Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board
Rochester School Modernization Program – Phase 1
Amended Reasons to Support SEQRA Determination of Significance

In March 2011, the Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board (RJSCB), as the duly-designated Lead Agency for the Rochester School Modernization Program – Phase 1 (“RSMP” or “Master Plan”) formally issued a Negative Declaration of Environmental Significance (“Negative Declaration”) for construction at twelve (12) schools within the Rochester City School District (Resolution 2010-11:38). This Negative Declaration included supporting documentation outlining specific reasons for supporting this determination and was based upon Concept Master Plans developed for each school.

Following the March 2011 SEQRA determination, RJSCB requested bonding for construction of six (6) schools designated in Phase 1A of the RSMP:

- Enrico Fermi School (#17)
- Henry Hudson School (#28)
- Helen Barrett Montgomery School (#50)
- World of Inquiry School (#58)
- Charlotte High School (#60)
- Franklin High School (#262)

In January 2012, RJSCB reviewed the final designs for the six Phase 1A schools to determine whether the final designs of the Phase 1A schools resulted in any significant adverse impacts not identified or evaluated in the original SEQRA process. In January 2012, RJSCB issued an amended SEQRA Determination supporting the original Negative Declaration with no significant adverse impacts identified based upon the final design documents (Resolution 2011-12:59).

RJSCB is now considering approval of bonding for the construction for the following Phase 1B schools:

- John Williams School (#5)
- East High School (#261)
- Edison Tech School (#270)

In addition, RJSCB is considering minor adjustments to the Phase 1A school designs as part of the Phase 1B project:

- Franklin High School (#262) (Internal Renovations only)
- Henry Hudson School (#28) (Lobby addition)

The Phase 1B project will also include continuing design work for Phase 1 schools Monroe High School, Jefferson High School and James Duffy School #12 as part of this
bonding. Bonding for construction at these schools will undergo SEQRA review to examine whether any significant program changes have been made and their effect to the original final SEQRA determination based upon their final designs.

The original environmental determination for construction of the Phase 1B was based on the concept designs and recommendations contained within the Master Plan. As such, any significant program changes may require an amendment to the SEQRA determination to ensure that any proposed program design modifications would not change RJSCB's original determination of environmental significance. This document provides the necessary review of the proposed construction of the Phase 1B schools.

Building Advisory Committees, (BACs) were formed for each of the Phase 1B schools. These BAC's were identified as a significant component of the design process to assess any potential environmentally significant design elements. Each design firm assigned to a Phase 1B school met with the BAC and other key school staff from their respective school to initiate the program verification phase. The BACs include representation from the RJSCB, the District, the school principal, City staff, school parents and community / neighborhood groups. In addition, each BAC also provides a vehicle for reviewing, discussing and providing recommendations for any changes or alterations to facility programming and design. Additional details and information regarding each school has been gathered as the design process advanced, resulting in several program changes from the original Master Plan designs. A listing of the meeting dates and the BAC members are included in this amendment in Appendix A.

The following pages present the final designs for the schools associated with the Phase 1B bonding identified above, identify changes from the original Master Plan design and provide an assessment of the environmental significance of the design change. For reference, the text from the original negative declaration supporting documentation is provided (where applicable and in italics) within each section for each school. Master Plan and Final design site plans, are included in Appendix B.

**Impacts to Land**

Overall, there are no new significant adverse impacts to land resources beyond any of those identified in the original environmental review. All of the additions identified in the Phase 1B schools have incorporated landscaping and screening in their designs to minimize changes in the visual quality of the site. The specific changes for each school are identified below along with a discussion of any potential changes in environmental significance.

