

**CHAPPAQUA CROSSING
REVIEW OF PROPOSED DEIS DATED OCTOBER 15, 2008**

**SUMMARY OF COMPLETENESS REVIEW COMMENTS
PREPARED BY LEAD AGENCY**

Adopted by New Castle Town Board on January 27, 2009

The following comprises a summary list of all “completeness” review comments that have been identified by the Lead Agency and its advisors¹ based upon their review of the proposed draft DEIS dated October 15, 2008. These comments have generally been organized according to DEIS subsection. As applicable, each comment is also followed by a reference to the specific subsection of the adopted DEIS Scoping Document to which it pertains.

The next edition of the proposed DEIS should be revised to address the below comments.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

1. Overall Comment: The completeness review completed to date should not be construed as a final review of all assumptions, procedures, findings and recommended mitigation. At this stage, the primary purpose of the completeness review is to confirm that each of the topics identified in the DEIS Scoping Document has been addressed in the DEIS. If, as part of that process, any significant issues were discovered that could affect the accuracy of the analysis completed, those issues were highlighted at this stage of review to provide the Applicant with the earliest possible opportunity to correct or expand the DEIS so that the document that is accepted for purposes of circulation and public comment contains the best and most appropriate information available. However, the review of the DEIS for completeness should not be interpreted as a final review and acceptance of every item included in the document.
2. When a revised proposed DEIS is submitted for another completeness review, it should be presented in a “redline” format so that all revisions made to the first draft of the document are highlighted with underlining (proposed new text) and strikeout lines (proposed text deletions).
3. To facilitate review of the DEIS, both prior to and following its acceptance as complete for purposes of commencing public review, the Table of Contents should be expanded to include subsection titles corresponding to at least one lower level of the outline format.
4. The document labeled “DEIS Volume 2 – Appendix” is somewhat cumbersome to review because the number of pages included in that volume exceeds the practical capacity of the binder used. It is recommended that a larger binder be used or, if not available, that the information contained in that volume be split into two separate volumes.

¹ Including Counsel to the Town Board, Town Planning Consultant, and multiple Town staff members.

5. Prior to resubmission of a revised DEIS, the entire document should be reviewed for internal consistency. For example, the content of Section I should be consistent with information presented in the balance of the document. Any revisions made to the content of Section II should also be reflected wherever the same subject matter is addressed elsewhere in the DEIS. Any revisions made to the subsections of Section III or to Sections IV, V, VI, VII and VIII should be reflected in comparable revisions in the pertinent subsections of Section II, and to the extent necessary in Section I as well.
6. The next edition of the proposed DEIS should be submitted in both paper and electronic formats. At least two (2) weeks prior to the submission of that document, the Applicant should contact the Town Board for the purpose of confirming how many copies of the revised DEIS in each format will need to be submitted for the purpose of conducting another completeness review. The ability to access the proposed DEIS electronically will greatly facilitate the Town's completeness review of future submissions.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY [Section I]

4. Page I-1 – Introduction – ¶2: The statement concerning “the growing need for senior housing in New Castle” should be cross-referenced to the portion of the DEIS where this need is documented.
5. Page I-1 – Introduction – ¶4: The statement concerning “11 public school students” should be cross-referenced to the portion of the DEIS where the projection of future public school students is documented.
6. Page I-1 – Introduction: The summary discussion comparing tax revenue to costs is misleading because it is based upon a flawed methodology that leads to inaccurate conclusions (as described elsewhere in this document). This narrative will need to be updated. [*Scoping Document Section III.B.3.c.(3).*]
7. Page I-3 – Section I.A: The second paragraph under the discussion of “B-RO-20 Zoning Requirements; Applicant’s Prior Submission” should be revised to more accurately describe the effect of the zoning amendments adopted in June 2005 at the Applicant’s request. Those zoning amendments actually permit the *entire* building to be fully leased provided that only one tenant occupies the balance of the floor area in excess of 171,000 square feet. [*Scoping Document Section I.A.*]
8. Page I-5 – Section I.A: The second paragraph under the discussion of “Application of MFPD Zone to Balance of Project Site” is misleading since it ignores the fact that the floor area to remain in the reduced size B-RO-20 District will require more off-street parking that is currently proposed by the Applicant to meet the minimum requirements of the Town’s Zoning Law. [*Scoping Document Section I.A.*]
9. Page I-10 – Section I.A: Dates are given in the discussion, but a sequencing plan is not provided. [*Scoping Document Section I.A.*]

10. Page I-10 – Section I-A: The discussion of the Projected Timeline for Full Occupancy of Dwelling Units may need revision based on the additional analysis required in Section II.C.13.c of the DEIS (pages II-63 to II-64). [*Scoping Document Section I.A.*]
11. Page I-14 – Section I-D: It appears to be an exaggeration to say that the Westchester 2025 Plan “depicts the Proposed Action as a leading example of adaptive re-use of under-utilized former private campuses” under the discussion of Land Use and Zoning. The Plan merely has a photo of the Site and site plan for the Project, without identifying them or making any qualitative statements specific to the Project. It would be more accurate to say that the Project is used as an example of a trend. [*Scoping Document Section I.D.*]
12. Page I-15 – Section I.D: The discussion of tax revenues that would be payable should present separate figure for the portion that would be payable to the Town and the portions that would be payable to special districts. [*Scoping Document Section I.D.*]
13. Page I-17 – Section I.D: The summary of Utilities seems to imply that approval of the sewer district extension has already been obtained. This section should more explicitly indicate that approval of the extension, which is required for compliance with zoning regulations, is sought but has not yet been obtained. Additional information should also be provided here, and elsewhere in the DEIS as appropriate, to more clearly describe the procedures applicable to the proposed sewer district expansion, including but not limited to identification of who is responsible for making that application. [*Scoping Document Section I.D.*]
14. Page I-21 – Section I.F: The discussion does not address all applicable Town costs and benefits to the Town, including but not limited to an evaluation of future consequences. [*Scoping Document Sections I.F.1.a, I.F.1.b, I.F.1.c, I.F.1.e, I.F.2.b and I.F.2.c.*]
15. Page I-21 – Section I.F.1.a: The Scoping Document requires discussion of *projected future consequences of change in commercial tax revenue*, in addition to discussion of immediate change in commercial tax revenue. The discussion should be expanded to describe quantitatively and qualitatively the projected future consequences (i.e., beyond 2015). [*Scoping Document Section I.F.1.a.*]
16. Page I-21 – Section I.F.1.c: Executive Summary should indicate whether there are any traffic infrastructure improvements for which the Town would be required to cover the costs. [*Scoping Document Section I.F.1.c.*]
17. Page I-21 – Section I.F.1.e: Scoping Document requires discussion in Executive Summary of cost to Town of enforcement of age restrictions. [*Scoping Document Section I.F.1.e.*]
18. Page I-21 – Section I.F.2.b: Scoping Document requires discussion in Executive Summary of the percentage of the Site’s new residents expected to move from within New Castle. [*Scoping Document Section I.F.2.b.*]

19. Page I-21 – Section I.F.2.c: Scoping Document requires discussion in Executive Summary of the percentage of the Site’s new workforce dwelling units expected to be occupied by persons who work within New Castle. [*Scoping Document Section I.F.2.c.*]
20. Section I generally: This entire section should be updated as necessary when other sections of the DEIS are revised to comply with the Town Board’s determinations regarding needed revisions. Information presented in this subsection must be internally consistent with information presented in other subsections of the DEIS.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION [Section II]

21. Page II-2 – Section II.A.2.a: The discussion does not address the prior busing program and the number of employees who need that service as a percentage of the total number of employees. [*Scoping Document Section II.A.2.a.*]
22. Page II-3 – Section II.A.2.b: The discussion does not address the ability of either party to terminate the lease agreement. [*Scoping Document Section II.A.2.b.*]
23. Page II-7 – Section II.A.2.f: This section must include more discussion of the need for affordable housing in the region as a whole. Although Appendix 9 contains a discussion of regional need, the discussion should be summarized in the Project Description, as required by the Scoping Document. [*Scoping Document Section II.A.2.f.*]
24. Page II-7 – Section II.A.2.f: This section must include a discussion that considers the full range of housing opportunities and need in the Town and the region as a whole in terms of *housing type, size, and price ranges*. This information does not appear to be included in either the Project Description or Appendix 9. [*Scoping Document Section II.A.2.f.*]
25. Pages II-7 to II-8 – Section II.A.2.h: The discussion must be supplemented to fully discuss all elements required in the Scoping Document. There must be discussion of residential density, dwelling unit types, and dwelling sizes by intended category of resident (i.e., age-restricted market rate, age-restricted affordable, and affordable workforce), including a discussion of the market studies and project economics for the various components of the Project. Some of this information is contained in Appendix 9 and should be summarized here (see 6 NYCRR § 617.9(b)(2)); other information (e.g., dwelling unit types and sizes for affordable component) does not appear to be included in the market studies in Appendix 9. [*Scoping Document Section II.A.2.h.*]
26. Page II-9 – Section II.A.2.h: There is no discussion of any market studies that were done. [*Scoping Document Section II.A.2.h.*]
27. Page II-9 – Section II.A.2.i: There is no substantive discussion of impacts associated with removal of tenant restrictions and the potential difference in operational practices for office buildings with less than 4 tenants and office with more than 4 tenants. [*Scoping Document Section II.A.2.i.*]

28. Pages II-12 to II-13 – Sections II.A.2.1.(2) and II.A.2.1.(3): This section refers to detailed descriptions in the market studies in Appendix 9 and summaries of the market studies in Section III.B; however, the information required by the Scoping Document should also be included in this section. In particular, this section should address alternative resident age criteria of 65+ years of age and demand for age-restricted dwellings with and without a restriction on occupancy by children. [*Scoping Document Sections II.A.2.1.(2) and II.A.2.1.(3).*]
29. Page II-16 – Section II.B.4: The discussion should reference all the appropriate maps included in the subsection(s) that describe existing conditions. [*Scoping Document Section II.B.4.*]
30. Page II-20 – Section II.C.1.a.(8): The discussion of employee and staffing levels should include a discussion of parking needs and hours of operation, including whether 24-hour operation is proposed or possible. [*Scoping Document Section II.C.1.a.(8).*]
31. Page II-21 – Section II.C.1.a.(9): The comparison of various types of office uses indicates that trip generation methodology distinguishes among the different types of uses but does not indicate what the differences in trip generation are. That discussion should be included here, since the Scoping Document required a comparison of office uses to the extent their characteristics are distinguishable. [*Scoping Document Section II.C.1.a.(9).*]
32. Page II-21 – Section II.C.1.b.(1): In the discussion of the proposed MFPD district’s compliance with relevant provisions, it should be noted that compliance requires County approval of the extension of the sewer district. [*Scoping Document Section II.C.1.b.(1).*]
33. Page II-24 – Section II.C.1.b.(2)(b): The last sentence of subsection “(b)”—discussing internal subsidizing of carrying charges—is unclear. The DEIS should provide additional detail regarding the mechanism by which the market rate units and commercial space would internally subsidize the carrying costs for the affordable housing units to ensure long-term compliance with the Westchester County Income and Rent Program Guidelines. [*Scoping Document Section II.C.1.b.(2)(b).*]
34. Pages II-25 to II-26 – Section II.C.1.b.(2)(c): There is a reference to the detailed analysis in Appendix 9 of deeds and offering plans for other age-restricted developments. This information should be summarized here, including a discussion of “any in-place mechanisms to enforce the age restrictions and strategies to fund the cost of such enforcement” at those other developments. [*Scoping Document Section II.C.1.b.(2)(c).*]
35. Pages II-26 to II-27 – Section II.C.1.b.(2)(f): Scoping Document requires evaluation of “impact that alternative layouts may have on target markets and occupancy.” [*Scoping Document Section II.C.1.b.(2)(f).*]
36. Page II.28 – Section II.C.1.b.(2)(j): More explanation should be provided for the methodology that was used to arrive at the number of residents in the age-restricted and workforce components of the Project. The demographic study in Appendix 9 does not

appear to fully explain the methodology for arriving at the numbers. A total of 71 residents in 32 workforce apartments seems low, especially since the demographic analysis indicates that New Castle contains more traditional family households. *[Scoping Document Section II.C.1.b.(2)(j).]*

