prevent installation of an agricultural land management system.*
- f. The proposed action may result, directly or indirectly, in increased development potential or pressure on farmland.*
- g. The proposed project is not consistent with the adopted municipal Farmland Protection Plan.*

Based on the information contained in Part 1 of the FEAF and supplemental documents each of the following criteria are deemed to be of 'small impact':

- a. The proposed action may impact soil classified within soil group 1 through 4 of the NYS Land Classification System.*
- d. The proposed action may irreversibly convert agricultural land to non-agricultural uses, either more than 2.5 acres if located in an Agricultural District, or more than 10 acres if not within an Agricultural District.*

All of the property encompassing the Group N and Group S sites is located in the Town's Rural Agriculture District. The zoning district to the east of the Group N sites along Turkey Hill Road is Neighborhood Residential. To the north and west, Site N1 abuts the Varna Hamlet Residential District and to the south along Stevenson Road is Rural Agricultural. The zoning district of the lands associated with Group S sites is also Rural Agriculture. To the north, east and west the zoning district remains Rural Agriculture. To the south and abutting the S3 and S5 sites, the zoning district is Neighborhood Residential. Aside from the Cornell University agriculture research fields there are no other farming enterprises that adjoin the project sites.

The Town's Zoning Law allows the installation of ground-mounted, large-scale solar arrays in the Rural Agriculture Zone, however, locating the solar energy system on prime farmland soils requires approval by the Town Board in conjunction with the Special Use Permit approval process.

The solar panels have a relatively long useful life (30 +/- years) but the system can be decommissioned, allowing the land and the underlying 30.4 acres of highly productive soils to revert back to agricultural uses.

The project will reduce Cornell University's access to agricultural land, however, in a letter dated April 12, 2017 from Kathryn Boor, Dean of Agriculture and Life Sciences at Cornell University it is noted: *"To clarify, the Cornell lands proposed for solar development are not included in either of Tomkins County's two Agricultural Districts, nor are these lands within any of the County's six identified Agricultural Resource Focus Areas. It should also be noted that, as dictated by circumstance, solar farms are readily reverted to traditional agriculture and can support concurrent grazing activity."*

During the site-selection process, more than 50 Cornell sites were analyzed, many managed by the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences. A number were eliminated due to distance to an interconnection point (access to grid), and several other possible options were eliminated from consideration as well because they support active, funded research, are being maintained in a state of readiness for future research, or operate as research support.

The parcels selected for the community solar project were identified as either having low- productivity soils, less agricultural value, and-or the ability to relocate existing and planned research operations from the selected sites to other suitable Cornell lands".

As noted above, if the system is ever decommissioned, the underlying land could revert to agricultural use without having lost the highly productive soils. Based on this information, no significant impacts on agricultural resources are anticipated as a result of the proposed action.

9. Impact on Aesthetic Resources

Brief description of impact on aesthetic resources:

Neither the Town's 2005 Comprehensive Plan nor 2003 Open Space Inventory designate scenic or aesthetic resources that incorporate the Group N or Group S sites. Part 1 of the FEA does identify eight 'distinctive' and twelve 'noteworthy' viewsheds included in the 2007 Tompkins County Scenic Resources Inventory that are within five miles of the project sites. Only one noteworthy view, #12 in the County inventory, will be directly impacted by the project. As described in the Inventory, "There were 30 scenic resources selected as Noteworthy Views. While 75% of the views take in Cayuga Lake or another of the numerous scenic watercourses, this group includes more diversity than the Distinctive Views group. Almost half reflect a pastoral and agricultural landscape. They include more vistas and features from the built environment". The vantage point of view #12 on Turkey Hill Road is approximately 0.2 miles north of the Stevenson Road intersection and looking south west.

The N5 site is nearest Turkey Hill Road and will occupy the agricultural fields framed by view #12. Within the N5 site approximately 5.2 acres of solar panel surfaces will be installed. The ground elevation of Turkey Hill Road at the vantage point of view #12 is roughly 30 feet higher than the ground elevation along the east fence line of site N5. Continuing west, ground elevations fall another 20 feet at the west fence line of site N5. From 200 Stevenson Road (Reed) views to the north and northwest include the N4 and N5 sites. Travelers on Stevenson Road near the intersection of Dodge Road can observe sites N3, N4, N5, S1 and S2.