School #5 (John Williams): The parking expansion proposed as part of the Master Plan indicated 35-40 spaces which would be located on the west side of Verona Street on land that would need to be acquired from the City. Current school designs show that this parking expansion has been reduced to only 20-25 spaces, but still located on the west side of Verona Street. Although the parking expansion is located in the same area as it was in the Master Plan, one aspect that was not included during the Plan process
was any relocation of the baseball field immediately adjacent to the expanded parking. This was identified by the consulting architect as a result of the parking expansion. Overall, this element of work at the school was previously considered an insignificant impact. This would still be considered an insignificant impact as the amount of parking is reduced and the impact to the baseball field would amount to a slight relocation, but not a reduction in size or land use.

The Master Plan also identified a 1,000 square foot vestibule addition. The design drawings for the school show a 900 square foot loading dock addition on the rear (western) portion of the building within an existing alcove that was currently asphalt (facilities parking and utilities). This addition is smaller than was previously proposed in the Master Plan and will not have any significant environmental impacts that would alter the original SEQRA final determination.

School #28 (Henry Hudson) – **Phase 1A school**: Additional design work at School #28 shows a 275 square foot stair tower addition on the southwestern entrance to the school. This addition was added to the design drawings following Phase 1A review. Due to the size of the addition no significant environmental impacts are anticipated that would alter the final SEQRA determination.

School #261 (East High): The work initially proposed at East High consisted of exterior replacement of façade features and some reconstruction of site elements, such as the athletic fields, sidewalks, and parking lots. Design drawings still show all of this reconstruction and façade improvement work occurring, with few exceptions. An alternate for reconstruction of the athletic field indicates conversion from grass to an all-weather surface and subsequent underground drainage improvements. In addition, the replacement of the antenna, which was previously shown in the Master Plan, is not included in the scope of work in the design phase. A new 32 space parking lot has been shown along Culver Road east of the football field with access to Culver as an Alternate for the Project. This was not previously identified in the Master Plan and currently, consists of maintained grass. The conversion of the area to a parking lot would change the land from a pervious to impervious surface, and would require a curb cut for vehicle access. However, the land is currently owned by the School District with no land acquisitions required and the parking will not impact any existing land features above or underground. The relatively small size of the land upon which the parking lot has been designed limits the lot size to what has been currently designed. In addition, the street trees that border Culver Road on this area of land will remain, further buffering the lot from the roadway. No significant environmental impacts to land are anticipated as a result of this additional proposed work.

School #270 (Edison Tech): The only change identified in the design drawings for Edison Tech when compared to the proposed scope of work in the Master Plan is the removal of two tennis courts on the north side of the building. These courts will be replaced with sod – the other three tennis courts will remain. In addition, a small 1,000 square foot building addition has been identified on the south entrance within an existing alcove. The remaining work consists of replacement of exterior façade
elements and reconstruction of site features (i.e. sidewalk, parking repaving, etc.). As such, no significant environmental impacts are anticipated that would alter the final SEQRA determination.

**Impacts on Water**

No surface water, groundwater or wetlands impacts were identified in the original environmental review. The original SEQRA indicated that an increase in impervious surfaces was expected, both from building additions and parking expansions, and that storm water management systems would be designed and constructed in accordance with City standards. Although there is a slight increase in stormwater management requirements, this was determined to be an insignificant change as the additions are not extensive. The same design and construction standards will be utilized to mitigate any potential stormwater impacts.

School #5 (John Williams): The reduction in parking spaces along Verona Street will result in less impervious surface as compared to the initially reviewed scope of work in the Master Plan. The remaining parking expansion will still be subject to City stormwater management as it was previously identified in the environmental review. This change will have a positive environmental impact and will not change the final SEQRA determination.

School #261 (East High): During the design phase, a small parking lot was identified along Culver Road as an alternate to the overall work at the school. The lot is approximately 11,000 square feet in size and will not require a stormwater pollution prevention plan. Existing drainage systems will be utilized and the remaining portion of the land area upon which the parking lot has been shown will consist of maintained lawn, providing pervious surface for additional stormwater drainage. The athletic field will be converted from turf to a synthetic surface, thereby creating additional impervious surface. As part of the field replacement, underground drainage improvements are being made in ensure that there is no new increase in stormwater runoff quantity or quantity as a result. For these reasons, no significant adverse environmental impacts are anticipated.

