



senior author of this report. Sydne Marshall PhD, RPA served as Project Director. Dr. Sexton was assisted in the field by Ms. Marija Mahac. Resumes for the key members of TtEC's team are included within Appendix C.

## 1.2 Definition of Project Positive Visual APE

The positive visual APE for the Project was defined by TtEC's subcontractor, Saratoga Associates, Landscape Architects, Architects, Engineers, and Planners, P.C. (Saratoga Associates). Saratoga Associates conducted a thorough and detailed Visual Resource Assessment (VRA) of the Project (Saratoga Associates, 2007). Following standard VRA practices, and adhering to the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation Program Policy "Assessing and Mitigating Visual Impacts" (NYSDEC, 2000), Saratoga Associates evaluated the potential visibility of the Project for the area within five miles of it and plotted their findings on a viewshed map. This map forms the basis for the visual APE of the Project (Figure 2).

For this phase of the Project, the APE for aboveground resources is defined as a subset of the Project's total visual APE. It includes all areas within a 1-mile ring of the proposed wind turbines that have a view of the Project (positive visual APE). Given the low relief, limited built environment, and agricultural character of portions of the area, the Project's positive visual APE includes the entire 1-mile ring area (Figure 2) (Saratoga Associates, 2007). This 1-mile ring APE thus defined the study area for the historic architectural survey reported herein.

## 2.0 ARCHITECTURAL INVESTIGATION METHODS

The field methods implemented for this Project were designed to collect information consistent with the SHPO's Guidelines. The SHPO Guidelines set forth the following steps:

- Establish a 5-mile Area of Potential Effect (APE) around the Project site, using a topographic survey to determine the viewshed.
- Establish a "1-mile ring of study area" within the 5-mile APE.
- Conduct a field survey within the 1-mile ring APE to identify aboveground resources (buildings and sites) already listed (or previously determined eligible) or otherwise previously identified. The field survey will also include aboveground resources not previously identified (and generally 50 years of age or older). The field survey will record information within a geographic information system (GIS).
- Following consultation with the SHPO regarding the interim field survey report, the survey will be completed for the entire 5-mile APE.

This report presents the results of the 1-mile ring survey. Following consultation with the SHPO a second phase of the survey will be performed that will focus on the remaining unsurveyed



areas within the 5-mile ring around the Project. An additional report will be written to describe the results and conclusions of the 5-mile ring survey.

In the field, TtEC's architectural historians used historic maps, published histories, and visual indicators (such as style, form or foundation materials) to identify and approximately date above-ground resources 50 years of age or older. The TtEC team performed a comprehensive survey of all public streets within the 1-mile ring APE, observing and recording historic structures.

The team implemented a field data collection system in which data categories (based upon the SHPO "blue form" inventory categories) were recorded directly into a Trimble<sup>®</sup> Geo XT™ Global Positioning System (GPS) handheld unit. GPS locational data were collected at approximately the mid-point of street frontage wherever possible; however, field conditions and access resulted in some locational variations. Wherever field conditions permitted, reasonable efforts were taken to record the precise street address for each property inventoried; however, geographic locator coordinates and mapping was provided for all inventoried resources. Resources were generally recorded from the public right-of-way; at the discretion of field survey staff, permission for additional access may have been sought in limited circumstances. Field notes included in this report provide details where survey staff was unable to access resources due either to unique site geography, seasonal road closures or personal safety. Twenty-seven buildings do not have associated GPS readings due to technical malfunction experienced during fieldwork. When mapped, these buildings will appear in map section C1. This information will be collected and reported following mobilization for the second phase of fieldwork.

High-resolution digital photographs, generally one or two, were taken for each property. These photographs exceed the National Park Service photograph quality standards of 1600 x 1200 pixels contained in the March 2005 "National Register of Historic Places and National Historic Landmarks Survey Photo Policy Expansion." For report production purposes, resolution was reduced for printed photographs. Digitized versions of these photographs permit greater, "zoom in" examination and will be provided to SHPO on CD.

Field data also included descriptive data for each property, including primary exterior materials, style or building type, associated natural features, setting, individual architectural elements, and alterations. In addition, field data also included notation of observations related to the NRHP's criteria for evaluation (36 CFR 60.4). These criteria are paralleled by the criteria for eligibility to the New York State Register of Historic Places (NYSRHP). The NRHP criteria for evaluation are as follows:

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

- A. That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or

- B. That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
- C. That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- D. That have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Finally, the data collected included observations about the structures relative to NRHP's seven aspects of integrity (NRHP Staff, 2002). To be listed or eligible for listing in the NRHP, the observer must be able to understand both *why* any given resource was significant or *when* it was significant. A NRHP-eligible property need not possess all of the integrity criteria; rather these criteria may be used as tools in determining if a property meets a sufficient threshold of significance. The responses of the TtEC architectural historians to these criteria are included so that the process of evaluating the structures may be made as clear to the SHPO staff as possible. These criteria include:

- Location
- Design
- Setting
- Materials
- Workmanship
- Feeling
- Association

Based on the application of all of the above criteria to the collected field data, TtEC architectural historians made recommendations about the potential for each resource to meet the criteria for eligibility to the NRHP.

Field data were transformed into both Microsoft (MS) Access database and GIS. A single GPS coordinate or data point was recorded for each inventoried resource (including both newly and previously identified properties). Each GPS point includes all of the inventoried attributes included in the MS Access database. Field identification and subsequent analysis utilized National Park Service technical guidance and primary source historic documents wherever available. These data are presented in Appendix A.