



EAST POINT ENERGY CENTER

Case No. 17-F-0599

1001.20 Exhibit 20

Cultural Resources

Contents

Exhibit 20 Cultural Resources	1
20(a) Study of the Impacts of Construction and Operation on Archaeological Resources	3
(1) Summary of Probable Impacts on Archaeological Resources.....	3
(2) Phase IA Archaeological/Cultural Study	3
(3) Phase IB Archaeological Survey	6
(4) Phase II Archaeological Studies	9
(5) Unanticipated Discovery Plan.....	9
(6) Shapefiles	11
20(b) Study of the Impacts on Historic Architectural Resources.....	11
(1) SHPO Consultation and APE Definition.....	12
(2) Cemeteries and Other Significant Cultural Features	12
(3) Mitigation Measures	13

Tables

Table 20-1. Previously Recorded Archaeological Sites in a One Mile Radius of the Project Area	4
--	---

Appendices

Appendix 20-1 Phase IA/B Archaeological/Cultural Resource Study	
Appendix 20-2 New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation Project- Related Correspondence	

Exhibit 20 Cultural Resources

This Exhibit will track the requirements of proposed Stipulation 20, dated August 20, 2019, and therefore, the requirements of 16 NYCRR § 1001.20.

This Exhibit addresses 16 NYCRR § 1001.20, which requires a study of the potential impacts of the construction and operation of the Project, its interconnection, and its related facilities on cultural resources (archaeological and historic architecture).

Introduction and Record of Consultation

The New York Historic Preservation Act (NYHPA) of 1980 (Chapter 354 of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation Law) established a review process for State agency activities affecting historic or cultural properties, requiring consultation with the Commissioner of the Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation (OPRHP), which serves as the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). The NYHPA requires state agencies to consult with OPRHP if it appears that a proposed Project may cause any change, beneficial or adverse, in the quality of any historic, architectural, archaeological, or cultural property that is listed in the NRHP or in the State Register of Historic Places (SRHP), or that is determined by the Commissioner to be eligible for listing in the SRHP. It requires that state agencies, to the fullest extent practicable, be consistent with other provisions of the law; and fully explore all feasible and prudent alternatives to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse impacts.

Section 14.09 of the NYHPA indicates that if a Project has a federal permitting nexus, the OPRHP review process follows Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and its implementing regulations at 36 CFR § 800 (Public Law 89-665, as amended by Public Law 96-515; 16 USC 470 et seq.). Section 106 requires that agencies with jurisdiction over a proposed Project take into account the effect of the undertaking on cultural resources listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and afford the SHPO and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation an opportunity to comment.

Because the Project will require a Nationwide Permit from the USACE, in addition to the Article 10 certificate, consultation for the Project follows the Section 106 review process.

OPRHP-SHPO Consultation

Consistent with 16 NYCRR § 1001.20 and 36 CFR § 800, the Applicant, through its consultant, TRC, initiated formal consultation with the OPRHP to develop the scope and methodology for

cultural resources studies for the Project (see Appendix 20-2 for the Project correspondence with OPRHP). The consultants exceed the Secretary of the Interior's professional qualification standards (36 CFR 61) for Archaeologists, Historians, and Architectural Historians in their respective disciplines. To date, formal consultation with the OPRHP has included submissions through OPRHP's CRIS website consisting of the following technical documents for OPRHP review:

- *Request for Consultation Letter of May 8, 2018: Proposed East Point Solar Energy Center, Town of Sharon, Schoharie County; and*
- *Project shapefiles that present the preliminary Project layout.*

On November 13, 2018, the OPRHP requested a Phase IA/B archaeological investigation in areas of substantial proposed ground disturbance, including areas of grading, grubbing, tree removal, and excavations more than 1 foot wide or 6 inches deep. Archaeological fieldwork is not recommended for panel arrays, perimeter fencing, and utility poles as long as the associated posts are driven or drilled and the disturbances mentioned above are not involved.

To date, the Applicant has completed the necessary Phase IA/B archaeological survey. Archaeological fieldwork was conducted June 3-12, 2019. Artifact processing and report preparation are ongoing. Details of work completed to date are provided in this document. An Unanticipated Discovery Plan that identifies the actions to be taken in the unexpected event that resources of cultural, historical, or archaeological importance are encountered during the excavation process is included in this Exhibit.