37. Page II-31 – Section II.C.1.d.(2): The discussion does not address hours of operation for recreational facilities. *[Scoping Document Section II.C.1.d.(2).]*
38. Page II-38 – Section II.C.5: Proposed and modified existing buildings. A study should be done of any hazardous materials of building 600 and 700 that are planned to be demolished. *[Scoping Document Section II.C.5.]*
39. Page II-40 – Section II.C.5.b: Table No. III. A-5 zoning compliance table, specifically building heights. The proposed buildings are being measured from finished grades to the average mean of the roofs. The code of the Town of New Castle chapter 60-411 foot note #4 states that the measurement should be taken to the highest point of the roof. Therefore, these calculations should be rechecked.
40. Page II-42 – Section II.C.5.d: This page states that all connections will be approved by the “Fire Marshal’s office”. This should read “Building Inspector’s office.” *[Scoping Document Section II.C.5.d.]*
41. Page II-43 – Section II.C.5.d: This page describes compliance with the New York residential code for wood frame townhouse construction. The narrative should be expanded to also address the provisions of New Castle Town Code Chapter 68, which requires all new construction to contain a fire sprinkler system. *[Scoping Document Section II.C.5.d.]*
42. Page II-44 – Section II.C.5.e: The Scoping Document requires indication of whether existing buildings are to be retrofitted. *[Scoping Document Section II.C.5.e.]*
43. Page II-45 – Section II.C.5.e: Scoping Document requires discussion of energy time cycle in terms of embodied and operating energy associated with proposed building demolition, construction, and operation. *[Scoping Document Section II.C.5.e.]*
44. Page II-45 – Section II.C.5.e: The discussion does not address the project’s “carbon footprint” or greenhouse gases (GHG) that would be produced and/or mitigated by the low-impact development (LID) planned. *[Scoping Document Section II.C.5.e.]*
45. Page II-45 – Section II.C.6.a: There is no discussion of parking lot design standards. *[Scoping Document Section II.C.6.]*
46. Page II-46 – Section II.C.6.b: The discrepancy between the text and the footnotes regarding number of parking spaces in North Village should be corrected.

47. Pages II-47 and II-48 – Sections II.C.7.a and II.C.7.b: The narrative should be expanded to more completely describe the visual character and aesthetics of the current property, especially the viewshed along N.Y.S. Route 117 and Cowdin Lane. *[Scoping Document Sections II.C.7.a and II.C.7.b]*
48. Pages II-47 and II-48 – Sections II.C.7.a and II.C.7.b: A significant amount of trees will be removed from the property. The landscaping plan does not provide details on the species, size or functional value of replacements. The amount of tree removal will significantly impact the viewshed that currently exists. *[Scoping Document Sections II.C.7.a and II.C.7.b.]*
49. Page II-48 – Section II.C.7.b: The Scoping Document requires discussion of parkland reservation or in-lieu-of parkland recreation fees. *[Scoping Document Section II.C.7.b.]*
50. Page II-48 – Section II.C.7.c: Avoidance of invasive species is not included in the discussion. *[Scoping Document Section II.C.7.c.]*
51. Pages II-48 and II-49 – Section II.C.7.c: The proposed landscaping plan is presented only as a concept. The landscaping plan lacks sufficient details in order to evaluate the functional replacement or mitigation of the loss of a substantial amount of trees. *[Scoping Document Section II.C.7.c.]*
52. Pages II-48 and II-49 – Section II.C.7.c: At a minimum the species, size and specific locations of proposed plant material should be provided on the concept plans in order to evaluate the functional value of the proposed landscaping and how it will mitigate the impacts from the proposed development. *[Scoping Document Section II.C.7.c.]*
53. Page II-50 – Section II.C.8: Under the discussion of Stormwater Management, future maintenance measures and responsibilities are not addressed. *[Scoping Document Section II.C.8.]*
54. Page II-50 – Section II.C.8: Under the discussion of Stormwater Management, MS-4 Designation is not addressed. For example will the project maintain itself as its own MS-4 entity. *[Scoping Document Section II.C.8.]*
55. Page II-50 – Section II.C.8.a: There is no discussion of peak flows and total runoff volumes. *[Scoping Document Section II.C.8.a. (Scoping Document erroneously labels this subsection as II.C.8.e).]*
56. Page II.51 – Section II.C.8.a: Although a description is provided as to how the Proposed Action would address potential peak flow increases, a similar description regarding total runoff volume is not provided. *[Scoping Document Section II.C.8.a. (Scoping Document erroneously labels this subsection as II.C.8.e).]*
57. Pages II-51 to II-52 – Section II.C.9.a: Virtually all of the on-site water system would need to be offered for dedication to the Town (except for individual water lines supplying

existing buildings from existing metering pits). There is not a sufficiently detailed description of the proposed new mains' construction to supply the proposed buildings, and there is no statement about relocating (and/or replacing) existing mains so that they would not be beneath any proposed structures. The narrative should also acknowledge that 20-foot wide permanent easements would need to be established to ensure that all water mains to be dedicated to the Town would be accessible for future maintenance. *[Scoping Document Section II.C.9.a.]*

58. Pages II-51 through II-53 – Sections II.C.9.a and II.C.9.b: The narrative should be expanded to describe metering for mixed or multi-use buildings (commercial or common use facilities) as well as the installation of backflow prevention devices (critical part of the Town's cross-connection control program). It should also contain a detailed description of proposed testing, repairs, and upgrades needed to the existing water system. It is mentioned that the existing sewer system would be tested, but is missing specific discussion of the protocol for that testing. *[Scoping Document Sections II.C.9.a and II.C.9.b.]*
59. Page II-53 – Section II.C.9.b: The DEIS notes that it is expected that the Westchester County Department of Environmental Facilities might require mitigation due to increases in sewer flows. More detail should be provided regarding I&I off-site sewer improvements that might be required to meet demand. *[Scoping Document Section II.C.9.b.]*
60. Pages II-53 to II-54 – Section II.C.9.c: II-53 - 54: The discussion of the means of obtaining electric and gas service should indicate who would fund the Con Edison improvements that are mentioned. *[Scoping Document Section II.C.9.c.]*
61. Page II-55 – Section II.C.9.e: The Scoping Document requires information on “anticipated demand and means of obtaining service for solid waste,” but this topic is not addressed in the DEIS. In one section of the document, there is mention of continuing with the existing on-site carting company for solid waste service; however later in the document, it is mentioned that Summit Greenfield has contacted the Town's residential carter and there is ample capacity to service the proposed Chappaqua Crossing development. In addition, there is no specific mention of how the proposed development would operate in relation to the applicable requirements of the Town's existing Residential Refuse District. Senior citizens living in New Castle are allowed a reduction in their solid waste fees and any senior residing in Chappaqua Crossing would be allowed the same benefit. This provision has not been addressed. *[Scoping Document Section II.C.9.e.]*
62. Page II-55 - Section II.C.10: The discussion of Off-Site Improvements should clearly define future maintenance responsibilities, particularly when considering sidewalk repair and snow removal. *[Scoping Document Section II.C.10.]*

63. Page II-56 – Section II.C.11.d: The Scoping Document requires identification of location(s) to which demolition materials will be transported and travel routes. [*Scoping Document Section II.C.11.d.*]
64. Page II-58 – Section II.C.12.g: The discussion on this page indicates that all utilities servicing the residential component of the proposed project will be conveyed to the HOA. However, this may not be completely accurate since the Westchester County Health Department may require the sewer distribution system to be publicly owned and/or require the creation of a local sanitary sewer district. There is no discussion on this point. [*Scoping Document Section II.C.12.g.*]
65. Page II-58 – Section II.C.12.g: While the discussion on this page indicates that the HOA will own the utilities, it is stated on page III.G-11 that the homes will be individually metered. It should be verified that the Town and Westchester County Health Department will accept private water lines feeding individually metered homes. If the Town will need to accept ownership of the water distribution system, the DEIS analysis should address this additional cost. [*Scoping Document Section II.C.12.g.*]
66. Page II-59 – Section II.C.12.i: Clarification is needed on the ownership of the Site’s wireless telecommunications service facilities. Typically such facilities are owned by the telecommunication companies, and such companies would lease land from the Applicant. [*Scoping Document Section II.C.12.i.*]
67. Pages II-60+ - Section II.C: The function of and procedures for the affordable housing lottery are not clearly explained in the DEIS. In particular:
- a. The DEIS should explain the function of the “lottery.” Does such a “lottery” refer to a system by which Purchase Applications will be randomly placed in an order in which they will be reviewed, or does the “lottery” involve the random selection of a certain number of Purchase Applications that have been reviewed and deemed to meet threshold requirements?
 - b. It is not clear if there would be one or two lotteries, i.e., one for individuals in the priority category (e.g., Town residents, municipal employees, etc.) and one for the broader public. [*Scoping Document Section II.C.13.b.*]
68. Page II-63 – Section II.C.13.c.(1): The DEIS should clarify why death and divorce are treated inconsistently in the discussion of how involuntary transfers of property would affect occupancy of affordable housing units. [*Scoping Document Section II.C.13.c.(1).*]
69. Page II-63 – Section II.C.13.c.(1): The discussion of the potential consequences of occupancy dropping below the minimum percentage threshold required to maintain an age-restricted residential development is not adequate. It is not responsive to the Scoping Document’s requirements because: (1) the discussion only appears in the affordable housing subsection (there does not seem to be a corresponding discussion in the age-restricted unit section); (2) it seems misleading to say that affordable housing would not

be affected if occupancy dips below the 80 percent requirement; (3) in addition, the discussion as drafted may be misleading because it makes it sound as if the denominator for the 80 percent requirement is just the age-restricted units. This discussion should be revised to reflect the additional analysis required in Section II.C.13.c (pages II-63 to II-64) regarding whether the denominator for the 80 percent requirement includes all units (both age-restricted and workforce) or just the age-restricted units. [*Scoping Document Section II.C.13.c.(1)*]

70. Pages II-63 to II-64 – Section II.C.13.c: The discussion of techniques to be employed to ensure occupancy of proposed affordable and age-restricted dwelling units should be revised to address the following issues related to HOPA’s minimum percentage threshold: [*Scoping Document Section II.C.13.c.*]
 - a. The discussion should indicate whether the denominator for HOPA’s 80 percent requirement includes all units (both age-restricted and workforce) or just the age-restricted units.
 - b. The HOPA regulations provide that “[n]ewly constructed housing for first occupancy after March 12, 1989 need not comply with the [80 percent requirement] until at least 25 percent of the units are occupied.” 24 C.F.R. § 100.305(d). The projected timeline for full occupancy of dwelling units in the Project (see pages II.13 to II-14) indicates that the first 54 units to be constructed will be completed in 2011 and will include 32 workforce units. The discussion should explain how the 25 percent requirement applies to the Project, including whether the 80 percent requirement would begin to apply when 25 percent of the first 54 units were occupied or when 25 percent of all 278 units were occupied. The discussion should explain how the phasing of construction, sales, and occupancy would ensure compliance with HOPA.
71. Page II-66 – Section II.C.13.d: The DEIS should provide more detail regarding the initial capitalization of the legal fund. [*Scoping Document Section II.C.13.d.*]
72. Page II-67 - Section II.D.1: Table II-2 indicates a number of approvals that need to be obtained but does not include any mention of the creation of a local sewer district. This needs to be discussed because it may have an impact on the issue of maintenance. [*Scoping Document Section II.D.1.*]
73. Page II-68 – Section II.D.1: The Town Engineer should be included on the list of Involved Agencies. It is also unclear why the list of Involved Agencies has been split into two categories, which are presented separately in Tables II.2 and II-3. If the intent is to separate more ministerial types of approvals from the discretionary approvals, the information presented in Table II-3 is not accurate. Several of the approvals listed in Table II-3 should be moved to Table II-2, including but not limited to the ones under the jurisdiction of the Town of New Castle Board of Architectural Review, the New York City Department of Environmental Protection, the New York State Department of

Environmental Conservation and the New York State Department of Transportation.
[Scoping Document Section II.D.1.a.(5).]