School #270 (Edison Tech): Edison High School was built in an area of significant fill materials. Significant environmental testing has been performed for the foundation repair/waterproofing work proposed for the school, with no significant environmental concerns identified within the proposed work zones. During construction, appropriate health and safety measures are included in the construction documents to address unforeseen environmental conditions should they be encountered.

**Air Quality**

No significant changes to air quality impacts were identified in the final design phase for the Phase 1B schools that were not addressed in the Phase 1 review.
Plants/Animals (Threatened/Endangered Species)

The original environmental review did not identify any impacts to any threatened or endangered species. None of the changes associated with the revised scope of work for each school have altered this determination.

Agricultural Land Resources

The original environmental review did not identify any impacts to any agricultural resources. None of the changes associated with the revised scope of work at each school have changed this assessment.

Aesthetic Resources & Community Character

As noted in the original SEQRA document, a significant portion of the Modernization Program work involves interior renovation that will not have any significant impact on exterior views of the schools. None of the schools identify land acquisitions or any other significant changes that would alter aesthetics or community character that were not previously identified in the Phase 1 environmental review.

Cultural, Historic and Archeological Resources

None of the Phase 1B schools proposed for construction were previously identified in the original environmental review as National Register listed or eligible. Initial review by SHPO indicated that “additional design and construction details” would be required for further review by the agency for School #5 (Williams), #261 (East), as these schools were located in archeologically sensitive areas. Each design consultant has been in contact with a SHPO representative and has provided design and construction drawings to date. The work proposed in the Master Plan #270 (Edison) was identified by SHPO as having “No Impact”, with no change anticipated.

Open Space and Recreation

The original SEQRA determination concluded:

School #5 (John Williams): The proposed construction of parking spaces along Verona Street will minimally reduce lawn area along Verona Street. The parking spaces will be located along of the edge of the existing street. The minimal loss of existing lawn and a few small trees was deemed insignificant because it is offset by the addition of off-street parking for school employees and park users, which will increase the park space’s use and access.

The location of the parking along the west side of Verona Street remains in the design drawings, but the number of spaces has been reduced from 35-40 to 20-25 spaces. These spaces are located immediately adjacent to the baseball field in Brown Square Park. As a result of the expansion, the baseball field would need to be relocated 20 feet.
to the west. As shown in design drawings, the field would be replaced in-kind with no other recreational facilities impacted. In addition, an “age-appropriate” playground is identified as being constructed adjacent to the existing playground south of the baseball field. None of these changes would be considered significant adverse environmental impacts that would alter the SEQRA final determination.

School #261 (East High): The area along Culver Road that has the new parking lot as shown on current design drawings consists of maintained lawn. This area has no formal recreational features and is further separated from adjacent facilities by chain link fencing. The land itself is not separated from the sidewalk and adjacent roadway for the safety and security of any potential users and contained various underground utility facilities further making the area less likely to be utilized for any recreational uses.

The reconstruction of the athletic field was previously identified in the Master Plan; however, details on its replacement were not specified. Design documents indicate that the field will be converted from a turf to a synthetic surface, placing the facility out of commission during construction. Neither the additional parking nor the field replacement would be considered a significant adverse environmental impact that would alter the SEQRA final determination.

School #270 (Edison): The only work previously proposed at Edison Tech consisted of reconstruction of existing recreational facilities and amenities such as athletic fields, bleachers, and playground equipment. Current design drawings show the removal of the two western tennis courts on the north side of the building and their replacement with sod. Although two courts are being removed, three courts will remain and will provide sufficient facilities for the student population. No other recreational or open space facilities are impacted beyond these two courts. These changes would not be considered significant adverse environmental impacts that would alter the SEQRA final determination.

