

## PERMIT WRITING FORM - P2020-0277

Assigned EPS: Matt Brown Reviewed by: /s/JMB Date: 3/24/2021

#### **APPLICANT**

Project Sponsor(s): Gordon Woodcock, Pivot Energy Landowner(s): Bruce R Crammond and Karren Crammond

Authorized Representative: Jacob Runner, Project Manager, EDR

## **PROJECT SITE**

Town/Village: Ticonderoga County: Essex Road and/or Water Body: 33 Commerce Drive

Tax Map #(s): 150.2-10-2.000, 150.2-10-1.000, and 139.4-1-55.100

Deed Ref: Book/Page 1220/126, 661/137, 1200/241

Land Use Area(s): □H ⊠MIU □LIU □RU □RM □IU

Project Site Size: 50.47± acres

Same as Tax Map #(s) identified above

□Only the □H □MIU □LIU □RU □RM □IU portion of the Tax Map #(s) identified above

□Other (describe):NA

Lawfully Created? ⊠Y □N □Pre-existing subdivision: NA

River Area:  $\Box$ Y  $\boxtimes$ N If Yes:  $\Box$ Wild -  $\Box$ Scenic -  $\Box$ Recreational Name of River: NA CEAs (include all):  $\boxtimes$ Wetland -  $\Box$ Fed Hwy -  $\Box$ State Hwy -  $\Box$ State Land -  $\Box$ Elevation -  $\Box$ Study River

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The action involves the construction of a 5 MW photo voltaic energy system (solar generation facility) on 43± acres. The solar generation facility involves installation of solar panel arrays and related infrastructure including a new access road, fencing, landscaping, and utility connections. Existing access to the project site is from Commerce Drive. The project will involve the loss of 197 square feet of jurisdictional wetlands.

#### **JURISDICTION** (including legal citation)

810(1)(b)(15) – Major public utility use in Moderate Intensity Use 810(1)(b)(1)(b) – Development involving wetlands in Moderate Intensity Use 578 – Wetlands

### PRIOR PERMITS / SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS BEING SUPERSEDED

P95-60 – Commercial and Industrial uses within the Ticonderoga Commerce Park P93-189 – Conceptual review of the Ticonderoga Commerce Park P2008-310 – Two lot subdivision that created TMP 139.4-1-55.100

## FINDINGS OF FACT – ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

	-	ids, Navigable Rivers and Streams Name: NA	Check if none	X
	•	xisting Shoreline (feet): NA	MHWM determ: □Y □	N
_		ot Width: NA	Meets standard:□Y □N	
		etback (APA Act):NA	Meets standard: □Y □I	
		etback (River Regs): NA	Meets standard: □Y □	
□Y		Cutting proposed within 6 ft of MHWM?	If Yes, < 30% vegetation? □Y □	
□Y		Cutting proposed within 35 ft of MHWM?	If Yes, < 30% trees 6" dbh? □Y □	
□Y		Cutting proposed within 100 ft of river area? (If Y	•	
Non-	-Naviga	able Streams in proximity to development	Check if none	
		nt Stream □Intermittent Stream Conmental Resource Mapper stream classification: C	lassified? ⊠Y □N C(t)	
		The permanent stream is located in the wooded are 000 and the western border of TMP # 139.4-1-55.1	•	Ł
Wetl	ands			
$\boxtimes Y$	$\square N$	Jurisdictional wetland on property		
If Y:	A po	rtion of the proposed access road will impact 179 s	equare feet of jurisdictional wetlands	
		S biologist consulted _		
	• •	e: emergent marsh		
→ L(		< 200 ft from proposed development or along shor Y, value rating: 3	eline ⊠Y □N	
Wild	life			
$\Box Y$	$\boxtimes N$	Rare/threatened/endangered species	⊠RASS ecologist consulted	
$\Box Y$	$\boxtimes N$	R/T/E or other unique species habitat	⊠RASS ecologist consulted	
$\Box Y$	$\boxtimes N$	Northern Long-Eared Bat occurrences in Town	☐ If Yes, RASS ecologist consulte	d
$\Box Y$	$\boxtimes N$	Forest management plan existing or proposed	☐ If Yes, RASS forestry analyst consulte	∍d
□Y	⊠N	Biological Survey required by RASS ecologist	☐ If Yes, complete	d
Ecol	ogical	/ Special Districts		
□Y	$\boxtimes N$	Natural Heritage Sites	⊠RASS ecologist consulted	
□Y	$\boxtimes N$	Aquifer	⊠RASS engineer consulted	
⊠Y	□N	Agricultural District		
Slop	es	☐RASS engineer consulted if structure proposed on	>15%, driveway on >12%, or wwts on >8/15%	6
Exist	ing slo	pe range: 0-15% Building area(s) if authorizing de	velopment: 1-10%	

# Soils

□Y □N Deep-hole test pit completed? (Necessary for every building lot) □ If Yes, soil data information determined or approved by RASS soil analyst NRCS Mapped Soil Series or Other Comments: Mapped soil series include Kingsbury silty clay loam and Vergennes silty clay loam,				
Adjoining Land Uses / State agricultural lands adjoin the Wilderness are located with Is nearby development vis	hin 3 miles of the project si ible from road? ⊠Y □N scribe visible development:	al, light industry, res the Lake George W te.	idential, forested, and ild Forest and Pharoah Lake	
project site including 3 culv		om Commerce Rd. a		
Existing Developm PRINCIPAL BUILDINGS Structure - None	nent Pre-existing (Y/N)?	-	Lawfully constructed (Y/N)?	
	Pre-existing (Y/N)? Yes t located on the southeast on sultation with Essex Coul			
Proposed Development PRINCIPAL BUILDINGS Structure None	Footprint	-	rtions or all below are NJ □ osed as a non-building lot: □ # Bedrooms Slopes	
Have necessary density? # remaining potential prince		survey or □estimat	te	
ACCESSORY STRUCTURE  Structure  3 Construction Staging Areas 14,000 to 18,000 PV panels Fencing 4 utility poles ACCESS *Consult	Footprint totaling 37,800 square feet 37 acres about 6,900 feet of fencing NA	Height  NA  maximum 16 feet  8 feet  40 feet  12% slope / *consult RA	Slopes  0-10% 0-10% 0-10% 0-10% 0-10% ASS ecologist for driveway > ½ mile	