LAND USE AND ZONING [Section III.A]

74. Pages III.A-7 to III.A-8 - Section III.A.1.e: The discussion of Town Development Plan policies that are pertinent to the Proposed Action is selective and does not fully present all of the policies that may have a bearing on the Town’s evaluation of the Proposed Action. At a minimum, this discussion should be expanded to incorporate policies concerning multifamily residential land use as well. *[Scoping Document Section III.A.1.e.]*
75. Pages III.A-12 to III.A-13 and III.A-32 – Sections III.A.1.i and III.A.3.f.(2): It is not clear that the Westchester 2025 Plan is an endorsement of the Project as a “model typology” or “the example of how to protect, enhance and encourage redevelopment of a Private Campus.” This section should provide additional analysis, as required by the Scoping Document, of the ways in which the Proposed Action does and does not conform to the recommendations for Private Campuses in the Westchester 2025 Plan. *[Scoping Document Section III.A.3.f.]*
76. Pages III.A-22 to III.A-23, III.A-26 and III.A-27 - Sections III.A.3.e: In the discussions of the Project’s compliance with the MFPD District and other multifamily district requirements, DEIS should indicate that compliance requires approval of the extension of the sewer district. *[Scoping Document Section III.A.3.e.]*
77. Pages III.A-36 to III.A-37 – Section III.A.3.g: The DEIS should discuss the populations that would be targeted by the Project’s affordable housing component and should indicate that other populations identified in housing studies as contributing to the regional need for additional affordable housing in the region (e.g., the homeless, those living in physically deficient or overcrowded units, etc.) would not be targeted by the Project. The information presented in this narrative should also be consistent with the narrative presented in Section III.B.3.b(1). *[Scoping Document Section III.A.3.g.]*
78. Pages III.A-36 to III.A-37 - Section III.A.2.g: The Scoping Document requires a discussion of the need for multifamily dwelling units in the Town and County. *[Scoping Document Section III.A.2.g.(1).]*
79. Page III.A-37 - Section III.A.2.g: The Scoping Document requires identification of the number of persons or families who currently reside in the Town, or who are volunteer emergency services workers in the Town, etc. who would qualify for residency in the affordable housing. *[Scoping Document Section III.A.2.g.(2).]*
80. Page III.A-37 - Section III.A.2.h: The Scoping Document requires a *qualitative*, as well as quantitative, discussion of the demand for active senior developments. *[Scoping Document Section III.A.2.h.]*

81. Page III.A-37 - Section III.A.2.h: This narrative should identify what the “Study Area” encompasses.
82. Page III.A-48 – Section III.A.4.c: The text on this page should be deleted since it repeats text that appears on the previous page.
83. End of Section III.A – Table III.A.-2a: The title of this table should refer to “§ 60-412” rather than “§ 60-411,” and should only reference “Part 1” rather than “Parts 1 and 2.”
84. End of Section III.A – Table III.A-2b: The first title of this table should be changed to “§ 60-412. Schedule of regulations for business and industrial districts” rather than “§ 60-411. Schedule of regulations for residence districts.”

SOCIOECONOMIC AND FISCAL CONDITIONS [Section III.B]

85. Page III.B-8 – Section III.B.1.a.(2)(b): The source and date of the cited figure for average household income in New Castle (“about \$267,000”) should be identified since that figure may no longer be accurate given current economic condition. *[Scoping Document Section III.B.1.a.(2)(b).]*
86. Page III.B-12 to III.B-17 and III.B-37 – Sections III.B.2 and III.B.3.b: The discussion of how the Project meets the need for multifamily/age-restricted/affordable housing is included in the Existing Conditions section in various places. Instead, this discussion should be located in the Potential Impacts section. *[Scoping Document Sections III.B.2 and III.B.3.b.]*
87. Page III.B-31 – Section III.B.3.a.(1): It is predicted that there will be 71 persons in the non age-restricted units, but the DEIS chapter does not explain how this number was derived, and it seems low (less than 2 people per dwelling unit). *[Scoping Document Section III.B.3.a.(1)(a).]*
88. Page III.B-36 to III.B-37 – Sections III.B.3.b.(1)(d) through III.B.3.b.(1)(f): The discussion of how the Project meets the need for multifamily/age-restricted/affordable housing should discuss the issues identified below. *[Scoping Document Sections III.B.3.b(1)(d) through III.B.3.b.(1)(f).]*
 - a. Which populations would be targeted by the Project’s affordable housing component and what other populations identified in housing studies as contributing to the regional need for additional affordable housing in the region (e.g., the homeless, those living in physically deficient or overcrowded units, etc.) would not be served by the Project.
 - b. Pricing of the affordable units, including a discussion that addresses potential difficulties facing the population targeted by the Project’s affordable housing component in current financial climate (e.g., obtaining mortgages, requirements for larger-percentage down payments).

- c. Internal subsidies for the costs of the affordable housing units and how those subsidies affect marketability of the market rate age-restricted units.
89. Page III.B-38 – Section III.B.3.b.(1)(j): The *DEIS* should be more specific regarding what is meant by “local amenities” in subsection (j), and what is meant by “maintenance-free living” in subsection (j). [*Scoping Document Section III.B.3.b.(1)(i).*]
 90. Page III.B-41 - Section III.B.3.c.(2): III.B-41: This subsection, though titled “Projected Assessed Value . . . ,” does not appear to discuss assessed value. Instead it focuses on the amount of taxes. The narrative concerning assessed valuation for the residential components of the Project should also acknowledge that special provisions would apply to the ongoing valuation of workforce dwelling units beyond the 2015 Build Year, which would involve future adjustments to assessed valuation based upon the Consumer Price Index rather than market value considerations. [*Scoping Document Section III.B.3.c(2).*]
 91. Page III.B-43 - Section III.B.3.c.(2): III.B-43: This subsection should include historical analysis of assessed value based on full property valuation for condo townhouse dwellings in comparison to fee simple single-family detached dwellings in Town. This is discussed to some extent in Existing Conditions, but Scoping Document requires analysis in Potential Impacts discussion. [*Scoping Document Section III.B.3.c(2).*]
 92. Page III.B-45 – Sections III.B.3.c.(2) and III.B.3.c.(3): The first paragraph on this page (regarding potential differences in projected residential assessed valuation as function of location on the Site) should be moved to the previous section (subsection (2), “Projected Assessed Value of the Residential Components”). [*Scoping Document Sections III.B.3.c.(2) and III.B.3.c.(3) .*]

LAND, WATER AND ECOLOGICAL RESOURCES [Section III.C]

93. Page III.C-1 - Section III.C.1.a.(1): Although several soil tests were performed throughout the Site, except for Test B-2, no tests were performed in the proposed stormwater treatment areas. This information should be provided. [*Scoping Document Section III.C.1.a.(1).*]
94. Pages III.C-8 to III.C-9 - Section III.C.1.c.(1)(a): Scoping Document requires an evaluation of the effect of blasting activity. The discussion on these pages merely says that it is expected that the majority of rock would be removed without blasting but that state and local procedures and regulations would be followed if blasting is required. The discussion should also evaluate the potential impacts of blasting. [*Scoping Document Section III.C.1.c.(1)(a).*]
95. Page III.C-9 – Section III.C.1.c.(1)(b): The title of this subsection appears to be partially in error and should be corrected.

96. Page III.C-9 – Section III.C.1.c.(1)(b): The Scoping Document states that the Applicant should evaluate *the effect of the proposed clearing*. Several subsections of the DEIS indicate that an erosion and sediment control plan will be in place, but this subsection contains no discussion concerning an evaluation of the effect of the proposed clearing. According to Merriam Webster’s Dictionary, “evaluate” means to “determine the significance, worth, or condition of usually by careful appraisal and study” and “effect” means “something that inevitably follows an antecedent (as a cause or agent.)” This would include the effect of lost habitat, the effect of lost top soil, how the changes in grade will cause alterations in the flow path and hydrology to wetlands and watercourses on-site. [*Scoping Document Section III.C.1.c.(1)(b).*]
97. Page III.C-10 – Sections III.C.1.c.(2)(b) and III.C.1.c.(2)(c): The discussion and referenced grading plans indicate that substantial areas of new steep slopes would be created by the current grading plan. The areas of newly created steep slopes should be calculated and discussed in the DEIS. A map depicting proposed steep slopes according to the categories regulated by the New Castle Town Code should be provided. Discussion regarding newly created steep slopes should include the impacts associated with such slopes, such as potential instability and visual impacts. [*Scoping Document Section III.C.1.c.(2)(c).*]
98. Page III.C-12 - Section III.C.1.c.(3)(b): The Scoping Document requires that the DEIS indicate whether any outside funding sources will be used to perform necessary remedial work. [*Scoping Document Section III.C.1.c.(3)(b).*]
99. Page III.C-14 - Section III.C.1.d.(1)(b): The DEIS should include information on “monitoring locations” and “monitoring procedures” for the blasting mitigation plan. [*Scoping Document Section III.C.1.d.(1)(b).*]
100. Page III.C-15 – Section III.C.1.d.(2): The mitigation for creation of steep slopes should be discussed, including stabilization of newly created slopes and mitigation of the visual impacts of such slopes. [*Scoping Document Section III.C.1.d.(2).*]
101. Page III.C-15 - Section III.C.1.d.(2)(b): The discussion of Topography and Slopes states that “a portion of the disturbance is creation of new steep slopes.” This discussion should be presented in the Potential Impacts subsection and should be expanded to identify the areas of created steep slopes and quantify the proposed impacts, and should also be cross-referenced to appropriate map depicting the areas of created steep slopes. [*Scoping Document Section III.C.1.d.(2)(b).*]
102. Page III.C-16 - Section III.C.1.d.(2)(e): Although the narrative states that no further mitigation measures are necessary to further reduce potential impacts to existing steep slopes, it does not identify possible additional modifications as required by the Scoping Document. [*Scoping Document Section III.C.1.d.(2)(e).*]
103. Page III.C-16 - Section III.C.1.d.(3)(a): The discussion of Hazardous Materials states that the Proposed Action “avoids” impacts associated with demolition; however the

proposed removal of five buildings does not constitute avoidance, which is defined in Merriam Webster's Dictionary as "to refrain from." This narrative should be revised and potential mitigation for removal of those building should be addressed. *[Scoping Document Section III.C.1.d.(3)(a).]*

104. Page III.C-17 - Section III.C.2.a.(1)(b): The DEIS does not identify potential downstream groundwater nor described existing conditions. It simply states that the "proposed project is not anticipated to affect downstream groundwater resources." *[Scoping Document Section III.C.2.a.(1)(b).]*
105. Page III.C-17 - Section III.C.2.a.(2)(a): Under a description of off-site wetlands, it states that Wetlands 5 and 6 drain to an unnamed tributary to the Chappaqua Brook. Although there are no maps provided that show the area where the streams combine, an examination of New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) maps indicate that the unnamed tributary does not connect with Chappaqua Brook, but instead connects directly to the Kisco River. A map should be provided that clarifies this issue. *[Scoping Document Section III.C.2.a.(2)(a).]*
106. Page III.C-22 - Section III.C.2.a.(2)(b): The DEIS should identify any New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) or New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP) designated classifications of wetlands or receiving waters for runoff. *[Scoping Document Section III.C.2.a.(2)(b).]*
107. Page III.C-25 - Section III.C.2.a.(2)(c): The DEIS does not address the condition, characteristics, function and quality of the wetland buffer. *[Scoping Document Section III.C.2.a.(2)(c).]*
108. Page III.C-27 - Section III.C.2.a.(3): The peak "Design Flow" totals provided for each watershed do not correspond to a summation of the individual design points provided in the table at the top of page III.C-32. An explanation as to the affect of the additional routing between the Design Points and the "Design Flows" should be provided. *[Scoping Document Section III.C.2.a.(3)(c).]*
109. Page III.C-27 - Section III.C.2.a.(3): The existing runoff volume for each design storm (to each design point) must be provided. *[Scoping Document Section III.C.2.a.(3)(c).]*
110. Page III.C-27 - Section III.C.2.a.(3): The amount of runoff that is currently reaching each wetland and stream individually should be provided in terms of runoff volume. *[Scoping Document Section III.C.2.a.(3)(g).]*
111. Page III.C-31 - Section III.C.2.a.(3)(f): A discussion of the historical flooding problems to the *east of the Site*, whether or not such problems are documented on the existing flood maps (FIRM's) must be provided. The Applicant should contact the Town to review its records on past flooding problems in the vicinity of Jeffrey Lane, Pin Oak Lane, Cowdin Circle, Annandale Road and Bedford Road. The document should then summarize this historical information and recognize that runoff from the Proposed Action both in terms