In the vicinity of sites S1-S3, views from 74 Dodge Road (Miller) and 78 Dodge Road (Appel) are generally to the east and of the immediate surroundings; namely the cropland, successional fields, successional northern hardwoods, and evergreen plantation. The NYSEG right-of-way along the south end of site S3 includes two rows of high voltage overhead electric lines and poles. The vegetation beneath these overhead lines is cleared on occasion which opens distant views to the east and west. From the south end of site S3 adjacent to 15 Dodge Road (Habecker), the view to the north is of a distant horizon rising above Stevenson Road. Looking south from site S1, the view includes the climbing terrain of Hungerford Hill. The ground contours generally slope from south to north and the elevation at the north end of site S1 is 90 feet lower than the south end of S3.

The S4 and S5 sites west of Turkey Hill Road are largely obscured from view, especially from vantage points along Turkey Hill Road south of the Stevenson Road intersection. From 162 Turkey Hill Road (north of the Stevenson Road intersection), you can discern the southwest corner of the existing agricultural field bordering the proposed sites S4 and S5.

Given the footprint of the solar panel arrays, the change in view sheds will be significant for the immediate neighbors on Turkey Hill Road, Stevenson Road and Dodge Road. Users of Turkey Hill Road will observe the full depth and width of the array in site N5 between the Stevenson Road intersection and 162 Turkey Hill Road. The solar arrays do maintain a relatively low profile, the lower edge of a panel being 2 feet above grade and the upper edge 8 feet above grade. The panels are tilted at 20 degrees to the horizon and facing south.

Based on the information contained in Part 1 of the FEA and supplemental documents each of the following criteria are deemed to be of 'no impact':

- b. The proposed action may result in the obstruction, elimination or significant screening of one or more officially designated scenic views.*
- e. The proposed action may cause a diminishment of the public enjoyment and appreciation of the designated aesthetic resource.*
- f. There are similar projects visible within the following distance of the proposed project:*
 - 0-1/2 mile*
 - 1/2 -3 mile*
 - 3-5 mile*
 - 5+ mile*

Based on the information contained in Part 1 of the FEAF and supplemental documents each of the following criteria are deemed to be of ‘moderate to large impact’:

- a. *Proposed action may be visible from any officially designated federal, state, or local scenic or aesthetic resource.*
- c. *The proposed action may be visible from publicly accessible vantage points:*
 - i. *Seasonally (e.g., screened by summer foliage, but visible during other seasons)*
 - ii. *Year round*
- d. *The situation or activity in which viewers are engaged while viewing the proposed action is:*
 - i. *Routine travel by residents, including travel to and from work*
 - ii. *Recreational or tourism based activities*

The applicant has submitted a Visual Impact Statement (Statement) dated May 31, 2017 and prepared by LaBella Associates, PC. The Statement follows the guidelines contained in the NYSDEC Program Policy document titled “Assessing and Mitigating Visual Impacts” and specifically the procedure to verify the visual assessment using either graphic viewshed analysis or more sophisticated visual simulations and digital viewshed analysis. The applicant’s inventory of scenic resources included the view from Turkey Hill Road identified as Noteworthy View #12 in the Tompkins County Scenic Resource Inventory. Line-of-sight profiles were generated for the Miller and Appel residences at 74 and 78 Dodge Road, respectively viewing sites S2 and S3. A line of sight analysis was also prepared along Turkey Hill Road viewing sites N5 and N4. The Statement utilized visual simulations to assess the viewshed changes experienced at Noteworthy View #12 and from the second floor level of the Miller residence. The simulations depict the proposed solar arrays with no vegetative buffer, with the vegetative buffer at the time of planting and with the grown vegetative buffer.

Mitigation strategies that have been proposed by the applicant to reduce the visibility of the project include the following:

1. **Vegetative Screening:**
 - a. Native evergreen plantings (designated as non-invasive in NY), less than eight feet, but greater than five feet, tall at planting, on the east side of Dodge Road and immediately west of the array fences of S1, S2, and S3. Vegetative screening is also proposed along the south fence line of site S3 which is separated from the 15 Dodge Road property (Habecker) by approximately 370 feet. The plantings are being chosen from species recommended by Cornell’s Botanic Gardens and the applicants Landscape Architect.
 - b. Native evergreen plantings less than eight feet, but greater than five feet, tall at planting, on the west side of Turkey Hill Road and east of the array fence of S5.
 - c. The N5 fence line is set back at least 192 feet from the western line of Turkey Hill Road. A vegetative screen is proposed 100 feet away from the western right-of-way of Turkey Hill Road. The vegetative buffer will consist of two staggered rows of native plants/bushes (designated as non-invasive in NY), between four and six feet in height at planting and reaching maturity between eight and ten feet in height. The plants have been chosen in a manner that the vista view is not interrupted.
2. **Setbacks:**
 - a. Site S1 fence line is being set back from the edge of Dodge Road by 63 feet. The solar panels are set back by an additional 12 feet (75 feet from the edge of the road).