erce Driv
maintenan
)
d
ed ed
ed ed
ed ed

□Y	⊠N G ⊠N D ⊠N C	Public water supply Greater than 1,000 gpd wastewater Disturbing bed or bank of water body Creating 5 or more lots less than 5 acres each	☐ If Yes, DEC / DOH application submitted ☐ If Yes, DEC application submitted ☐ If Yes, DEC application submitted ☐ If Yes, DOH application submitted
		Army Corps involvement Agency-approved Local Land Use Program	☐ If Yes, ACOE consulted ☐ Town/Village consulted
PERMIT	T CONI	DITIONS AND IMPACT ANALYSIS	
<b>Merger</b> Justifica		merger required: NA, no subdivisions or lot convey	yance proposed
	ilding lo	nt ot being created? □ Y  ⊠N s not being merged by condition, no PBs? Or no s	structures at all? Justification: NA
	ent prop	posed or required? □Y □N th Legal for conditions. Justification: Easement no	ot required.
Construction Location and Size (may be different for each subdivision lot)  Is new development (other than oswts) being authorized without further Agency review? ⊠Y □N  → If Y: Structure height limit and justification: 40 foot limit for utility poles, 8 feet for fencing and 16 feet for solar arrays as proposed on the Project Plans			
Project		Structure footprint limit and justification: 37 acre so	lar array fields as proposed on the
	→ Revie	ptable development sites identified for all subdivis ew of future development required? ⊠Y □N ustification: Ensure protection of wetlands and im	I
Propose If	ed and l	es (if authorizing a dwelling) NA reviewed? □Y □N est cottages potentially allowed? □Y □N fication for any conditions: NA, no principle buildin	gs proposed
Propose  If  → If Y, I	ed and ا f N, boa <del>ک</del> review ا	if project site contains shoreline) NA reviewed? □Y □N athouses potentially allowed? □Y □N → If N, justification: NA, no navigable water on site required (beyond definition limits)? □Y □N stification: NA	

Docks (if project site contains shoreline) NA

Proposed and reviewed?  If N, docks potentially allowed?	□Y □Y	□N □N
<ul> <li>→ If N, justification: NA, no navigable water on site</li> <li>→ If Y, review required (beyond definition limits)?</li> <li>→ If Y, justification: NA</li> </ul>	□Y	□N
Outdoor Lighting (if authorizing development) Plan proposed and reviewed? □Y ⊠N		
Building Color (if authorizing development) NA If color condition required, justification: NA, no building	ngs pro	posed
Tree Cutting / Vegetation Removal Town with Northern Long-Eared Bat occurrences? If Y, consult with RASS for conditions. Justification:		⊠N
Vegetative cutting restrictions required? ⊠Y □N If Y, restrictions required (choose all that apply): ⊠on entire site outside limits of disturbance		
Extent of cutting restriction necessary within the area   Cutting of all vegetation prohibited  Justification: To minimize visual impacts from proposet wetlands.		
Plantings  Plan proposed and reviewed? ⊠Y □N  If N, plantings required? □Y □N  → If Y, species, number, location, and time of year: Justification: to minimize visual impacts from develor and provide potential habitat and forage for pollinator	pment	
Wetlands Consult with RASS for conditions. Justification: Starland use or development that may impact wetlands	idard w	etlands condition requiring review of any
Density (may be different for each subdivision located in Town with ALLUP? □Y ☒N  Authorizing PB on substandard-sized lot created pre If N and N, list existing PBs, including whether they a	-2000 v	•
Mathematically available # of new PBs (in addition to Extinguishing PBs? □Y ☒N If Y, number: 39	existin	g or replacement):

Wastewater (if authorizing construction of a Municipal system connection approved? Community system connection approved by RA Proposed on-site system designed by engineer If N, has RASS field-verified location for convent If N, has RASS field-verified location for convent Suitable 100% replacement area confirmed for Consult with RASS for additional conditions.	SS? and approved by RASS? tional standard trench system? tional shallow trench system?	□Y □N		
Stormwater Management (if authorizing development) Consult with RASS for conditions. Justification: Stormwater control measures shall be constructed as shown and described in the SWPPP to ensure potential stormwater impacts resulting from the development are minimized.				
Erosion and Sediment Control (if authorizing development) Consult with RASS for conditions. Justification: Erosion and sediment control measures shall be installed as shown and described in the SWPPP to ensure impacts from disturbance resulting from development and post-construction run-off is mitigated.				
Infrastructure Construction (if authorizing development) Construction necessary before lot conveyance: No Justification: NA, no lot conveyances proposed				
For permits that will not include conditions r	elated to Building Color, Vegetation Re	moval, or		
Plantings Explain why no condition is needed: Building co will minimize visual impacts to off-site locations	lor condition not required because planting	condition		
Additional Site / Project-Specific Concerns / Invasive species condition, discontinuance of us				
Justification: minimize the spread of non-native, structures are removed when they become inop interconnection will not impact wetlands or other	erable or abandoned, and to ensure the po			
	If Yes, #: 1 (notes, if any) One comment letter from th	e		