- of runoff peak flow and increased volume could adversely impact these areas. It should also acknowledge that, as contained in a statement on the maps, the FIRM's do not necessarily identify all areas subject to flooding. *[Scoping Document Section III.C.2.a.(3)(f)]*
112. Page III.C-27 - Section III.C.2.a.(3): The amount of runoff that is currently reaching each wetland and stream individually should be provided in terms of runoff volume. *[Scoping Document Section III.C.2.a.(3)(g).]*
 113. Page III.C-33 – Section III.C.2.b: The required discussion of TMDL mandates is missing from the discussion of Future Conditions Without Project. *[Scoping Document Section III.C.2.b.]*
 114. Page III.C-33 - Section III.C.2.c.(1)(a): Potential impacts on groundwater *quantity* are not identified. Mitigation measures such as design consistency with the Watershed Regulations should be described in Section III.C.2.d.(2). *[Scoping Document Section III.C.2.c.(1)(a).]*
 115. Page III.C-33 - Section III.C.2.c.(1)(b): Potential impacts on groundwater *quality* are not identified. Mitigation measures such as design consistency with the Watershed Regulations should be described in Section III.C.2.d.(2). *[Scoping Document Section III.C.2.c.(1)(b).]*
 116. Page III.C-33 - Section III.C.2.c.(1)(c): Does not identify potential impacts to groundwater due to land coverage and recharge and on-site usage of groundwater. Mitigation measures such as design consistency with the Watershed Regulations should be described in Section III.C.2.d.(2). *[Scoping Document Section III.C.2.c.(1)(c).]*
 117. Page III.C-34 – Section III.C.3.c.(1)(d): The analysis of potential impacts to groundwater from fertilizers and pesticides is not adequate. The analysis explains that the use of fertilizers and pesticides on the Site is likely to decline because of the reduction of the mowed lawn ecosystem. The Scoping Document requires discussion of impacts if fertilizers were proposed for use, and if not proposed for use, a discussion of measures to be taken to ensure their non-use on ongoing basis. Mitigation measures should be described in Section III.C.2.d.(7). *[Scoping Document Section III.C.2.c.(1)(d).]*
 118. Page III.C-34 - Section III.C.2.c.(2)(a): In order to complete the analysis, the DEIS must identify, discuss and analyze the direct and indirect disturbance to the regulated wetland buffer. *[Scoping Document Section III.C.2.c.(2)(a).]*
 119. Page III.C-34 - Section III.C.2.c.(2)(a): The potential impacts of indirect disturbances, i.e., changes to the quantity and quality of stormwater discharges to the existing discharge points should be identified, discussed and analyzed. *[Scoping Document Section III.C.2.c.(2)(a).]*

120. Page III.C-35 - Section III.C.2.c.(3)(b): In addition to the analysis of peak runoff flows at the property boundaries that is provided, potential impacts to stormwater quantity due to changes in the runoff volume also must be described. Since the amount of impervious coverage in this watershed will increase by 5 acres, besides peak flow changes there is the potential for adverse downstream impacts due to changes in the runoff volume. Also, in order to properly evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed mitigation practices as they relate to the downstream watershed, a downstream analysis using the 10% Rule should be performed in accordance with Section 4.8 of the New York State Stormwater Management Design Manual (NYSSMDM). *[Scoping Document Section III.C.2.c.(3)(b).]*
121. Page III.C-36 – Table III.C-10: This table is missing the stormwater runoff volumes associated with the increase in impervious surfaces. *[Scoping Document Section III.C.2.c.(3)(b).]*
122. Page III.C-37 - Section III.C.2.c.(3)(d): This section should describe how the Proposed Action would comply with the provisions of Chapter 108-A of the Town Code. It should include an explanation that a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be prepared which will address construction phasing, temporary and permanent structural and vegetative measures as well as long term management of the facilities through the establishment of maintenance procedures, schedules, easements and agreements. *[Scoping Document Section III.C.2.c.(3)(d).]*
123. Page III.C-38 - Section III.C.2.c.(3)(e): The peak “Design Flows” totals provided for each watershed do not correspond to a summation of the individual design points provided in Table III.C-10 on page III.C-36. An explanation as to the affect of the additional routing between the Design Points and the “Design Flows” should be provided. In addition for consistency and clarity, the “On-Site Drainage Area Discharging to the Kisco River Subwatershed” Chart on Page III.C-40 should be renamed to indicate that it discharges to the Bedford Road “Tributary”. An evaluation must be provided that assesses the potential adverse impacts that the changes to the runoff amounts (i.e., peak flow and volume) will pose to the existing wetlands and streams. *[Scoping Document Section III.C.2.c.(3)(e).]*
124. Page III.C-38 - Section III.C.2.c.(3)(e): The narrative addresses altered drainage patterns; however, the DEIS does not assess the effect of those changes on existing wetlands and streams. *[Scoping Document Section III.C.2.c.(3)(e).]*
125. Page III.C-40 - Section III.C.2.c.(3)(f): The narrative should address how the proposed reduction and the amount of phosphorous leaving the Site as a result of the Proposed Action will impact the Town’s ability to comply with the TMDL requirements and GP-0-08-002. *[Scoping Document Section III.C.2.c.(3)(f).]*
126. Page III.C-42 - Section III.C.2.d.(2)(b): This section as well as Section III.C.2.c.(3)(d) and the Stormwater Management Report refer to BSD Adjuncts that were utilized to comply with the Enhanced Phosphorous Requirements, however no information is

presented to support this. Details and supporting calculations should be provided that demonstrate compliance with Chapter 10 of the NYSSMDM. In addition, measures that are proposed to mitigate changes (both increased and decreased) to runoff volume should be addressed. *[Scoping Document Section III.C.2.d.(2)(b).]*

127. Page III.C-45 - Section III.C.d.(3): In addition to explaining the design features of the Micropool Extended Detention Ponds, other proposed mitigation measures, i.e., rain gardens, grass swales, erosion controls during construction and long term maintenance procedures as required by GP-0-08-001, should be described. *[Scoping Document Section III.C.2.d.(3).]*
128. Page III.C-45 - Section III.C.2.d.(4): A discussion of how the Project proposes to reduce the existing phosphorous loading from the Site, thereby impacting the Town's ability to meet TMDL requirements, should be provided. *[Scoping Document Section III.C.2.d.(4).]*
129. Page III.C-46 - Section III.C.2.d.(5): Although an explanation of existing impervious areas that are proposed to be removed or re-used is included, no discussion is provided as to how the techniques specified in the Scoping Document to reduce impervious areas, were incorporated into the project. *[Scoping Document Section III.C.2.d.(5).]*
130. Pages III.C-46 to III.C-47 - Section III.C.2.d.(6): Other site design features, including rain gardens and grass swales with infiltration that are currently part of the Proposed Action, should be included in the discussion. The narrative does not appear to address all the alternatives to use of stormwater ponds that the Scoping Document requires to be discussed (e.g., detention galleries and curb cuts). *[Scoping Document Section III.C.2.d.(6).]*
131. Page III.C-47 - Section III.C.2.d.(7): The DEIS should describe the implementation of an integrated pest management plan. *[Scoping Document Section III.C.2.d.(7).]*
132. Page III.C-48 - Section III.C.2.d.(8)(b): The peak "Design Flows" totals provided for each watershed do not correspond to a summation of the individual design points provided in Table III.C-12 on page III.C-42. An explanation as to affect of the additional routing between the Design Points and the "Design Flows" should be provided. *[Scoping Document Section III.C.2.d.(8)(b).]*
133. Page III.C-59 - Section III.C.3.a.(3): The tree survey has identified all trees and breaks out specimen trees as part of the analysis. The survey does not, however, provide any analysis on the potential impacts or current functional value provided by the existing trees and the existing plant communities that are present on the property. *[Scoping Document Section III.C.3.a.(2).]*
134. Page III.C-59 - Section III.C.3.a.(3): The environmental impacts from the removal of approximately 619 trees, 80 of which are specimen quality, needs to be addressed within the DEIS. For example, information on the impacts to the carbon footprint should be

evaluated, the impacts on site characteristics, evaporation and transpiration rates, impact on water resources and drainage, wildlife value for food, cover, shelter, etc. *[Scoping Document Section III.C.3.a.(2).]*

135. Page III.C-60 - Section III.C.3.a.(3)(c): The DEIS states that a document entitled Guidelines for Bog Turtle Surveys published by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) was used to determine adverse impacts; however, the guidelines were not reviewed in their entirety. In order to complete the determination, the subsection on “Bog Turtle Conservation Zones” must also be reviewed, as stated in the Guidelines, to determine potential adverse effects to bog turtles using the “Action Area” as defined by USFWS. *[Scoping Document Section III.C.3.a.(3)(c).]*
136. Page III.C-63 – Section III.C.3.c.(3): The tree preservation plan should be shown on a separate plan sheet with the grading plan (or on the grading plan itself) so it is easier to identify the trees to be removed and those to be preserved. The location of tree preservation measures, tree protection and the limits of construction should also be included on that sheet. *[Scoping Document Section III.C.3.c.(3).]*
137. Page III.C-64 – Section III.C.3.c.(4): The DEIS states that the pH of the soil “likely precludes [bog turtle’s] future presence on the Project site.” In order to demonstrate that this assertion is accurate, the Applicant should support its claim that the pH of the soil found on Site is “not preferred” bog turtle habitat and “precludes their future presence on the Project Site” with reference to peer-reviewed scientific studies. *[Scoping Document Section III.C.3.c.(4).]*
138. Page III.C-64 - Section III.C.3.c.(4): Since a bog turtle was documented by the NYSDEC within 1 mile of the Site and the Site has the characteristics of bog turtle habitat, the USFWS office must be contacted to coordinate Phase II surveys in order to complete the review of Bog Turtle Habitat presence. The results of that coordination should be reflected in the DEIS. *[Scoping Document Section III.C.3.c.(4).]*
139. Page III.C-65 - Section III.C.3.d.(2): The proposed plans do not provide any specific details on tree protection measures that will be employed during the construction process to protect existing trees. This is only discussed in a narrative form. *[Scoping Document Section III.C.3.d.(2).]*

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES [Section III.D]

140. Page III.D-13 – Section D.1.c.(1): The discussion does not address average response time for police calls, and there is no analysis of all calls for service in each patrol sector. *[Scoping Document Section III.D.1.c.(2).]*
141. Page III.D-15 – Section D.1.c.(3): The discussion does not provide average response time for ambulance service calls, and does not provide the average number of annual calls over the past 5 years. *[Scoping Document Section III.D.1.c.(3).]*