- b. Array S2 (east of the Appel and Miller residences) are set back at least 200 feet from the east line of Dodge Road. Vegetative buffer is being proposed to shield array S2 from the homes and from the road. In addition, 5 evergreen trees of the Burki Juniper variety (or equal non-invasive variety) will be planted on the east side of Dodge Road, within 10 feet of the NYSEG easement, opposite to the neighboring homes.
- c. Array S3 is set back to a minimum of 139 feet away from the east right-of-way of Dodge Road. A vegetative buffer is being proposed (outside the fence) between Dodge Road and the fence to shield array S3 from the homes and from the road. A vegetative buffer is also proposed outside the fence between the array and the buried gas line to the south to screen the view from 15 Dodge Road.
- d. Site S5 fence is set back from the neighboring property to the southeast by at least 125 feet.

The Statement also included a summary of the results from a solar glare hazard analysis performed using a web-based Solar Glare Hazard Analysis Tool (SGHAT) for PV systems, developed by Sandia National Laboratories, that provides a quantified assessment of when and where glare will occur throughout the year, as well as potential effects on the human eye at locations where glare occurs. The vantage points are analyzed at 6 feet above ground surface elevation, approximating the eye height of an above-average person. Simulations for 74 Dodge Road (Miller) were also at the height of a second floor (15 feet elevation). Based on the coordinates provided in the Statement table, the receivers or 'vantage points' include the residences at 344 Turkey Hill Road (Plotkin & Brindisi), 200 Stevenson Road (Reed), 74 Dodge Road (Miller) and 78 Dodge Road (Appel). A point standing on Stevenson Road near the grain silos and a point on Turkey Hill Road opposite site N5 were also analyzed. The SGHAT output is in 3 categories; "low potential for temporary after-image", "potential for temporary after-image" and "potential for Permanent Eye Damage". After-image is a visual illusion in which retinal impressions persist after the removal of a stimulus (e.g. the spot of light one sees after a camera flash has been fired). Results of the analysis indicate there is a "low potential for temporary after-image" at the Reed residence between 5:45-6:30 PM in the months between April and September and at the Plotkin/Brindisi residence 15 minutes prior to sunset. There is the "potential for temporary after-image" at the Miller and Appel residences between 5:45-6:45 AM and 6:00-6:30 AM, respectively, for the majority of spring and summer months. The SGHAT, however, does not account for the presence of existing or proposed vegetation that will interrupt the line of site and thus separate the source of glare from the receiver.

An additional glare analysis was performed using SGHAT for the Ithaca-Tompkins Regional Airport following the FAA document titled "Technical Guidance for Evaluating Selected Solar Technologies on Airports". The resulting SGHAT simulation provided a "no glare" outcome for the entire Runway 32 flight path to the landing threshold and a "no glare" outcome for the control tower.

The applicant has prepared numerous visual simulations to inform the selection of reasonable and effective mitigation strategies that lessen the visual presence of the solar panels to the immediate neighbors. These strategies include a combination of adjustments to the array layout and property line separation distances and very specific vegetative screening requirements. The impact on visual resources will be significant, however all things considered they are not anticipated to be adverse.

10. Impacts on Historic and Archeological Resources

Brief description of impact on historic and archeological resources:

The project site is located within an Archaeologically Sensitive Area as designated by NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP). No previously identified archaeological resources are located within one mile or immediately adjacent to the project sites. The Phase 1 Archeological Investigation Report identifies one archeological site, the Lamkin Historic Site on the west side of Dodge Road.