Tribal Historic Preservation Office Consultation

Stipulation 20(c) requires the Applicant to initiate consultation with Native American Tribes. Based on the Project's geographical location and guidance from the NYS OPRHP and the Indian Nations of New York State, the Applicant is consulting with the following federally recognized Tribes: Delaware Nation, Delaware Tribe of Indians, Mohican Nation Stockbridge-Munsee Band (Stockbridge Munsee Community), and the St. Regis Mohawk Tribe. The Tribal consultation procedures included preparing correspondence to each Tribal Historic Preservation Office (THPO) that describes the Project's location and design. The Applicant has requested comments from each THPO on any potential effects from the Project on Tribal resources or lands. Documentation of these consultations is included in the Appendix 20-2 of the Application. THPO

consultation letters were mailed to the above-listed federally recognized tribes on August 21, 2019. No responses have been received as of September 6, 2019.

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

(1) Summary of Probable Impacts on Archaeological Resources

A Phase IB archaeological survey of the Project Area was conducted June 3-12, 2019. A total of 2,350 STPs (56 positive) were excavated, leading to the identification of 13 prehistoric sites, three (3) prehistoric isolated finds, and one (1) historic isolated find. Measures to avoid impacts to any potentially significant archaeological resources will be taken throughout Project design. A previously unrecorded family cemetery containing two graves was identified on top of a small mound in an agricultural field near the intersection of Pomella and Beech Roads. Based on historic map research, the cemetery is interpreted as the “Fritcher Family Cemetery;” corresponding to the historic property owner D. Fritcher, noted on historic maps of the mid- to late-nineteenth century.

Where resources were identified within 100 feet (31 meters) of proposed Project-related impacts, and can be avoided, the Applicant has identified their locations as “Environmentally Sensitive Areas” on the Project construction drawings and will mark them in the field by construction fencing with signs that restrict access prior to construction. These measures are considered adequate to ensure that impacts to potentially significant archaeological resources are avoided.

(2) Phase IA Archaeological/Cultural Study

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

Phase IA Study Methods and Results

Background research included examination of site files and archives at the OPRHP, online CRIS database, and the NRHP database. This research yielded information on recorded sites and previous cultural surveys in the surrounding area. Local histories, cartographic data, and other relevant information on the prehistoric and historic archaeological sites in the area were also reviewed. The USDA NRCS Soil Survey Geographic Database was also examined to obtain information on soil types in the Project Area. The historical assessment of the Project Area included a review of historical maps, aerial photographs, a literature search, and a review of

County historical documents located at the New York State and County repositories. This work was conducted to develop historic and prehistoric contexts of the Project Area which are presented in detail in the Phase IA/B study (see Appendix 20-1); a cultural synopsis is provided below.

The OPRHP CRIS database indicates that a small portion of the Project Area is located within an archaeologically sensitive area. The OPRHP records confirm there are no NRHP-listed or eligible archaeological sites within the APE for archaeological resources, which is defined as all potential ground-disturbance areas of the Project. As part of the Phase I study, a search of OPRHP records indicated that one archaeological investigation and one consultation project have been conducted and two archaeological sites have been previously recorded in a one-mile radius of the Project Area (see Table 20-1).

Table 20-1. Previously Recorded Archaeological Sites in a One-Mile Radius of the Project Area

Site Number	Site Name	Description	NRHP Status
09514.000012	Fundy Site NYSM 11227	Historic	Undetermined
09514.000013	Louck/Sharp Site NYSM 11228	Historic	Undetermined

Source: OPRHP Site files June 2019.

An archaeological sensitivity analysis of the Project Area determined that approximately 283 acres (ac) of the 1,313-ac Project Area (ca. 22 percent) are considered as having high sensitivity for archaeological resources. Areas of moderate archaeological sensitivity constitute approximately 621 ac (ca. 47 percent) and 409 ac (ca. 31 percent) are considered to have low archaeological sensitivity. Areas of high sensitivity for historic resources include locations near historic roads and areas where structures have appeared on historic mapping. Hilltops and ridgelines overlooking springheads that flow into large upland swamps are considered high sensitivity for prehistoric resources. Moderate sensitivity areas include minimal to moderately sloped areas displaced from water sources, and areas of low sensitivity are steeply sloped or poorly drained.