**Critical Environmental Areas**

Areas zoned by the City of Rochester as Open Space (O-S) have been locally designated as critical environmental areas in Monroe County. Although several schools were located adjacent to these resources, #5 (John Williams) was the only Phase 1B school where there was any work proposed that would be directly within a critical environmental area. In this instance, the impact of the proposed work was determined to be insignificant.

The original SEQRA determination concluded:

School #5 (John Williams): In Monroe County, critical environmental areas are located in places throughout the City of Rochester that are zoned as open space. School #5 is located adjacent to Brown Square Park, which is zoned as open space. The proposed scope of work includes the parking expansion which will take place on lawn area along
this area. As currently identified, this impact is insignificant as the parking would impact lawn area and not any dedicated recreational facilities in the park.

As indicated above, design drawings show the parking expansion in the same location as it was proposed in the Master Plan, although now reduced by almost half. The reduction is a positive impact in that there will be less of an impact along Verona Street. Although the baseball field will need to be relocated 20 feet west to accommodate this parking expansion, there is no net impact as the field will be reconstructed in-kind with no other facilities in the Park affected. Therefore, the impact of the work identified in the design phase for School #5 will be insignificant.

**Transportation/Traffic**

School #5 (John Williams): The acquisition and change in one-way direction of Verona Street for use as a dedicated bus loop by the School was previously identified in the SEQRA review. The only change from this is that the street will be open to the public after school hours, but only to park users. This minor change will not have any significant environmental impacts that would alter the original SEQRA final determination.

School #261 (East High): Design drawings for School #261 show a new curb cut along Culver Road between the existing football field and tennis courts. This curb cut is for a proposed 32-space parking lot identified as a design alternate. This was not contemplated in the original Master Plan and was developed as a result of discussions with the BAC and the RJSCB. Due to the location of the new parking facility, it would primarily be used as parking for athletic events or general use of the facilities; it is too far away to provide sufficient parking for staff and students during normal class times. In addition, the size of the lot limits the number of cars and therefore the number of turning movements and any additional volumes on Culver Road. These changes would not have any significant adverse environmental impact that would alter the SEQRA final determination.

**Energy**

Energy supply and impacts were previously addressed in the original environmental review. Although some of the additions identified during the design phase for each of the school are slightly larger than the original review, the overall increase in energy needs for these additions was adequately addressed. No changes have been identified that would have any significant adverse environmental impacts that would alter the SEQRA final determination.

**Noise and Odor Impact**

Noise and odor impacts were anticipated during the construction phase for each of the schools and were addressed in the original environmental review. No changes have
been proposed that would have any significant adverse environmental impacts that would alter the SEQRA final determination.

**Public Controversy**

The Building Advisory Committees (BACs) that were established as part of the original SEQRA review were utilized during the final design phase for each of the schools. Each design consultant team met with their respective BAC several times to discuss designs and address any specific issues that arose that were relevant to their specific school. There have been no substantial issues or concerns brought forth during the meetings with the BACs that have not been adequately addressed through the design process. The design consultant teams will continue to work with and utilize the BAC’s through construction phase at each of the schools to address any issues that may arise.
Appendix A

Building Advisory Committee (BAC)
Meetings & Attendees
School #5 (John Williams) – Young + Wright Architectural

BAC Meetings:

March 29, 2012
May 16, 2012
August 29, 2012
October 30, 2012
March 13, 2013

BAC Attendees:

Wayne Williams (Gilbane/Savin)
Claude Watt (Gilbane/Savin)
Tom Renauto (RJSCB)
Todd Bruce (RCSD Facilities)
Andrew Wheatcraft (RCSD Facilities)
Peter Saxe (City of Rochester)
Joanne Wideman (School #5)
LoWan Brown (School #5)
Alonzo Conley (School #5)
Jocelyn Cox Hiler (School #5)
Brian Gallagher (School #5)
Jeanette Gilbert (School #5)
Diane Leone (School #5)
Debra Rath (School #5)
Amy J. Simcick (School #5)
Patricia Yildirim (School #5)
Hindi Wade (School #5)
Kelli Monique Briggs (School #5)
Carmen Torres (School #5)
Rishawn Sonubi (Young + Wright Architectural)
Christina Weber (Young + Wright Architectural)
Carolyn Lyons (Young + Wright Architectural)

School #12 (James PB Duffy) – SEI Design Group

BAC Meetings:

May 22, 2012
June 19, 2012
July 24, 2012
August 30, 2012
October 9, 2012
November 8, 2012
December 6, 2012
January 28, 2013
February 25, 2013
March 25, 2013

BAC Attendees:

Connie Izzo  (School #12)
Laurie Ayers  (School #12)
Mary Beth Ash-Jones (School #12)
Wanda LeBron  (School #12)
Sandra Perez  (School #12)
Mark Lovett  (School #12)
Leslie Fowler  (School #12)
Mary Kay Lovell  (School #12)
Jill Miller  (School #12)
Michele Liguori-Alampi  (School #12)
Laurie Murty  (School #12)
Andy Wheatcraft  (RCSD Facilities)
Eric Hansen  (RCSD Facilities)
Sue Snyder  (RCSD Facilities)
Gail Perogine  (Gilbane/Savin)
Wayne Hermanson  (Gilbane/Savin)
Brie Harrison  (Rochester Public Library)
David Creek  (Rochester Public Library)
Victoria Robertson  (RCSD Parent)
Tony Jordan  (City Recreation)
Nancy Johns Price  (SENSC)
Kenel Antoine  (Kenel Antoine Architects)
Zack Bloomer  (Kenel Antoine Architects)
Victor Tomaselli  (SEI Design Group)
Ted Mountain  (SEI Design Group)
Jen Kelley  (SEI Design Group)
Kelly Wobser  (SEI Design Group)

School #261 (East High School) – Cannon Design

BAC Meetings:

February 10, 2012
March 2, 2012
September 27, 2012
March 21, 2013

BAC Attendees:

Tony Robinson  (East HS)
Margaret Crowley (East HS)
Bryant Cromartie (East HS)
Scott Kliewer   (East HS)
Teisha Maldenado (East HS)
Jennifer Rees   (East HS)
Kyle Crandall   (East HS/Beechwood)
Anibal Soler, Jr. (East HS)
Tom Murphy      (East HS)
Bryant Cromartie (Rochester CSD)
Paul Conrow     (Rochester CSD / East)
Alecia McLaughlin (Rochester CSD / East HS)
Kathie Mykins   (Rochester CSD / East HS)
Maycanitza Perez (Rochester CSD / East HS)
Denise Quamina  (Rochester CSD / East HS)
Ben Rhodes      (Rochester CSD / East HS)
Christopher Smith (Rochester CSD / East HS)
Lois Geiss      (JFMB)
Marilyn Schutte (North Winton Village Neighborhood Association)
Mary Coffy      (North Winton Village Neighborhood Association)
Bob DiPaola     (Gilbane / Savin)
Wayne Hermanson (Gilbane / Savin)
Tom Renauto     (RJSCB)
Terry Costich   (RCSD)
Eric Hansen     (RCSD)
Nancy Johns Price (City of Rochester)
Migdalia Mendez (City of Rochester Recreation)
Peter Siegrist  (City of Rochester Architect)
Bill Mahoney    (LP Ciminelli, Inc)
Deborah Pease   (Cannon Design)
Richard Little  (Cannon Design)
Roland Coleman  (Cannon Design)

School #270 (Edison Tech) – LaBella Associates

BAC Meetings:

March 1, 2012
April 5, 2012
April 11, 2013
BAC Attendees:

Bonnie Atkins  (Principal)
Pete Torchia  (Head Custodian)
Ed Mascardi  (AP of Operations)
David Grant  (Robert Brown HS Principal)
Richard Amico  (Robert Brown Teacher and RTA representative)
Kathleen Denaro  (STEM High School Principal)
Molly Schleigh  (STEM High School NAF Coordinator)
Richard DellaCosta  (STEM High School, AOIT, English & Media)
Kimberly Tookes  (STEM High School, AOHS, Science)
Al Casey  (STEM High School, President ME Engineers)
Dr. Douglas Merrill  (STEM High School, RIT)
Safiya Hussein  (STEM High School)
Shannon Alvardo  (WEP representative)
Peter Saxe  (City of Rochester)
Janet Russell  (Community representative)
Luis Aponte  (Community representative)
Kevin Halat  (Community representative)
Thomas Rogér  (RSMP Program Director)
Pepin Accilien  (Gilbane/Savin, RSMP Program Manager)
Wayne Williams  (Gilbane/Savin, Program Manager)
Todd Bruce  (RCSD Facilities)
Terry Costich  (RCSD Facilities)
Andy Wheatcraft  (RCSD Facilities)
Bev Gushue  (CTE Director)
Shirley Green  (S.E., TRACE)
Stephanie Thompson  (S.E.)
Tom Renauto  (RJSCB)
Michael Short  (LaBella Associates)
Marielle Santoriello  (LaBella Associates)

School #263 (Jefferson High School)

No work proposed at Jefferson High School in Phase 1B.

School #266 (Monroe High School) – CJS Architects

BAC Meetings:

August 16, 2012
November 1, 2012
December 6, 2012
BAC Attendees:

Claude Watt       (Gilbane/Savin)
Gail Perogine     (Gilbane/Savin)
Michael Ellison   (CJS Architects)
Craig Jensen      (CJS Architects)
Armando Ramirez   (Principal, Monroe HS)
Anthony Bianchi   (Assistant Principal, Monroe HS)
Susen hart        (Assistant Principal, Monroe HS)
Dan Strassner     (Head Custodian, Monroe HS)
Nydia
Padilla-Rodriguez (RCSD Director of Strategic Partnership)
Angel Alicia      (Parent Representative)
Eric Hansen       (RCSD Facilities)
Todd Bruce        (RCSD Facilities)
Nancy Johns-Price  (City of Rochester, SE Quadrant)
Allan Richards     (Wadsworth Square Neighborhood Association)
Brenda Pacheco    (Principal, SOTA)

*The meetings and attendees listed above may include meetings that were scheduled but did not take place (e.g. scheduling conflicts, etc.) and/or attendees that may not have attended all meetings. Information was provided by each design consultant team.*
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Facility Addition Comparison
(Master Plan & Proposed Design)
## SEQRA Comparison

Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Williams/#5</th>
<th>East/#261</th>
<th>Edison/#270</th>
<th>Hudson/#28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Young &amp; Wright</td>
<td>Cannon</td>
<td>LaBella</td>
<td>LaBella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Building Area (1)</td>
<td>124,924</td>
<td>418,536</td>
<td>464,519</td>
<td>85,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition Area</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Plan</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-7,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Footprint</td>
<td>49,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footprint Addition</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Plan</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3,305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Existing bldg area per RSMP.

(2) Phase 1A school - figures are originally from Phase 1A review and have been updated accordingly.
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School Site Plans
Program Concept Test:
Henry Hudson #28
450 Humbolt Street
Model Program: 3 Strand (K-8)

SITE CONTEXT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Bus Loop</th>
<th>Proposed Bus Loop</th>
<th>Existing Total Parking Spaces - paved and striped</th>
<th>Proposed Parking Spaces</th>
<th>Total Parking Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buses</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Property Acquisition