Based on the information contained in Part 1 of the FEAF and supplemental documents each of the following criteria are deemed to be of ‘no impact’:

- a. *The proposed action may occur wholly or partially within, or substantially contiguous to, any buildings, archaeological site or district which is listed on or has been nominated by the NYS Board of Historic Preservation for inclusion on the State or National Register of Historic Places.*
- b. *The proposed action may occur wholly or partially within, or substantially contiguous to, an area designated as sensitive for archaeological sites on the NY State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) archaeological site inventory.*

Based on the information contained in Part 1 of the FEAF and supplemental documents each of the following criteria are deemed to be of ‘small impact’:

- c. *The proposed action may occur wholly or partially within, or substantially contiguous to, an archaeological site not included on the NY SHPO inventory. Source: Lamkin Historic Site per Archaeological Report dated May 2017.*

A Phase 1 Archaeological Investigation Report (Investigation) dated May 2017 was prepared by Tetra Tech, Inc. and submitted to OPRHP. The project Area of Potential Effect (APE) was determined in consultation with OPRHP and included the proposed access roads, utility trenching, concrete equipment pads, tree/brush clearing and the staging area. Within the APE, a total of 476 subsurface shovel test excavations were dug by hand. The soil from each shovel test was screened through ¼-inch mesh hardware cloth. The north site completed 170 shovel tests, south sites S1-S3 completed 178 shovel test and site S4 and S5 completed 170 shovel tests.

The Lamkin Historic Site is within an area that is slated for vegetation and tree trimming and clearing, to provide maximum amount of sunlight to the solar panel location east of Dodge Road. Shovel test within the Lamkin Historic Site recovered multiple historic artifacts consisting of metal, brick ceramic, bone, and glass. The site measures approximately 130 feet by 350 feet. An additional 100 foot buffer to the north and south of the site has been proposed to further limit disturbance near the site. The project applicant has agreed to avoid using heavy machinery within site limits and buffer areas, using only hand tools and chainsaws. With the exception of the Lamkin Historic Site, no cultural material, prehistoric or historic materials were recovered.

Upon review of the Investigation, OPRHP issued an opinion letter dated May 31, 2017 that the “project will have no effect upon cultural resources in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places with the condition that tree removal in the Lamkin Archaeological site is conducted with hand tools to minimize physical impacts to the site”.

Based on the above information and the opinion of OPRHP, no significant adverse impacts on historic and archeological resources are anticipated as a result of the proposed action.

11. Impacts on Open space and Recreation

Brief description of impacts on open space and recreation:

The Cornell University parcels in the vicinity of the Group N and Group S sites are depicted on the Map 2-2, titled Open Space Assets in the Town's 2005 Comprehensive Plan and also identified as Managed Open Space Assets in the 2003 Open Space Inventory. Section 2 of the Comprehensive Plan describes the Cornell University (non-Plantations) lands as being "utilized for agricultural field crops and experimental plots, and field laboratories. Some are woodland tracts". These sites are not located within or adjacent to a designated Unique Natural Area.

The Town is planning for the Dryden Trail (Varna Section) that would be routed along the old railroad bed to the west of sites N1 and N2. The trail project involves the continuation of the Town of Ithaca East Ithaca Recreation Way to the Hamlet of Varna. The applicant had accounted for the future trail corridor with the solar array layout in the N1 and N2 sites.

Based on the information contained in Part 1 of the FEAF and supplemental documents each of the following criteria are deemed to be of 'no impact':

- b. The proposed action may result in the loss of a current or future recreational resource.*
- c. The proposed action may eliminate open space or recreational resource in an area with few such resources.*
- d. The proposed action may result in loss of an area now used informally by the community as an open space resource.*

Based on the information contained in Part 1 of the FEAF and supplemental documents each of the following criteria are deemed to be of 'small impact':

- a. The proposed action may result in an impairment of natural functions, or "ecosystem services", provided by an undeveloped area, including but not limited to stormwater storage, nutrient cycling, wildlife habitat.*

As described in Section 7, agricultural fence will be used to secure the solar array sites. The fence style will allow small animals to pass freely through the arrays while restricting larger predatory animals, such as coyotes. One wildlife corridor approximately 45-feet wide is proposed between Site N3 and N4 that will encompass the existing east/west hedgerow. Two additional wildlife corridors approximately 15-feet wide will be maintained between Site S1 and S2 and between Sites S2 and S3. The corridors will allow larger animals to move east/west through the sites. Drawing C-111 titled Group "S" Tree Removal Plan shows the wooded corridor along the existing perennial stream east of Sites S4 and S5 will be cut using non-mechanized methods and based on the Vegetation Removal Notes this grove of trees will be reviewed to determine hazards posed prior to tree cutting.

Based on this information, no significant impacts on open space and recreation are anticipated as a result of the proposed action.