142. Page III.D-17 – Section III.D.1.e: Under the discussion of Public Works, the Applicant references the Highway Department as being responsible for maintaining approximately 100 miles. However, that should be changed to approximately 200 lane-miles so that it is consistent with the next following reference in the same paragraph to 60 lane-miles of County and State Roads. *[Scoping Document Section III.D.1.e.]*
143. Page III.D-18 – Section III.D.1.f: On page III.D-18 there is a chart of other multifamily complexes in the Town of New Castle. The chart is incomplete. It fails to list the first half of Riverwoods, the recently constructed project on Station Road in Millwood and several group homes, and is missing several smaller multifamily properties, including but not limited to some in the Town’s two hamlet centers. In addition, it does not identify accessory apartments in the “Rental” category, though mention is made of those multifamily dwelling units in the narrative. There should also be some consideration given to the dormitory housing that exists at Yeshiva and Maryknoll. The reference to “Chappaqua Mews” in the table should be changed to “Chestnut Oaks (formerly known as Chappaqua Mews.” A copy of the correspondence sent to the Town seeking “an updated list of multifamily and affordable dwellings, including accessory apartments and attached dwelling units in conservation subdivisions” should be included in Appendix 2 of DEIS Volume 2. *[Scoping Document Section III.D.1.f.]*
144. Page III.D-23 – Section III.D.2.f: This subsection should discuss future conditions without the Project instead of discussing the number of affordable housing units that the Project would provide. The revised narrative should indicate if there are any other plans for affordable housing units in New Castle or the region. *[Scoping Document Section III.D.2.]*
145. Page III.D-26 - Section III.D.3.a.(1)(a): The reference to “31 affordable workforce units” should be “32 affordable workforce units” and the reference to “52 years of age” should be “55 years of age.” *[Scoping Document Section III.D.3.a.(1)(a).]*
146. Page III.D-33 - Section III.D.3.a.(4): The Scoping Document requires evaluation of the effect of the proposed age restriction in comparison to the policies of the Town Development Plan concerning “senior housing” in the Town. This discussion does not appear to be included in the DEIS. *[Scoping Document Section III.D.3.a.(4).]*
147. Page III.D-37 – Section III.D.3.b.(2): There is no discussion about the potential for increased demand for public recreation services and facilities as a result of residential development for workforce housing. There is also no discussion of consideration of potential for “bulge” in demand for public recreation facilities and services. *[Scoping Document Section III.D.3.b.(2).]*
148. Page III.D-38 – Section III.D.3.c.(1): The calculation for estimating the cost of providing police services is based solely on a memo prepared by Lt. Mark Simmons indicating the number of police calls generated by one condominium complex in the Town (one that is not age restricted). From that, the Applicant has estimated the number of police calls to be 78 per year. The document needs to provide a sample of call volume generated from

similar developments and then assess the impacts and costs. *[Scoping Document Section III.D.3.c.(1).]*

149. Page III.D-38 – Section III.D.3.c.(1): While the DEIS indicates on page III.D-14 that the Proposed Action lies in the East Post, which is a large post and accounts for a high percentage of calls, the narrative does not indicate if the increased number of calls requires an additional officer to patrol the post or will necessitate the need for an additional patrol officer in general. Without this issue being addressed, one cannot reach any real conclusion on what the cost of providing this community service could be. *[Scoping Document Section III.D.3.c.(1).]*
150. Page III.D-38 through III.D-40 - Section III.D.3.c generally: The Scoping Document requires an evaluation of a number of factors related to the provision of emergency services at the Site. The DEIS does not address all of these factors with respect to each of the three types of emergency services and, in some cases, fails to draw conclusions regarding the implications of increases in demand.
- a. In the discussion of impacts on police services, the DEIS should discuss potential implications of increased demand on police facilities, equipment, personnel, and response times, and whether police access to the Site would change. The discussion regarding call volume should draw a conclusion regarding the significance of the increase in calls. *[Scoping Document Section III.D.3.c.(1).]*
 - b. In the discussion of potential impacts on fire services, the DEIS should discuss potential implications of increased demand on fire personnel, response times, and call volume. *[Scoping Document Section III.D.3.c.(1).]*
 - c. The DEIS should describe existing access to the Site for ambulance service providers. *[Scoping Document Section III.D.3.c.(1).]*
 - d. The DEIS Scoping Document includes a long list of specific items that are required to be addressed in regard to fire protection service. However, the DEIS discussion defers much of the analysis of these factors (e.g., fire safety protocol, Site access and on-site circulation requirements) to the site plan approval process. These issues need to be addressed in the DEIS. *[Scoping Document Section III.D.3.c.(3).]*
 - e. Discussion of impacts on police protection and ambulance services does not contain the same level of detail regarding Site access and on-site circulation requirements as the fire protection services section. The DEIS discussion of police protection and ambulance service should be expanded. *[Scoping Document Section III.D.3.c.(3).]*
151. Pages III.D-38 through III.D-40 - Section III.D.3.c.(2): Discussion of impacts on emergency services should include discussion of the effect of future traffic conditions on

- access to the Site in the event of an emergency. [*Scoping Document Section III.D.3.c.(2).*]
152. Page III.D-41 - Section III.D.3.d.(1): Scoping Document requires *quantification of potential additional costs* on service providers for disposal of solid waste. [*Scoping Document Section III.D.3.d.(1).*]
153. Page III.D-41 - Section III.D.3.d.(1): The Scoping Document requires discussion of how the Project would operate in relation to the requirements of the Town's existing Residential Refuse Garbage District. [*Scoping Document Section III.D.3.d.(1).*]
154. Page III.D-42 - Section III.D.3.e.(1): Under the discussion of "Need for Additional Public Works Services, Equipment or Facilities," it is noted that "the estimated costs associated with Public Works is \$105,548 in 2008 dollars for the 119.7 acre Project Site." It should be clarified whether these costs include those related to the establishment of a water and a sewer district. [*Scoping Document Section III.D.3.e.(1).*]
155. Page III.D-41 – Section III.D.3.d.(2): The narrative provided on page III.D-16 describes the Town's existing regulations regarding residential garbage collection, indicating that Chapter 72 of the Town Code states that a dwelling unit becomes a service unit upon receipt of a certificate of occupancy. However, the narrative on page III.D-41 states that "It is anticipated that a private carting company will be used for the residential refuse and recycling pickup at Chappaqua Crossing. The DEIS should discuss the ability of a residential facility "opt out" of the garbage district. The discussion is incomplete and needs clarification to determine if the Applicant's proposed approach is sustainable. [*Scoping Document Section III.D.3.d.(2).*]
156. Page III.D-7 - Section III.D.1.b: The DEIS includes the following statement: "*The Recreation Master Plan indicated that national standards for open space needs provided by the National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) which related to the number of acres per 1,000 people were limited and not utilized in the Recreation Master Plan. Instead, the Plan used an approach, which was tailored to the individual community based on an evaluation of community needs (identified by surveys). However, the surveys provided in the Plan focused primarily on facilities and programming, versus amount of open space. Since the community surveys in the Plan did not discuss amount of open space. Using the NRPA national standards does provide an order of magnitude useful for comparison in the DEIS.*" However, the DEIS should be revised to also reflect the fact that the NRPA no longer endorses national per capita standards for facilities/park acreage. [*Scoping Document Section III.D.1.b.*]
157. Page III.D-40 - Section III.D.3.d.(2): While Town Code Chapter 73 does not apply to the existing practice of solid waste on the Site, more information should be provided regarding the Applicant's decision to continue with the existing private carter service and a projection of per dwelling unit solid waste collection and disposal costs. Senior citizens who are living in New Castle are allowed a reduction in their solid waste fees and any seniors living at Chappaqua Crossing could be entitled to a reduced rate as well. This

topic should be also be addressed, as appropriate, in other sections of the DEIS. *[Scoping Document Section III.D.3.d.(2).]*

158. End of Section III.D - Table III.D-18: Table III.D-18 groups together Emergency Services (Fire District No.1) with Public Works and groups together Recreation and Parks, Emergency Services (Police Department, Chappaqua Volunteer Ambulance, Westchester EMS) and the Chappaqua Public Library. The correct grouping should be the School District and Library as one unit, Recreation and Parks, the Police Department and Public Works as another unit, Fire District #1 as a third and Westchester EMS as a fourth. Once these errors are corrected, the net proceeds that each is expected to receive will change. The narrative portion of the DEIS that is based upon the information presented in this table should be similarly revised once the analysis has been corrected. *[Scoping Document Section III.D.3.e.(1).]*
159. End of Section III.D – Table III.D-18: As the service costs are “unitized,” Public Works costs are based on “Area Covered.” However, it is unclear why the Town’s total acreage was used to calculate the cost of public works services since the Highway Fund only pays for work performed within the public right-of-way and that work is not related to acreage. In addition, the narrative on page III.D-42 states that “... interior roadways will be privately owned and maintained and will not require any additional public works services.” That narrative is inconsistent with the information presented in Table III.D-18 since the table shows the public works costs associated with the Proposed Action to be \$105,548. The methodology used to project the cost for services is incomplete and cannot be used for any analysis. The narrative portion of the DEIS that is based upon the information presented in this table should be similarly revised once the analysis has been corrected. *[Scoping Document Section III.D.3.e.(1).]*
160. End of Section III.D – Table III.D-18: The accuracy of the 2008 adopted public works budget of \$13,543,949 needs to be reconfirmed. The source of that data should be identified, along with information on what is included in that figure (in addition to what is excluded, i.e., solid waste). There is no discussion explaining why the budget for the Water and Highway Funds were added together. They are separate and cover different geographical areas. The narrative portion of the DEIS that is based upon the information presented in this table should be similarly revised once the analysis has been corrected. *[Scoping Document Section III.D.3.e.(1).]*
161. End of Section III.D – Table III.D-18: If the figure for the Public Works budget includes the Water Budget, the proposed revenue generation calculations presented in Table III.D-19 and the related narrative are clearly wrong since water revenues are based upon both consumption and an ad valorem assessment. The narrative portion of the DEIS that is based upon the information presented in this table should be similarly revised once the analysis has been corrected. *[Scoping Document Section III.D.3.e.(1).]*
162. End of Section III.D – Table III.D-19: Tax revenue to the County (both property and sewer tax) should not be used to offset the cost of providing community services. This is misleading and makes the 21% figure cited at the end of this table lower than it actually

would be. The narrative portion of the DEIS that is based upon the information presented in this table should be similarly revised once the analysis has been corrected. [Scoping Document Section III.D.3.e.(1).]

HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES [Section III.E]

163. Page III.E-5 – Sections III.E.1.a.(3) and III.E.3.b: The discussion in the last paragraph on this page should be moved to the Potential Impacts section. [Scoping Document Sections III.E.1.a.(3) and III.E.3.b.]
164. Pages III.E-11 to III.E-12 – Sections III.E.3.b and III.E.4.b: The proposed demolition of the National Register-eligible Bedford Valley House should be identified as an impact. Even if not identified as an impact, its demolition should be discussed in more detail in the Potential Impacts section to explain why it is not a significant adverse impact. There is currently discussion of its demolition in the Potential Mitigation Measures section. Some of this discussion could be appropriate for the Potential Impacts section. [Scoping Document Sections III.E.3.b and III.E.4.b.]
165. Page III.E-12 – Section III.E.4.c: The discussion of the preservation or archiving of artifacts found on the Site should indicate what steps would be taken to preserve any materials unexpectedly encountered during construction. [Scoping Document Section III.E.4.c.]

VISUAL RESOURCES [Section III.F]

166. Page III.F-3 - Section III.F.1.a.(6): If the view arrows depicted on DEIS Figure III.F-1 are intended to graphically describe the “cone of vision” for purposes of undertaking a visual impact analysis under *existing* conditions, View #7 should include analysis of a view directed more towards the North Village buildings rather than in a northeasterly direction. In addition, View #13 should include analysis of a view directed more to the northwest since the view taken from the west would barely include the North Village buildings as required. [Scoping Document Section III.F.1.a.(6).]
167. Page III.F-10 – Section III.F.3.a.(6): If the view arrows depicted on DEIS Figure III.F-1 are intended to graphically describe the “cone of vision” for purposes of undertaking a visual impact analysis under *proposed* conditions, View #7 should include analysis of a view directed more towards the North Village buildings rather than in a northeasterly direction. In addition, View #13 should include analysis of a view directed more to the northwest since the view taken from the west would barely include the North Village buildings as required. [Scoping Document Section III.F.3.a.(6).]