Cultural Synopsis

A synopsis of the prehistoric and historic periods is presented to provide a context for interpreting cultural resources of the Project Area. The central region of New York State has been occupied since about 12,500 years ago. The prehistory of this region is conventionally divided into the

Paleoindian, Archaic, Woodland, and Contact cultural periods. The history of the project region ranges from early exploration and contact with the Iroquois, particularly the Mohawk, through modern-day development.

Prehistoric Overview

The Paleoindian period represents the earliest human occupation in the northeastern United States. Paleo-Indian populations were highly mobile hunter-gatherers who specialized in hunting large game (Funk 1976). Subsistence patterns included hunting of a variety of smaller game, as well as fishing and the exploitation of available plant foods (McNett 1985; Nicholas 1983 and 1987). Fluted projectile points are characteristic of Paleoindian peoples. Paleoindian sites in this region have been classified as either camps or quarry workshops, although many “sites” consist merely of isolated fluted point finds (Ritchie and Funk 1973).

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

The Woodland Period is denoted by the appearance of new cultural traits, such as the widespread use of ceramics, as well as the intensification of older traits that were carried over from the Late and Terminal Archaic subperiods (Ritchie 1980; Ritchie and Funk 1973). During the Woodland period (1000 BC – AD 1600), the adoption of horticulture played an integral part in population growth, subsistence, and settlement systems as well as in the establishment of large villages in mostly riverine settings. The Iroquoian Mohawk tribe inhabited the area that would become Schoharie County at the time of European contact. Powerful both politically and economically, the Mohawk hunted and traded throughout the mid-Atlantic and played a significant role in colonial affairs and commerce from Virginia to New York with the English, French, Dutch, and Swedish colonies. The replacement of tools and other materials manufactured by Native American technologies by those manufactured by Europeans (brass kettles, iron knives, glass beads, etc.) defines the Contact Period (Wray 1973).

Historic Overview

The Mohawk retained control of their traditional lands until the mid-eighteenth century. The Mohawk and Hudson River valleys gave the area strategic transportation, political, and economic importance. The first Europeans settled in the area in the mid-eighteenth century as part of Albany County. Hostilities between the colonists and Mohawk occurred during the French and Indian War and American Revolution, exacerbated by the importance of the area as a transportation connection between the population centers along the Atlantic Ocean and Canada. Three forts were erected along the Schoharie River for defense of the local population during the Revolutionary War. Lower Fort, constructed as a church in 1772 and enclosed by a protective log stockade in 1777, was attacked by a force of British loyalists and their Mohawk allies under Joseph Brant in 1780. The Battle of Sharon Springs Swamp on July 10, 1781 was a victory for the American army under Col. Marinus Willett (The Old Stone Fort Museum 2019; Revolutionarywar.us).

The Town of Sharon, originally known as New Dorlach, was first settled in 1780. Schoharie County was created in 1795 from portions of Otsego and Albany Counties (Roscoe 1882). Primarily rural, the regional economy focused on agriculture with minor industrial development in the nineteenth century. Transportation improvements, including roads, railroads, and canals, helped to further population and economic advancement. The Great Western Turnpike (modern US-20) was constructed in the early 1800s and was instrumental in the movement of mail, freight, and people. Railroads entered the area in the mid-nineteenth century. Increased access led to the growth of local industries. Tourism played a large role in the area as wealthy city dwellers escaped to the mineral springs and countryside (Collins 2000).

The Village of Sharon Springs was formed from the Town of Sharon in 1871. Frequented for centuries for its mineral spas, the area became a thriving resort town in the late nineteenth through early twentieth centuries, hosting thousands of wealthy and notable visitors each summer. The County has remained agricultural and, after a decline mid-century, tourism is resurging. Sharon Springs is recognized by both the NRHP and the New York State Register of Historic Places as a historic spa village. As of the 2010 Census, there were roughly 32,749 residents of Schoharie County, 1,846 residents in the Town of Sharon, and 558 residents in the Village of Sharon Springs (US Census 2010).