- Alternative - Aquire Adjacent Property for Parking Expansion
New two story addition approx. 2,200 sf footprint
Two story infill addition approx. 1,800 sf footprint
Two story infill addition approx. 900 sf footprint
SUMMER PERENNIALS AND SPRING BULBS

SHEET L-(#)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item # / Key</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Size or Spacing</th>
<th>Root Quantity or as per sq ft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Echinacea purpurea 'Mangus'</td>
<td>Cone flower - Pink</td>
<td>20&quot; C/C</td>
<td>Potted 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Echinacea purpurea 'White Swan'</td>
<td>Cone flower - White</td>
<td>20&quot; C/C</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Echinacea purpurea 'Mangus'</td>
<td>Cone flower - Pink</td>
<td>20&quot; C/C</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Echinacea purpurea 'White Swan'</td>
<td>Cone flower - White</td>
<td>20&quot; C/C</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planter 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item # / Key</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Size or Spacing</th>
<th>Root Quantity or as per sq ft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Echinacea purpurea 'White Swan'</td>
<td>Cone flower - White</td>
<td>20&quot; C/C</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Echinacea purpurea 'Mangus'</td>
<td>Cone flower - Pink</td>
<td>20&quot; C/C</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Echinacea purpurea 'White Swan'</td>
<td>Cone flower - White</td>
<td>20&quot; C/C</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Echinacea purpurea 'Mangus'</td>
<td>Cone flower - Pink</td>
<td>20&quot; C/C</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planter 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item # / Key</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Size or Spacing</th>
<th>Root Quantity or as per sq ft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Heuchera 'Obsidian'</td>
<td>Coral bells</td>
<td>12&quot; C/C</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chrysanthemum 'Rose Blush'</td>
<td>Hardy Chrysanthemum - Mauve</td>
<td>20&quot;-24&quot; C/C</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Echinacea purpurea 'White Swan'</td>
<td>Cone flower - White</td>
<td>20&quot; C/C</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Aster x. frikartiii</td>
<td>Hardy Asters - Blue</td>
<td>20-24&quot; C/C</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Heuchera 'Obsidian'</td>
<td>Coral bells</td>
<td>12&quot; C/C</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Chrysanthemum 'Rose Blush'</td>
<td>Hardy Chrysanthemum - Mauve</td>
<td>20&quot;-24&quot; C/C</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Heuchera 'Obsidian'</td>
<td>Coral bells</td>
<td>12&quot; C/C</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Chrysanthemum 'Rose Blush'</td>
<td>Hardy Chrysanthemum - Mauve</td>
<td>20&quot;-24&quot; C/C</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Chrysanthemum 'Rose Blush'</td>
<td>Hardy Chrysanthemum - Mauve</td>
<td>20&quot;-24&quot; C/C</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Chrysanthemum 'Rose Blush'</td>
<td>Hardy Chrysanthemum - Mauve</td>
<td>20&quot;-24&quot; C/C</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planter 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item # / Key</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Size or Spacing</th>
<th>Root Quantity or as per sq ft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Heuchera 'Venus'</td>
<td>Coral bells</td>
<td>12&quot; C/C</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Heuchera 'Obsidian'</td>
<td>Coral bells</td>
<td>12&quot; C/C</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chrysanthemum 'Rose Blush'</td>
<td>Hardy Chrysanthemum - Mauve</td>
<td>20&quot;-24&quot; C/C</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Echinacea purpurea 'White Swan'</td>
<td>Cone flower - White</td>
<td>20&quot; C/C</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chrysanthemum 'Rose Blush'</td>
<td>Hardy Chrysanthemum - Mauve</td>
<td>20&quot;-24&quot; C/C</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Aster x. frikartiii</td>
<td>Hardy Asters - Blue</td>
<td>20-24&quot; C/C</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Chrysanthemum 'Rose Blush'</td>
<td>Hardy Chrysanthemum - Mauve</td>
<td>20&quot;-24&quot; C/C</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: All Plants to be spaced alternately with the bulbs.