UTILITIES [Section III.G]

168. Page III.G-2 - Section III.G.1.a: The actual capacity of the Millwood Water Treatment Plant and Pump Station is 10 MGD. The existing on-site private distribution system is

- not sufficiently described (e.g., lineal feet, age, material of construction, condition, pipe internal corrosion, fire flow capacity, etc...). [*Scoping Document Section III.G.1.a.*]
169. Page III.G-3 - Section III.G.1.a.(2): The correct spelling of the name that appears on this page is *Gerard* Moerschell.
170. Page III.G-3 - Section II.G.1.a.(2): The narrative accurately indicates that site pressure ranges between 110 to 135 psi. However, this discussion does not reflect a complete understanding of water system hydraulics. Fire flow tests are needed to determine site specific characteristics for fire flows, not static pressure. Under New York State Building and Plumbing Codes, the existing pressure on the Site (which will not be changed by the Project) automatically requires that pressure regulators (PRVs) be installed for all proposed buildings to protect internal plumbing. [*Scoping Document Section II.G.1.a.(2).*]
171. Page III.G-3 - Section II.G.1.a.(3): There is not a sufficient description of the existing mains (e.g., quantity, diameter, etc.). [*Scoping Document Section II.G.1.a.(2).*]
172. Page III.G-4 – Section G.1.b.(1): There is no discussion of the terms under which sewer service was originally provided to the Site and whether the Site was limited to a specific amount of effluent and the basis for such limit. [*Scoping Document Section III.G.1.b.(1).*]
173. Page III.G-5 – Sections III.G.1.b.(3) and III.G.1.b.(4): The third paragraph of subsection (4) should be moved to subsection (3) because it addresses municipal treatment plant capacity and connection policies, not existing easements or restrictions. [*Scoping Document Sections III.G.1.b.(3) and III.G.1.b.(4).*]
174. Page III.G-5 – Section G.1.b.(3): There is no discussion of connection policies. [*Scoping Document Section III.G.1.b.(3).*]
175. Page III.G-11 – Section III.G.3.a.(2): The Scoping Document requires that water demand be described *in relation to the available supply and capacity*. [*Scoping Document Section III.G.3.a.(2).*]
176. Page III.G-14 - Section III.D.1.d: Scoping Document requires an analysis of the potential impacts of the extension of the sewer district. [*Scoping Document Section III.G.3.b(3).*]
177. Page III.G-14 - Section III.G.3.b.(3): The discussion of the need for an extension of the sewer district should discuss what would happen if the district were not extended. [*Scoping Document Section III.G.3.b.(3).*]
178. Page III.G-14 – Section G.3.c.(1): There is no discussion of energy time cycle associated with building demolition and construction. [*Scoping Document Section III.G.3.c.(1).*]

179. Page III.G-16 – Sections III.G.4.a and III.G.4.b: The discussion of the features of the proposed site plan that reflect steps taken to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts on utilities seems incomplete. This could be remedied (at least in part) by moving the final two paragraphs of subsection (b) on page III.G-17 to this section. [*Scoping Document Section III.G.4.a.*]
180. Page III.G-19 – Section G.4.e.(4): The DEIS does not include a subsection discussing modification of the development concept to reflect change in type of principal and accessory uses proposed and/or a reduction in the size of proposed residential dwelling units. [*Scoping Document Section III.G.4.d.(4).*]

TRAFFIC, TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING [Section III.H]²

181. Overall Comment: It is noted that a more detailed review of baseline traffic volumes, future no-build traffic volumes, site traffic estimates, assignment of site traffic, build traffic volumes, existing and future capacity analysis inputs and procedures, analysis of sight lines, public transportation service, mitigation and other pertinent portions of the DEIS during the substantive review stage may result in additional comments that could potentially require the complete revision and/or partial revision of certain aspects of the traffic analysis and the DEIS narrative that has been included to describe the results of that analysis. Mitigation measures that are currently described in the DEIS might, at some point in the future, be accepted as appropriate; however, it should not be assumed at this stage of review that an acceptable level of mitigation has been proposed to accommodate this development. A more detailed review of the traffic study included in Appendix 8 will be undertaken after the DEIS has been accepted as complete for purposes of public review.
182. Section III.H generally: This entire section should be updated as necessary after DEIS Section X.8 (Appendix 8 - Traffic, Transportation and Parking) has been revised. In addition, this subsection should include discussion of every topic mentioned in the adopted DEIS Scoping Document, and should include cross-references to DEIS Section X.8 for a more detailed discussion of technical analyses and/or backup documentation that supports the discussion in Section III.H. It should not be necessary to review DEIS Section X.8 in order to determine if all of the scoping requirements have been met. In several cases, information that was required to be examined in the DEIS is referenced

² According to information provided in the DEIS dated October 15, 2008, the Applicant has identified two off-site mitigation measures that will be implemented prior to the start of construction on the Site. One is the installation of a N.Y.S. Route 117 southbound right-turn lane at the intersection of Roaring Brook Road. The other is the installation of a sidewalk along the west side of N.Y.S. Route 117 south of the Site access driveway and along the north side of Roaring Brook Road from N.Y.S. Route 117 to an area generally opposite the entrance to Horace Greeley High School. If these are the only mitigation measures required to address potential traffic impacts, the proper approvals can be obtained to undertake construction in the affected road rights-of-way, and these mitigation measures are installed at the outset before any on-site construction work begins, then the completion of traffic impact analyses at intermediate times between the date when construction is completed and the date on which the development has been fully occupied would not be necessary. If during the course of review of the Proposed Action, it is determined that additional mitigation measures are required and those measures are not proposed to be in place and operating prior to commencement of on-site construction activities, the Lead Agency may require the completion of additional traffic analyses for intermediate times, as originally required in the Scoping Document.

only in Appendix 8 and has not been adequately summarized and/or mentioned in Section III.H. It is noted that completeness review comments relating to the topics that are required to be discussed in Section III.H appear in this subsection of the summary list as well as in a later subsection on Appendix 8 specifically. Both subsections of this summary list should be reviewed together to gain a clear understanding of required DEIS revisions.

183. Page III.H-8 - Section III.H.1.c: The discussion in subsection (c) does not fulfill all the requirements of the Scoping Document. The discussion should evaluate traffic patterns during peak hours as those conditions affect the routes used by emergency vehicles. The section merely describes the routes used. In addition, the last sentence, which addresses the Project's impacts, should be deleted. [*Scoping Document Section III.H.1.c.*]
184. Pages III.H-10 through III.H-11 - Section III.H.1.f.(4): The School District personnel who were contacted should be identified and the results of those consultations should be described. [*Scoping Document Section III.H.1.f.(4).*]
185. Page III.H-11 – Section III.H.1.g.(1): Discussions and conclusions regarding impacts should be confined to the Potential Impacts section. To that end, the final paragraph of subsection (1), which addresses the Project's impacts, should be deleted.
186. Page III.H-15 - Section III.H.1.i: Discussions and conclusions regarding impacts should be confined to the Potential Impacts section. To that end, the final sentence of subsection (i) should be deleted.
187. Pages III.H-15 through III.H-16 - Section III.H.1.k.(1): The discussion of existing conditions for commuter train service should include information on ridership as a means of describing usage and should provide more detail on frequency of service. [*Scoping Document III.H.1.k.(1).*]
188. Page III.H-16 – Section III.H.1.k.(1): Discussions and conclusions regarding impacts should be confined to the Potential Impacts section. To that end, the next-to-last sentence of carryover paragraph should be deleted.
189. Page III.H-16 - Section III.H.1.k.(2): The document discusses parking at the train station and uses the words “based on observations.” On page III.H-48, the phrase “it is anticipated” appears. This section should instead discuss empirical counts taken at the train station to support the contention that the parking lot has capacity to absorb the additional vehicles. [*Scoping Document Section III.H.1.k.(2).*]
190. Page III.H-17 - Section III.H.1.k.(4): This subsection should discuss the frequency of bus service. [*Scoping Document Section III.H.1.k.(4).*]
191. Page III.H-17 - Section III.H.1.k.(5): The Scoping Document requires measurement of queues and back-ups due to train operations. Although field data may have included information on queuing, there is no discussion of this topic. More quantitative data should be provided. [*Scoping Document Section III.H.1.k(5)(a).*]

192. Page III.H-26 - Section III.H.2.a.(5): This subsection indicates that data from NYSDOT were consulted, but does not indicate whether data from the Westchester County Department of Public Works were consulted. The Scoping Document indicates that data from both agencies was to be provided. [*Scoping Document Section III.H.2.a.(5).*]
193. Page III.H-26 - Section III.H.2.c: This subsection should indicate whether bicycle facilities are anticipated to remain the same under no-build conditions. [*Scoping Document Section III.H.2.c.*]
194. Page III.H-27 - Section III.H.2.d: The Scoping Document requires analysis of traffic impacts associated with alternative assumptions (i.e., single tenant vs. general office use by multiple tenants and medical office use by multiple tenants). It also requires analysis of traffic impacts associated with office support facilities. The information presented in Appendix 8 does not clearly identify each of the alternative land use assumptions, and appears to be missing some of those that were required to be examined. In the appendix of the traffic report contained in Appendix 8, Alternative B-3 is identified as one of the land use scenarios studied; the other one studied is not identified. The Section III.H summary of Appendix 8 is also not detailed enough. When the analysis is expanded to following the Scoping Document requirements, the summary results in Sections III.H and X.8 should both present results for the individual components of each land use scenario separately. [*Scoping Document Section III.H.2.d.*]
195. Page III.H-27 - Section III.H.2.e: Scoping Document requires discussion of conditions of the parking facilities in the Chappaqua hamlet business center in the future without the Project. [*Scoping Document Section III.H.2.e.*]
196. Page III.H-28 - Section III.H.1.a.(1): Potential Impacts - Proposed Development Traffic – The Applicant’s analysis of alternative land use scenarios and the summary discussion of those analyses is not complete. The results of the analyses required in the Scoping Document should be summarized in this section. Results should be presented separately for each component of each of the land use scenarios that are required to be analyzed. [*Scoping Document Section III.H.3.a.(1)(a).i.*]
197. Page III.H-28 - Section III.H.3.a.(1): Potential Impacts - Proposed Development Traffic – The narrative discussion of assumptions describing the specific methodology that was used is very brief and substantially incomplete. That discussion should contain more detail, if not in this section, then at least in Appendix 8. [*Scoping Document Section H.3.a.1.(a).iv.*]
198. Page III.H-29 - Section III.H.3.a.(1): The narrative should clearly identify the number of trucks that are anticipated to serve the Site, separate from other types of vehicles that would be traveling to and from the Site. [*Scoping Document Section III.H.3.a.(1)(a).*]
199. Page III.H-38 – Section III.H.3.a.(1)(f): The summary sentence in subsection “(f)” does not seem to make sense: “*Due to the lack of existing pedestrian and bicycle facilities in*

the vicinity of the Project Site, it is not expected that a significant number of new Chappaqua Crossing residents would increase the demand for those facilities.” [Scoping Document Section III.H.3.a.(1)(f).]