15. Impact on Noise, Odor, and Light

Brief description of impacts on noise, odor and light:

During construction, it is anticipated that chainsaws will be used for tree cutting and hand-held power tools with portable generators will be used for array installation. Track mounted excavators, skid steers, wood chippers, dump trucks and tractor trailers will also be common and generate engine exhaust as well as noise. The applicant has indicated construction will occur in a single phase for a period of 6 months. The hours of operation during construction are proposed to be 6 AM and 6 PM Monday through Friday and possibly on Saturday.

The applicant has indicated that during sunlight operation, the inverters within each array will produce a low hum comparable to a refrigerator or an idling car and at a distance of 100 feet away the hum is indistinguishable from ambient noise. The nearest inverter to a neighboring residential property line is in Site S2 and S3 at a distance of 450 feet. The distance between the Site S2 inverter and the nearest residence (Appel) is approximately 500 feet.

There is no proposed outdoor lighting for the project.

Based on the information contained in Part 1 of the FEAF and supplemental documents each of the following criteria are deemed to be of ‘no impact’:

- a. *The proposed action may produce sound above noise levels established by local regulation.*
- b. *The proposed action may result in blasting within 1,500 feet of any residence, hospital, school, licensed day care center, or nursing home.*
- c. *The proposed action may result in routine odors for more than one hour per day.*
- d. *The proposed action may result in light shining onto adjoining properties.*
- e. *The proposed action may result in lighting creating sky-glow brighter than existing area conditions.*

Based on the information contained in Part 1 of the FEAF and supplemental documents each of the following criteria are deemed to be of ‘small impact’:

- f. *Other impacts: Construction noise.*

Common and ordinary construction equipment and tools used for the site clearing and installation of the solar array panels, underground electric cables, access drives and fencing will generate noise that is not uncommon in rural residential and agricultural settings. This construction noise will be of a temporary nature, therefore, no significant impacts on noise, odor and light are anticipated.

16. Impact on Human Health

Brief description of impacts on Human Health:

Federal, state, and local environmental records were reviewed as a part of the Phase I Environment Site Assessment completed by Labella Associates, D.P.C dated March 22, 2017. Two NYSDEC 'Closed' or 'Inactive' spill listings have been identified for the eastern portion of tax parcel 67.-1-7.2. This site was formerly occupied by the Cornell University Turkey Farm which appears to have been located east of Sites S4 and S5 between the stream identified on Sheet C108 and Turkey Hill Road. Based on the results of the assessment, no apparent Recognized Environmental Conditions, Historical Recognized Environmental Conditions, Controlled Recognized Environmental Conditions, or de minimis conditions have been identified or associated with the sites.

Based on the information contained in Part 1 of the FEAF and supplemental documents each of the following criteria are deemed to be of 'no impact':

- a. *The proposed action is located within 1500 feet of a school, hospital, licensed day care center, group home, nursing home or retirement community.*
- b. *The site of the proposed action is currently undergoing remediation.*
- d. *The site of the action is subject to an institutional control limiting the use of the property (e.g., easement or deed restriction).*
- e. *The proposed action may affect institutional control measures that were put in place to ensure that the site remains protective of the environment and human health.*
- f. *The proposed action has adequate control measures in place to ensure that future generation, treatment and/or disposal of hazardous wastes will be protective of the environment and human health.*
- g. *The proposed action involves construction or modification of a solid waste management facility.*
- i. *The proposed action may result in an increase in the rate of disposal, or processing, of solid waste.*
- j. *The proposed action may result in excavation or other disturbance within 2000 feet of a site used for the disposal of solid or hazardous waste.*
- k. *The proposed action may result in the migration of explosive gases from a landfill site to adjacent off-site structures.*
- l. *The proposed action may result in the release of contaminated leachate from the project site.*

Based on the information contained in Part 1 of the FEAF and supplemental documents each of the following criteria are deemed to be of 'small impact':

- c. There is a completed emergency spill remediation, or a completed environmental site remediation on, or adjacent to, the site of the proposed action.
- h. The proposed action may result in the unearthing of solid or hazardous waste.

The NYSDEC spill reports that have been identified for the former Turkey Farm, have been summarized below as originally outlined by Labella Associates.