(3) Phase IB Archaeological Survey

A Phase IB archaeological survey was conducted to determine whether archaeological sites are located in the Project area of potential effects (APE), which is defined as those areas of substantial

proposed ground disturbance for the Project that also have a high or moderate archaeological sensitivity.

Field Methods

Phase IB field methods consisted of both pedestrian survey and shovel test pit (STP) excavation to locate all archaeological resources within the Project APE. In portions of the Project APE with high and moderate archaeological sensitivity, TRC excavated STPs at 15-meter intervals along survey transects in the proposed construction impact areas. During the Phase IA research, TRC identified areas of high archaeological sensitivity as areas in close proximity to historic features, floodplains, stream confluences, areas adjacent to water sources (within 100 meters), headwater zones, prominent knolls, ridge fingers, benches, wetland edges, and rock overhangs. Areas of moderate archaeological sensitivity included relatively level uplands displaced from perennial water sources (greater than 100 meters). Areas of low archaeological sensitivity included moderate to steeply sloping surfaces and areas of existing ground disturbance.

To help ascertain the viability of the probability-defined field methods, as per *OPRHP Guidelines*, TRC examined up to 5 percent of the areas identified as having high and moderate archaeological sensitivity with a 5-meter STP interval. The locations of the smaller subset of close interval testing in areas of high and moderate archaeological sensitivity were based on suitable areas as determined in the field.

In areas of low archaeological sensitivity, which consist predominantly of areas of steep slope, a combination of pedestrian survey and judgmental STP excavation was used. Pedestrian survey was conducted in lieu of shovel testing where steep slope, exposed bedrock, wetlands, and/or ground disturbance precludes the utility of shovel testing. Judgmental STPs were excavated in areas of micro-topography, such as small level benches on steep slope, possible rock shelter locations, and narrow, ephemeral stream crossings.

Per *OPRHP Guidelines*, STPs measured 30 to 50 centimeters in diameter, and were excavated to sterile subsoil. Excavated soil was screened through ¼-inch hardware cloth over tarps or plastic sheeting. Soil strata within each shovel test were recorded on standardized forms describing Munsell color and USDA soil types. Shovel tests were backfilled after completion and their location was recorded using a *Trimble* sub-meter accurate GPS unit and plotted on aerial photographs and Project maps. Per *OPRHP Guidelines*, if artifacts were discovered in an isolated shovel test context, a minimum of eight additional shovel tests at 1-meter (3.3 feet) and 3-meter

(10 feet) intervals were excavated in a radial pattern around the initial positive STP. Work was conducted inside the Project APE.

Laboratory Methods and Curation

Photographs, field form records, field notes, and maps were returned to TRC's Lanham, Maryland office for processing. Artifact processing and analysis is currently in progress. Recovered artifacts will be cleaned, catalogued, and analyzed according to the *New York Archaeological Council Standards*, and selected items illustrated. Analysis will be conducted according to the OPRHP *Guidelines*, and the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards and Guidelines for Curation* (36 CFR 79). Lab work will be undertaken to determine the age, function, cultural affiliation and significance of the identified sites. Deeds of gift will be obtained for any collections derived from this investigation prior to submittal to the NYSM or other identified repository for permanent curation at a state-approved facility (to be identified via consultation with the OPRHP).

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

Survey Report

Following completion of the research and fieldwork, TRC prepared a Phase IA/B archaeological survey report following the OPRHP Guidelines. The report summarized the Phase IA research, the fieldwork methods and results of the Phase IB survey and provided recommendations. In support of the text, historical maps and photographs were prepared to illustrate findings. Tables including the artifact inventory were appended to the report. The Phase IA/B survey report provided recommendations on whether the identified archaeological sites are eligible or ineligible for inclusion on the NRHP, or if additional Phase II studies would be required to determine site eligibility. A Draft Report will be produced and submitted to the OPRHP for preliminary review. Once submitted to OPRHP, the agency will have 30 days to review and comment on the report. Following OPRHP review, TRC will make necessary changes and a Final Report will be produced within two calendar weeks.