200. Page III.H-39 - Section III.H.3.a.(1)(g): The Scoping Document requires discussion of impacts on taxi service. *[Scoping Document Section III.H.3.a.(1)(g).]*
201. Page III.H-39 - Section III.H.3.a.(1)(g): DEIS should indicate whether Metro-North was consulted regarding impacts. *[Scoping Document Section III.H.3.a.(1)(g).]*
202. Page III.H-39 - Section III.H.3.a.(1)(g): DEIS should indicate whether there is an impact on train station parking. *[Scoping Document Section III.H.3.a.(1)(g).]*
203. Page III.H-39 - Section III.H.3.a.(1)(h): Scoping Document requires tabular summary of the sight distance analysis. *[Scoping Document Section III.H.3.a.(1)(h).]*
204. Page III.H-39 - Section III.H.3.a.(1)(h): Scoping Document requires that conclusions regarding sight distance adequacy be based on sight distance standards. Those standards should be identified here. *[Scoping Document Section III.H.3.a.(1)(h).]*
205. Page III.H-40 - Section III.H.3.a.(2): The narrative discusses construction traffic and the interference with school traffic; however, there is no mention here of the impact associated with transporting off-site the 21,000 cubic yards of excess fill noted on page III.K-4. *[Scoping Document Section III.H.3.a.(2).]*
206. Page III.H-46 - Section III.H.4.e.(2): The Scoping Document requires discussion of additional items with respect to the jitney service, including proposed schedule and identification of all assumptions made to project future ridership. Jitney service was evaluated for commercial and residential service. Other developments, which used jitney bus service, were identified and listed but not discussed in a complete manner. This section should be expanded to provide more information regarding the jitney services provided at the other residential developments identified. The expansion of this section should include the number of vans/buses, ridership, schedule and other pertinent information to provide more information to the Town regarding jitney service for other residential developments in Westchester County. *[Scoping Document Section III.H.4.e.(2).]*
207. Page III.H-51 - Section III.H.4.n: The Scoping Document requires a description of all approvals required to implement mitigation measures and written evidence of the approving board or agency’s preliminary findings that the proposed mitigation measures appear to be reasonable and feasible. The DEIS should include a listing of all anticipated approvals necessary for road improvements or modifications to traffic control in the designated Study Area. These approvals, at a minimum, will require a Highway Work Permit from the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT), permits from the Town and possibly permits from the Westchester County Department of Public Works. The Applicant should provide documentation, if possible, of any preliminary

discussions that were held with a reviewing agency during the preparation of the traffic analysis portion of the DEIS. If possible, the Applicant should present a summary of those preliminary discussions, including an indication of whether the reviewing agencies believe that the recommended improvements are reasonable or feasible. If this information cannot be provided, the DEIS should explain why this requirement of the Scoping Document cannot be met at this time. *[Scoping Document Section III.H.4.d on page 45; should have been Section III.H.4.n instead because subsections “b,” “c,” “d” and “e” above Section III.I are currently mislabeled and should instead have letter designations of “l,” “m,” “n” and “o,” respectively.]*

208. Page III.H-51 - Section III.H.4.n: Scoping Document requires written evidence of preliminary findings by agencies that mitigation measures are reasonable and feasible. *[Scoping Document Section III.H.4.d on page 45; should have been Section III.H.4.n instead because subsections “b,” “c,” “d” and “e” above Section III.I are currently mislabeled and should instead have letter designations of “l,” “m,” “n” and “o,” respectively .]*
209. Page III.H-51 - Section III.H.4.o: Scoping Document requires discussion of necessary commitments for funding of all types of mitigation measures. This discussion should address funding of the jitney service. *[Scoping Document Section III.H.4.e on page 45; should have been Section III.H.4.o instead because subsections “b,” “c,” “d” and “e” above Section III.I are currently mislabeled and should instead have letter designations of “l,” “m,” “n” and “o,” respectively.]*

AIR QUALITY AND NOISE [Section III.I]³

210. Page III.I-2 - Section III.I.1.a.(2): This subsection should indicate whether there are any relevant aspects of the State Implementation Plan, and if there are, discuss them. *[Scoping Document Section III.I.1.a.(2).]*
211. Page III.I-2 - Section III.I.1.a.(3): This subsection should indicate whether there are any designated vehicular emission hot spots. *[Scoping Document Section III.I.1.a(3).]*
212. Pages III.I-3 and III.I-4 - Section III.I.1.a.(6): This subsection should address greenhouse gas emissions more fully and quantify those impacts. *[Scoping Document Section III.I.1.a(6).]*

³ According to information provided in the DEIS dated October 15, 2008, it is stated that the Proposed Action will have no significant adverse impact on air quality and, for that reason, no mitigation is required and . If that conclusion is verified during the course of review of the Project, then the completion of air quality impact analyses at intermediate times between the date when construction is completed and the date on which the development has been fully occupied would not be necessary. If during the course of review of the Proposed Action, it is determined that additional mitigation measures are required and those measures are not proposed to be in place and operating prior to commencement of on-site construction activities, the Lead Agency may require the completion of additional air quality analyses for intermediate times, as originally required in the Scoping Document.

213. Page III.I-8 - Section III.I.1.c.(4): This subsection should indicate whether there are any energy-efficiency improvements planned for the commercial buildings. *[Scoping Document Section III.I.1.c.(4).]*
214. Page III.I-8 and III.I-9 to III.I-10 – Sections III.I.1.c.(4) and III.I.1.c.(8): The analysis of potential impacts on climate change and greenhouse gas emissions should be more quantitative to allow for a comparison to be made between the Proposed Action and other alternatives described in the DEIS. *[Scoping Document Sections III.I.3.a.(4) and III.I.3.a.(8).]*
215. Page III.I-16 – Section III.I.2.b: The DEIS treats Northern Westchester Hospital (NWH) as a presumptive tenant in analysis of future conditions without the Project (this assumption appears throughout the DEIS). The DEIS should either confirm that NWH will be the 4th tenant to occupy the existing building or should be revised to include the additional analysis of impacts associated with general office use occupancy. *[Scoping Document Section III.I.2.]*
216. Pages III.I-18 and III.I-21 – Sections III.I.2.c.(2) and III.I.2.d.(2): The Scoping Document indicates that impact criteria for noise should be based on the absolute values in the New Castle Town Code. The second sentence of the second paragraph of subsection (2) on page III.I-18 and the discussion in subsection (2) on page III.I-21 indicate that the Town Code’s values were used as references but not as impact criteria. The sentence on page III.I-18 should be deleted, and the discussion of impacts on page III.I-21 should be revised. *[Scoping Document Sections III.I.3.b.(3) and III.I.4.b.(2).]*
217. End of Subsection III.I – Table III.I-1: This table should be updated to identify the new NAAQS for airborne lead. *[Scoping Document Section III.I.1.a.(1).]*

COMMUNITY CHARACTER [Section III.J]

218. Page III.J-9 – Section III.J.3.f: The conclusions presented in this subsection cannot be verified until a more complete analysis of traffic impacts associated with alternative land use scenarios is undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Scoping Document, as described elsewhere in this summary. Furthermore, some of the statements that appear in this subsection, comparing the impacts of the Proposed Action with existing conditions, are not consistent with the findings presented elsewhere in the DEIS. For example, the discussion on pages III.H-27 and III.H-29 seems to indicate that the Project would generate more traffic than is generated under existing conditions. If the comparison in trip generation is intended to be between traffic generated by the Project and traffic generated by commercial development of the Site, this should be made clear. *[Scoping Document Section III.J.3.a.]*
219. Page III.J-9 and III.J-12 – Sections III.J.3.d and III.J.4: The discussion of “Cutoff lighting” on page III.J-12 needs to be reconciled with the statement on page III.J-9 that indicates that exterior lighting could increase the visibility of the Project. *[Scoping Document Sections III.J.3.a and III.J.4.a.]*

220. Pages III.J-12 and III.I-20 to III.I-21 – Sections III.J.4 and III.I.2.d.(1): The discussion of noise mitigation in the Noise chapter should be updated with information regarding the temporary berm of topsoil that is described in this section. [*Scoping Document Section III.J.4.a and III.I.4.b.(1).*]
221. Page III.J-12 – Section III.J.4: When blasting is discussed, it should be noted that blasting is not planned (to be consistent with discussions in other portions of DEIS). [*Scoping Document Section III.J.4.*]

CONSTRUCTION [Section III.K]

222. Page III.K-4 - Section III.K.3.a: The Scoping Document requires discussion of type and amount of materials to be removed from the Site. [*Scoping Document Section III.K.3.a.*]
223. Page III.K-4 - Section III.K.3.a: In the section on demolition of existing buildings and parking areas, the Scoping Document requires discussion of the evaluation and treatment of hazardous materials. [*Scoping Document Section III.K.3.a.*]
224. Page III.K-4 - Section III.K.3.a: The DEIS does not discuss impacts of demolition on existing tenants. [*Scoping Document Section III.K.3.a.*]
225. Page III.K-4 - Section III.K.3.a: The DEIS does not identify and discuss disposal location(s) for materials that are not recycled on site and the routes to be taken from the Site to those locations. [*Scoping Document Section III.K.3.a.*]
226. Page III.K-4 - Section III.K.3.a: The DEIS does not provide information regarding the identification of type and amount (in cubic yards) of materials to be removed, evaluation and treatment of potential hazardous materials, location where materials from demolition materials activities are to be taken. [*Scoping Document Section III.K.3.a.*]
227. Page III.K-4 - Section III.K.3.c: The narrative does not describe the types and number of vehicles to be used over the course of the demolition and construction phases and does not provide information on maximum and total number of truck traffic trips to and from the site on a daily basis or plans for traffic control (Maintenance and Protection of Traffic Control Plan) along adjacent roads during the demolition and construction phases. [*Scoping Document Section III.K.3.c.*]
228. Page III.K-49 - Section III.K.3.h: The DEIS does not reflect any discussions with the Police Department and Volunteer Ambulance Corps regarding demolition and construction phasing. [*Scoping Document Section III.K.3.c.*]
229. Page III.K-49 - Section III.K.3.f: The DEIS does not identify and analyze impacts to groundwater from interception and/or capture during construction. [*Scoping Document Section III.K.3.f.*]

ALTERNATIVES [Section IV]

230. Page IV-1 – Introduction: The last sentence on the page references “Table No. IV-2,” which is not included in DEIS Section IV. There is, however, a “Table IV-1,” entitled “Alternate Programs” included in Section IV following page IV-19, which outlines the programs for the five groups of alternatives that are discussed in Section IV. There is also a four-part “Table No. IV-2” entitled “Alternate Program Matrix” that is inexplicably included in Section II following page II-69, although that table would appear to belong in Section IV. Both tables should be part of Section IV and both should be referenced therein so they are readily available for review and can be easily found. We also recommend, however, that Table IV-2 be included in Section I (instead of Section II) with an appropriate table number corresponding to its inclusion in the Executive Summary. *[Scoping Document Section IV – first paragraph]*
231. Pages IV-2 through IV-19: The narrative summaries describing Alternatives A through E inclusive should include more detailed discussion and quantification of each of the potential impact topics as they relate to each specific group of alternatives and each specific alternative. All of the topics addressed for the analysis of the Proposed Action should be included in the discussion of each alternative, and should be compared and contrasted to the Proposed Action and to the other alternatives. The “Alternative Program Matrix” (Table IV-2) should also include information on all of the impact topics as well. The DEIS narrative discussions and Table IV-2 should also include information on impact analysis that are still missing from the DEIS, such as carbon footprint and newly created steep slopes. *[Scoping Document Section IV – first paragraph]*
232. Pages IV-3 and IV-5 – Sections IV.B.1 and IV.B.3: Discussion of the alternatives on these pages presumes that Northern Westchester Hospital (NWH) would be a tenant. Additional analysis will be required if the Applicant cannot confirm that NWH will be the 4th tenant to occupy the existing building. *[Scoping Document Sections IV.B.1 and IV.B.3.]*
233. Page IV-5 – Section IV.B.2: The discussion of why the Applicant believes that single-tenant occupancy would result in higher traffic impacts than the Project may need to be revised once additional analysis required by the Scoping Document is completed. *[Scoping Document Section IV.B.2.]*
234. Pages IV-13 to IV-15 – Sections IV.D.1 and IV.D.2a: The DEIS should include analysis of why there is no significant adverse impact on schools where the proposed action is modified to eliminate all proposed age restrictions. The DEIS indicates that costs associated with educating additional children are \$1,487,000 (with no age restrictions) versus \$248,000 (with age restrictions), but does not explain the criteria used for determining that both cost increases are not significant impacts. *[Scoping Document Section IV.D.1.]*
235. Section IV generally: The Scoping Document requires that the design of each alternative reflect an accurate assessment of the requisite environmental mitigation, including but not

limited to the extent of stormwater management measures necessary to achieve no increase in pollutant loading over existing conditions. No such mitigation analysis is included as part of this section. For example, the alternatives presented in this subsection cannot be fully reviewed under the DEIS subsection pertaining to Land, Water and Ecological Resources because the type of land disturbance is not quantified in Section IV. In order to present a complete summary in Table IV-2, the amount of disturbance to wetlands and steep slopes should be quantified. Mitigation for each impact should also be described. Additionally the amount of wildlife habitat should be quantified separately from “open space.” It is also recommended that potential changes in water quantity total volume be evaluated in order to determine the impact of stormwater. In order to determine the impact on use and conservation of energy, the amount of carbon dioxide equivalents should be calculated for each alternative. The analysis should consider all forms of environmental mitigation associated with potential impacts on the existing resources described in Section III of the DEIS. The DEIS should be revised to comply with this section of the Scoping Document. *[Scoping Document Section IV – first paragraph]*

USE AND CONSERVATION OF ENERGY [Section VII]

236. Page VII-1 – Section VII.A: The DEIS identifies “electricity” as an energy resource. However, the Scoping Document requires that the “energy resources to be used” be listed. An “energy resource” is the material used to produce electricity or energy (i.e., coal, uranium, sunlight, wind, etc.). *[Scoping Document Section VII]*
237. Page VII-1 – Section VII.A: The DEIS does not address the “level” of consumption as required. As defined in Merriam Webster’s Dictionary, the term “level” means a “quantity of consumption” or “the magnitude of a quantity.” In addition, the DEIS does not address the “energy time cycle” as required. *[Scoping Document Section VII]*
238. Page VII-1 – Section VII.C: The DEIS should clarify which level of LEED certification the Proposed Action is intended to meet. Also, information should be presented on the “proposed carbon footprint.” The DEIS should identify the amount of carbon equivalents that would be added with the measures as proposed. *[Scoping Document Section VII]*
239. Pages VII-1 to VII-2 – Section VII.C: Discussion should indicate whether energy efficiency measures are proposed for the commercial buildings. *[Scoping Document Section VII.]*

IRRETRIEVABLE AND IRREVERSIBLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES [Section VIII]

240. Page VIII-1 – Section A: In order to provide a complete assessment of Irretrievable and Irreversible Commitment of Resources, additional analysis needs to be completed to determine the presence of the bog turtles. If bog turtles are present, the Proposed Action could lead to an irretrievable loss of habitat for this endangered species. Revisions to this

narrative may be necessary depending on the results of the additional analysis required.
[Scoping Document Section VIII.]