Spill #8707993 (closed): According to the closed NYSDEC Spill Report Form #8707993, dated December 15, 1987, last updated April 21, 1988, a 2,000-gallon underground storage tank (UST) failed a tank tightness test. The product was reportedly removed from the UST. Four (4) USTs were removed between

March 14 and March 16, 1988. No contamination was reportedly encountered during the removal of the USTs. The NYSDEC assigned the spill a closed status on April 15, 1988.

NYSDEC Spill #9607049 (inactive): According to the inactive NYSDEC Spill Report Form #9607049, dated September 4, 1996, last updated October 24, 1996, USTs were encountered during the remediation of the Cornell University Turkey Farm. According to the Petroleum Storage Tank Permanent Closure report prepared by Gaynor Associates, Inc., two steel USTs associated with PBS #181943 were removed from the property. The first UST (500-gallon gasoline tank) was installed in 1962 and removed on September 5, 1996. The UST was reportedly in poor condition with holes observed in the tank. As a result, 168 cubic yards of contaminated soil was removed from proximate to the UST. Confirmatory soil samples were collected from the excavation and the analytical results from the excavation bottom sample indicated residual concentrations of petroleum compounds below the current NYSDEC Commissioner's Policy (CP-51) guidance values. The analytical results for the remaining samples were below the laboratory detection limits. The second UST (1,000-gallon fuel oil tank) was installed in 1945 and removed on August 10, 1996. The UST was reportedly in good condition with no holes observed in the tank. Photoionization detector readings in the UST excavation were recorded at 0 parts per million (ppm). Confirmatory soil samples were collected and analytical results were below the laboratory detection limits. The NYSDEC assigned the spill an inactive status on October 24, 1996.

Existing access drives located east of the stream at the former Turkey Farm are to be utilized for access to Sites S4 and S5, therefore no excavation is proposed east of the stream for the project. Based on the proper removal of the underground storage tanks, the closure/inactivation of the spills by the NYSDEC, and the apparent direction of groundwater flow to the north and away from the site, there are no apparent recognized Environmental Conditions associated with regulatory listings identified at the eastern adjacent property and therefore, no significant impacts on human health are anticipated as a result of the proposed action.

17. Consistency with Community Plans

Brief description of the impact on community plans:

The Town 2005 Comprehensive Plan, as amended, envisions that relative to land use planning "While small scale solar energy generation exists on some small private lots, there is a desire to provide more options for solar energy generation. Large solar installations will allow this but the impacts should be mitigated through careful siting and adequate buffering." Further, the Plan recommends "To diversify our electrical supply grid large scale solar installations should be allowed in the town with careful siting and adequate buffering provided to mitigate adverse impacts." The Town's Zoning Law permits ground-mounted large-scale solar energy systems as principal and accessory uses through the issuance of a Special Use Permit and Site Plan as approved by the Town Board with prior review and recommendations on the Site Plan by the Planning Board within Conservation, Rural Agriculture, Rural Residential, Mixed-Use Commercial, and Light Industrial Zoning Districts. No parking lots are proposed, three new road cuts or access points are proposed on Dodge Road and additional vegetative screening as described previously will be planted along Turkey Hill Road and Dodge Road. With respect to other community plans, the Tompkins County Planning Department has written in the Section 239-l, -m and -n review letter that "The

proposed project has been adjusted in a way that better accommodates the natural features of the site and goes a long way to supporting the Tompkins County Comprehensive Plan (2015) policy to increase the use of local and regional renewable energy sources and technologies”.

Based on the information contained in Part 1 of the FEAF and supplemental documents each of the following criteria are deemed to be of ‘no impact’:

- b. The proposed action will cause the permanent population of the city, town or village in which the project is located to grow by more than 5%.*
- d. The proposed action is inconsistent with any County plans, or other regional land use plans.*
- e. The proposed action may cause a change in the density of development that is not supported by existing infrastructure or is distant from existing infrastructure.*
- f. The proposed action is located in an area characterized by low density development that will require new or expanded public infrastructure.*
- g. The proposed action may induce secondary development impacts (e.g., residential or commercial development not included in the proposed action)*

Based on the information contained in Part 1 of the FEAF and supplemental documents each of the following criteria are deemed to be of ‘small impact’:

- c. The proposed action is inconsistent with local land use plans or zoning regulations.*