(4) Phase II Archaeological Studies

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

(5) Unanticipated Discovery Plan

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

Based on the background research conducted, portions of the Project Area are considered archaeologically sensitive, and a potential exists for identifying archaeological resources in the Project Area. Therefore, the involved personnel will follow standardized procedures in accordance with State and Federal regulations detailed below.

Both the environmental monitor and the construction personnel would be provided with a preconstruction briefing regarding potential cultural resources indicators. These indicators would include items such as recognizable quantities of bone, unusual stone or ash deposits, or black-stained earth that could be evident in spoil piles or trench walls during construction. In the event that potentially significant cultural resources or human remains are discovered during

construction, the environmental monitor and construction personnel would be instructed to follow the specific requirements and notification procedures outlined below. Cultural resource discoveries that require reporting and notification include human remains and recognizable, potentially significant concentrations of artifacts or evidence of human occupation.

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

Discovery of Human Remains

If Native American human remains are encountered, procedures for such discoveries would be followed in accordance with State regulations. This will involve consultation with the SHPO or THPO and appropriate interested parties in an effort to identify and notify next of kin, closest lineal descendant, or the Indian tribes who may be culturally affiliated with the remains, and to determine appropriate treatment and disposition of the remains.

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

If the remains are found to be human and older than 75 years, the OPRHP will be notified and may assume jurisdiction of the remains. If jurisdiction is assumed by the OPRHP, they will a) determine whether the human remains represent a significant archaeological resource, and b)

make a reasonable effort to identify and locate persons who can establish direct kinship, tribal community, or ethnic relationship with the remains. If such a relationship cannot be established, then the OPRHP may consult with a committee to determine the proper disposition of the remains. This committee shall consist of a human skeletal analyst, Native American members of current State tribes recommended by the Governor's Council on Indian Affairs, and "an individual who has special knowledge or expertise regarding the particular type of the unmarked human burial."

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

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

(6) Shapefiles

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

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

This section addresses Stipulation 20(b), which requires a study of the impacts from the construction and operation of the Project and the interconnections and related facilities on architectural historic properties listed in or eligible for listing in the NRHP, and a discussion of measures to minimize or mitigate adverse effects, if required. To date, OPRHP has not requested a Historic Architecture Reconnaissance Survey for the Project and, therefore, OPRHP and DPS were not consulted to obtain input concerning appropriate criteria for Historic Architectural Surveys. OPRHP's only concern has been for information on Farmstead 09514.000032 as discussed below.

(1) SHPO Consultation and APE Definition

SHPO Consultation

The OPRHP replied to the initial Request for Consultation Letter (May 8, 2018) with a request for additional information (photographs) about one above-ground cultural resource (Farmstead 09514.000032). These photographs were obtained on June 12, 2019 and were submitted to the OPRHP via the CRIS system on June 24, 2019. Due to loss of integrity, OPRHP determined that this architectural resource is not eligible for NRHP listing on July 8, 2019.

Definition of APE

The APE is defined as the geographic area or areas within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause changes in the character or use of historic properties. The APE is determined in relation to the scale of the undertaking, including new construction, improvements, or demolitions to be made during operation and maintenance of the Project. The APE also includes areas that may have visual or indirect impacts.

Identification of indirect (visual, atmospheric, or audible) effects includes investigations of those areas removed in distance, where Project Components will be visible and where there is a potential for a significant visual effect. The Study Area used for above-ground resource analysis is comprised of areas within 5 miles of the proposed Project and areas that fall within the potential Project viewshed (i.e., those areas from which the Project is potentially visible). The 5-mile-radius above-ground resource Study Area for the Project includes parts of the Towns of Sharon, Seward, and Carlisle and the Village of Sharon Springs in Schoharie County, and the Towns of Root and Canajoharie in Montgomery County.

(2) Cemeteries and Other Significant Cultural Features

In order to locate previously identified historic resources within the APE, TRC conducted an initial desktop analysis using the OPRHP's CRIS and NRHP online database. The initial review of previously identified resources identified 92 listed, 8 eligible, and 18 unevaluated historic properties, and 1 listed historic district inside the 5-mile-radius APE for historic architectural resources. Based on background research, TRC anticipated that the Project Area would contain potentially historic agricultural resources.