APPENDICES [Section X]

Appendix 7 – Stormwater Management Report

241. The design parameters and routing summary between DP(s) 1-5 and the Chappaqua Brook “Junction” point should be provided. The design parameters and routing summary between DP(s) 6-8 and the Bedford Road “Junction” point should be provided. If routing between these design points and the junction points was not specifically performed, an explanation should be provided as to why the addition of the flows from each design point are not equivalent to the combined watershed flow.
242. Full sized maps of the Existing and Proposed Drainage conditions should be provided. These areas cannot be reviewed on the 8½-inch x 11-inch maps provided.
243. Details of the proposed outlet structures of the stormwater basins and the diversion structure in Sub-Area CC should be included.
244. An explanation as to how the diversion structure is intended to function should be provided. It should specify the elevations and flows at which the diversions will take place and what it is intended to achieve relative to re-development requirements.
245. The report should explain why the “Detention Times Summary” for the 1-year storm provides the average plug time instead of the center of mass as required by the NYSSMDM.
246. Detailed plans and cross sectional views of the proposed stormwater basins are not provided, therefore a determination can not be made whether the designs comply with the NYSSMDM.
247. The chart entitled “Stormwater Management Basin Volume Calculations” should be amended to indicate the tributary drainage area to each practice, and the required and provided WQv and CPv. Also, the “NA” entries for the CPv for basin CC-S should be explained.
248. The Scoping Document requires that the Proposed Action discuss existing flooding problems and evaluate potential impacts on downstream areas to the east of the Site. It also requires that the impact of the increased runoff volume be evaluated. This has not satisfactorily been provided in the Report. Since the amount of impervious coverage in this watershed will increase by five acres, there is the potential for adverse downstream impacts. In addition to an analysis of peak runoff flow, the report must describe potential impacts to stormwater quantity by addressing proposed runoff volume. Also, in order to properly evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed mitigation practices as they relate

to the downstream watershed, a downstream analysis utilizing the 10% Rule should be performed in accordance with Section 4.8 of the NYSSMDM.

249. The Stormwater Management Report and Section III (C)(2)(c)(3)(d) state that a portion of the project (Subwatershed CC-S) was considered a re-development area in accordance with Chapter 9 of the NYSSMDM. Additional information is needed in order to determine compliance with Chapter 9 of the NYSSMDM. This information should first provide documented justification for use of the proposed alternative approaches contained in Chapter 9. It should contain Site specific circumstances that do not allow proper sizing and installation of the management practices contained in Chapter 6 of the Manual. Next, a plan must be provided that clearly indicates how the re-development portion of the project was calculated and include all existing and proposed pervious and impervious disturbed areas. The information should indicate which areas are proposed to be treated at reduced volume requirements. Also, calculations that demonstrate how the water quantity controls were sized should be provided. An explanation should be included with the “Stormwater Management Basin Volume Calculations” chart that clarifies why CPv information is not provided.

Appendix 8 - Traffic, Transportation and Parking Study

250. Traffic signal timing plans from the NYSDOT are not included. Signal Plans (if available) are needed to appropriately review the capacity analysis section. [*Scoping Document Section III.H.1.a.*]
251. Section C - Study Area (Page 4): Measurements of existing traffic volumes during the typical roadway peak hours, when schools are open and during Saturday midday peak periods at the intersection of Roaring Brook Road at Metro-North Railroad crossing, are not included. The purpose is to identify traffic volumes at the railroad crossing. [*Scoping Document Section III. H.1.a.(9).*]
252. Section E – Traffic Count Data – Manual/Machine: Automatic Traffic Recorders (ATRs) were not installed on N.Y.S. Route 117, north of Roaring Brook Road, for at least one week to identify the roadway peak periods, peak hour volumes and hourly patterns. [*Scoping Document Section III. H.1.b.(1).*]
253. Section E – Traffic Count Data – Manual/Machine: Automatic Traffic Recorders (ATRs) were not installed on Roaring Brook Road, east of Saw Mill River Parkway, for at least one week to identify roadway peak periods, peak hour volumes and hourly patterns. [*Scoping Document Section III. H.1.b.(3).*]
254. Section O – Emergency Services (Page 78): The study does not evaluate traffic patterns during the relevant peak hours as those conditions affect accessibility of the Site for emergency services by police, fire and ambulance corps personnel and apparatus. It should provide an identification and description of emergency and truck routes, both on the Site and within the Study Area. An analysis was not provided to evaluate the impacts

of the project on the emergency services; only a summary statement was provided. *[Scoping Document Section III.H.1.c.]*

255. Section C – Study Area (Page 4) and Section M – Pedestrian Activity (Page 77): Vehicle classification (e.g., passenger vehicles, school buses, large trucks), pedestrian counts and bicycle movements were not provided. The document should include a summary discussion of field observations for both pedestrian and bicycle movements and activities within the Study Area, as appropriate. If no field observations or studies have been conducted, the Applicant should complete those field surveys and incorporate them, as well as a summary discussion of results, in the next edition of the DEIS. *[Scoping Document Section III.H.1.f.]*
256. Section S – Special Event Conditions at Horace Greeley H.S. (Page 84): The Applicant did not consult with or contact Chappaqua Central School District to obtain information on all special events to determine how often these events occur and how many people typically attend. There is no analysis to determine whether the arrivals and departures for those events correspond to any of the peak traffic hours for the Proposed Action. The Applicant only used a school calendar. *[Scoping Document Section III.H.1.f.(4).]*
257. Section E – Traffic Count Date – Manual/Machine: Automatic Traffic Recorders (ATRs) were not installed on N.Y.S. Route 117, north of Roaring Brook Road and Roaring Brook Road east of Saw Mill River Parkway, for at least one week to identify peak hour volumes and hourly patterns. *[Scoping Document Section III.H.1.h.(1).]*
258. New subsection on “Site Parking” needed between Section Q – Accident Data and Section R – Parking in the Downtown Hamlet Area (Page 83): The current parking supply and current parking demand was not provided. *[Scoping Document Section III.H.1.l.(1).]*
259. Section R – Parking in the Downtown Hamlet Area (Page 83): There was no analysis provided to address potential impacts on parking facilities in the Chappaqua Hamlet Business Center, including commuter parking, on-street parking, and off-street parking. *[Scoping Document Section III.H.2.e.]*
260. New subsection needed on “Trucks Servicing the Site”: Trip generation estimates used for each project component did not include the number of trucks anticipated to serve the Site. *[Scoping Document Section III.H.3.a.(1)(a)(i).]*
261. Section T – Alternatives (Page 88): The Scoping Document required discussion of the specific methodology used to compute potential impacts. The response provided was generic and does not completely respond to the Scoping Document requirements. Other than to state that the analyses of all alternatives were based upon the same assumptions concerning signal timing/phasing as the Proposed Action, there was no substantive discussion of the specific methodology used to evaluate potential impacts. The “basis” for the assumptions used was not stated. Only a portion of the original Scoping Document was addressed and the narrative provided is too generic and cursory in its treatment of the

subject. A more detailed description of projected site generated traffic for each alternative examined should be provided, included detailed information on each separate land use component, as appropriate. The basis for assumption made should reference the ITE Trip Generation Handbook. The results of the impact analysis for each alternative land use scenario should be described in more detail for each intersection. *[Scoping Document Section H.3.a.1.a.iv.]*

262. Section E – Year 2015 No-Build Traffic Volumes (Page 7): The analysis did not include a phasing program for the project and the suggested horizon year for each phase, if any. *[Scoping Document Section III.H.3.a.(1)(d).]*
263. Section B – LOS Table and Queue Table: Summaries of the intersection and stopping sight distance analysis results in a tabular format were not provided. *[Scoping Document Section III.H.3.a.(1)(h).]*
264. New subsection needed on “Site Parking” between Section Q – Accident Data and Section R – Parking in the Downtown Hamlet Area (Page 83): The study does not provide an analysis to identify parking needs or compare results of that analysis to off-street parking requirements of Town Zoning Ordinance. *[Scoping Document Section III.H.3.b.]*
265. New subsection needed on “Potential Mitigation Measures”: The study does not address roadway improvements, such as but not limited to northbound left turn lane on N.Y.S. Route 117. *[Scoping Document Section III.H.4.k.(1).]*
266. New subsection needed on “Potential Mitigation Measures”: The Off-Site Traffic Improvements subsection does not include the provision of Westchester County DOT bus service between the Site and the Chappaqua Train Station. *[Scoping Document Section III.H.4.k.(2).]*
267. New subsection needed on “Potential Mitigation Measures”: The Off-Site Traffic Improvements subsection does not address possible traffic calming techniques on Roaring Brook Road. *[Scoping Document Section III.H.4.k.(3).]*
268. New subsection needed on “Potential Mitigation Measures”: The Off-Site Traffic Improvements subsection does not address widening of Roaring Brook Road at its intersection with N.Y.S. Route 117 to provide for left and right turning lanes. *[Scoping Document Section III.H.4.k.(4).]*
269. New subsection needed on “Potential Mitigation Measures”: The Off-Site Traffic Improvements subsection does not address widening of westbound Roaring Brook Road to two lanes, between its intersection at N.Y.S. Route 117 and the High School entrance, to provide dedicated lanes to carry traffic turning onto Roaring Brook Road from both northbound and southbound N.Y.S. Route 117 and to provide potentially improved traffic flow in the area of the High School. *[Scoping Document Section III.H.4.k.(5).]*

270. New subsection needed on “Potential Mitigation Measures”: The Off-Site Traffic Improvements subsection does not address improvement of sight lines at intersection of N.Y.S. Route 117 at Cowdin Lane. [*Scoping Document Section III.H.4.k.(7)(a).*]
271. New subsection needed on “Potential Mitigation Measures”: The Off-Site Traffic Improvements subsection does not address improvement of sight lines at intersection of N.Y.S. Route 117 at Annandale Drive. [*Scoping Document Section III.H.4.k.(7)(b).*]
272. New subsection needed on “Potential Mitigation Measures”: The study does not include evaluation of techniques to prevent the use of shortcuts, using Annandale Drive, Kittle Road and Taylor Road, between N.Y.S. Route 117 and N.Y. S. Route 128. [*Scoping Document Section III.H.5.b.*]
273. New subsection needed on “Potential Mitigation Measures”: The study does not provide a discussion of specific commitments from all necessary agencies and property owners in regard to funding, implementation and/or maintenance of all proposed traffic, parking and/or mass transit improvements and/or other types of mitigation measures. [*Scoping Document Section III.H.5.e.*]