The Town’s Zoning Law does permit ground-mounted, large-scale solar energy systems as principal and accessory uses in this district subject to Special Use Permit and Site Plan approval by the Town Board. However, the proposed layout of solar panel arrays relative to the proposed subdivision parcel lines will not conform to the 50-foot front yard, rear yard and side yard setback and, therefore will require approval of an Area Variance by the Town Zoning Board of Appeals. The separation distance between the fence line of Site N5 is at least 211 feet from the north property of the Reed property line (tax parcel 57.-1-7.2). The fence line for Site N5 is approximately 46 feet from the south property line of Resler Living Trust (tax parcel 56.-5-29). Site N3 fence line is approximately 23 feet from the west property lines of Resler Living Trust (tax parcel 56.-5-29 and 56.-5-28). Site S5 fence line is approximately 125 feet from the north property lines of the Plotkin and Brindisi property (tax parcel 67.-1-8.1). Sites S2 and S3 fence line have been set back from the east line of Dodge Road a minimum of 130 feet in front of the Appel and Miller residences (tax parcels 67.-1-2 and 67.-1-33.1, respectively).

Based on the information contained in Part 1 of the FEAF and supplemental documents each of the following criteria are deemed to be of ‘moderate to large impact’:

- a. The proposed action’s land use components may be different from, or in sharp contrast to, current surrounding land use pattern(s).*

Ground-mounted, large-scale solar energy systems are an allowed use under the Zoning Law, but the erection of 21.8 acres and 19.51 acres of grouped solar panel surfaces for the Group N and Group S sites, respectively presents a land use that does not currently exist, and as such the solar energy systems will have a moderate to large impact on the surrounding land use pattern. This new land use will not be

building up gradually but will immediately be on par with the agricultural use of the surrounding areas. There are no nearby agriculture enterprises that erect structures at this scale. This large-scale solar facility shares some land use characteristics with the surrounding agriculture in that the fenced fields can support grazing opportunity for sheep and the land cover within the fenced areas will take on either a meadow or grazed pasture condition. Much of the discussion in Sections 9 and 18 is equally applicable to this subject.

Although the solar panels present a visual contrast to other surrounding land uses, the vast majority of the land beneath the arrays will be maintained in a vegetative condition. The physical mitigation measures the applicant is utilizing (vegetative screening and setbacks from the adjacent property lines), along with site topography, vegetation that will be retained, and the low profile of the arrays, all minimize the impact of this contrast. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts on community plans are anticipated as a result of the proposed action.

18. Consistency with Community Character

Brief description of the impact on community character:

The architectural and landscape characteristics of current uses in the immediate vicinity of the property include rural residential, agriculture and agriculture research. If any use predominates, it would be agriculture. In addition to the surrounding fields and fenced pastures, the Stevenson Road corridor is bounded by numerous agricultural buildings and structures including silos, grain bins, metal clad pole barns, quonset shelters, concrete block buildings and a remnant farm house. Between 162 and 344 Turkey Hill Road the architecture reflects a prior farming history in the form of barns and farm houses as well as Cornell University's 1950 and 2000 era agriculture research buildings. Residential structures adjacent to the Dodge Road sites reflect a mix of old farm house and more recent colonial styles.

Based on the information contained in Part 1 of the FEAF and supplemental documents each of the following criteria are deemed to be of 'no impact':

- a. The proposed action may replace or eliminate existing facilities, structures, or areas of historic importance to the community.
- b. The proposed action may create a demand for additional community services (e.g. schools, police and fire)
- c. The proposed action may displace affordable or low-income housing in an area where there is a shortage of such housing.
- d. The proposed action may interfere with the use or enjoyment of officially recognized or designated public resources.

Based on the information contained in Part 1 of the FEAF and supplemental documents each of the following criteria are deemed to be of 'moderate to large impact':

- e. The proposed action is inconsistent with the predominant architectural scale and character.
- f. Proposed action is inconsistent with the character of the existing natural landscape.

By virtue of the structural characteristics of solar arrays, the proposed project introduces architectural components inconsistent with the character of the existing architectural and natural landscape. Much of

the information presented in Sections 9 and 17 applies to this subject. Further, as discussed in Sections 9 and 17, there are many design features and mitigation strategies to be implemented by the applicant that will lessen the visual impacts of this project. Once the project is operational, there are no traffic, noise, light, or other impacts that accompany many of the existing surrounding land uses. The design features and mitigation strategies that lessen the visual impacts, together with the lack of impacts that often accompany other types of development, mitigate the impact caused by the fact the solar energy facility is different from the current broad spectrum of surrounding uses. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts to community character are anticipated as a result of the proposed action.