There are five cemeteries located within the 5-mile-radius APE for historic architectural resources. Three cemeteries are located along US Route 20 to the immediate south of the Project Area; two

of which, Ball cemetery and an unnamed cemetery, were likely demolished during widening of US Route 20. The third cemetery, Bellinger cemetery, may still be present, though ground truthing is necessary due to thick vegetation. The remaining two cemeteries, Slate Hill cemetery and Leesville cemetery, are both present but are located over 0.5 miles from the Project Area.

(3) Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures, such as local improvement projects, are not required. As requested by OPRHP, TRC conducted a reconnaissance-level architectural field survey within the proposed APE, following the OPRHP *Guidelines*, at Farmstead 09514.000032. From the public road, TRC photographed the farm house and associated agricultural buildings and ancillary outbuildings. The resource's location was recorded. Notes taken in the field maps described physical characteristics, materials, condition, integrity, and other characteristics of the farmstead.

Identification of Historic Properties

The evaluation of this architectural resource utilized the two-part test of historic significance and integrity to determine NRHP eligibility. Alterations have irrevocably compromised the farm's historic integrity. Due to lack of distinctive historical characteristics, lack of integrity, and lack of notable construction methods that would qualify it for NRHP listing, TRC recommended that the farm is not eligible for NRHP listing under any NRHP criterion of significance (36 CFR § 60.4 [a-d]). OPRHP concurred with this recommendation on July 8, 2019.

Reporting

All consultation with OPRHP for Farmstead 09514.000032 is documented in CRIS for the Project.

Preliminary Assessment of Effects

The Project is expected to have no direct or indirect impacts on above-ground historic properties that would result in a finding of adverse effect, based on current design. The Project will not have any audible or visual impacts on historic resources. No historic properties are present in the APE. Consequently, the Project will have no effect on NRHP-eligible or listed historic properties. Therefore, mitigation of adverse effects is not necessary.

References

- Collins, G. (2000). "Fragile Recovery for Village of Spas." *New York Times*. August 30, 2000.
- Funk, R. E. (1976). *Recent Contributions to Hudson Valley Prehistory*. New York State Museum and Science Service Memoir 22. New York State Museum, Albany, New York.
- McNett, C. (editor) (1985). *Shawnee-Minisink: A Paleoindian-Early Archaic Site in the Upper Delaware Valley of Pennsylvania*. Academic Press, New York.
- New York Archaeological Council [NYAC] (1994). *Standard for Cultural Resource Investigations and the Curation of Archeological Collections in New York State*. Adopted by the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation.
- Nicholas, G. P. (1983). A Model for the Early Postglacial Settlement of the Central Merrimack River Basin, New Hampshire. *Man in the Northeast*, 25: 43–63.
- Nicholas, G. P. (1987). Rethinking the Early Archaic. *Archaeology of Eastern North America*, 15: 99–124.
- Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation, New York State [OPRHP] (2006). *OPRHP Guidelines for Wind Farm Development Cultural Resources Survey Work*.
- Revolutionarywar.us. (2017). *The Battle of Sharon Springs Swamp*. <https://revolutionarywar.us/year-1781/battle-sharon-springs-swamp/>. February 27, 2019.
- Ritchie, W. A. (1980). *The Archaeology of New York State* (revised edition). Harbor Hill Books, Harrison, New York.
- Ritchie, W. A., and R. E. Funk (1973). *Aboriginal Settlement Patterns in the Northeast*. New York State Museum and Science Service Memoir No. 20. New York State Museum, Albany, New York.
- Roscoe, W.E. (1882). *History of Schoharie County, New York*. D. Mason & Co.: Syracuse, New York.
- The Old Stone Fort Museum (2019). *The Old Stone Fort*. From <https://theoldstonefort.org/our-museums/old-stone-fort/>. Accessed February 27, 2019.

United States Census Bureau (2010). New York: 2010 Population and Housing Unit Counts. Electronic document, <https://www.census.gov/search-results.html?q=Schoharie+County%2C+NY&page=1&stateGeo=none&searchtype=web&cssp=SERP>.

Wray, C. F. (1973). *Manual for Seneca Iroquois Archaeology*. Cultures Primitives, Inc., Rochester, New York