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Echo Bay Center  1/29/13
A. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT AND PURPOSE OF THE DEIS

This Draft Environmental Impact Statement (“DEIS”) has been prepared and submitted by Forest City Residential, Inc. (the “Applicant”) to the City Council of the City of New Rochelle (the “Lead Agency”), as lead agency under the State Environmental Quality Review Act (“SEQRA”) for the environmental review of the Applicant’s proposed Echo Bay Center project (the “Proposed Action” or the “Project”) on two parcels currently owned by the City of New Rochelle – the Department of Public Works City Yard parcel and the City Armory parcel (the “Project Site”) in the City of New Rochelle, New York.

The Project Site, located at 224 East Main Street and 260-70 East Main Street, consists of two tax parcels, totaling approximately 9.4 acres in the City of New Rochelle. The Project Site is located on the northeastern side of the City, with the eastern edge adjacent to Echo Bay, which is a sheltered inlet off the Long Island Sound. The City Yard parcel is approximately 6.5 acres, and is designated on the City Tax Map as Block 846-Lot 5. The Armory parcel is approximately 2.9 acres, and is designated on the City Tax Map as Block 846-Lot 22. Both parcels are located within the PWD-5 Zoning District (PWD-5 District). The City Yard parcel is currently used for DPW operations, including office space; equipment, parts and fleet vehicle storage; vehicle repair within various onsite buildings; recycling program for commingled waste; fleet vehicles storage; and sand/salt storage. The Armory parcel houses the main Armory building, Administrative building (also referred to as the “Annex”) and several outbuildings. The Armory was acquired by the City in 1997 and was utilized for a variety of uses such as Fire and Police Department training, movie screenings, and storage of building materials for Habitat for Humanity. The City Council has been reviewing two redevelopment proposals for the Armory buildings that were submitted in July. At its September 19, 2012 meeting, the City Council selected “Good Profit” team for the redevelopment of the majority of the Armory parcel, including the Armory building. In November 2012, the Council approved a six-month, non-binding “letter of agreement” (“LOA”) between the City and Good Profit, which has not yet been signed, pursuant to which Good Profit and the City will explore the redevelopment of the Armory buildings.

The Project includes a mixed-use commercial and residential building to be located along the Echo Bay waterfront and East Main Street in New Rochelle. The building contains approximately 25,000 square of commercial retail space located along East Main Street and 285 residential units. The residential units include 71 studio apartments, 137 one-bedroom apartments and 77 two-bedroom apartments, for a total residential gross floor area of approximately 302,500 square feet. An additional 15,900 square of residential amenity/leasing space is included on the Main Street level of the building. Of the 285 dwelling units, 29 units (10%) would be designated “Moderate-Income Housing Units” affordable for households with annual incomes not exceeding 80% of the Westchester County median annual income. The Project also includes the cleanup and restoration of the Echo Bay shoreline within the Project Site and the creation of a public waterfront esplanade providing physical public access to the waterfront, a small non-motorized boat launch area and a pedestrian bridge connection to the northern edge of the Westchester County WWTP parcel with future connection to Five Islands Park. The waterfront esplanade also has been designed to connect to any future open space west of the Armory parcel.
The Project would anchor Main Street and extend its retail frontage, while opening up both a visual corridor to the bay via the proposed new “Armory Place” and a physical connection to the bay via the proposed esplanade around the perimeter of the Project Site. Two levels of structured parking would be located within the building to shield all residential and retail parking from view. Access to the lower parking level would be through a driveway at the location of the existing City Yard driveway. The existing Armory driveway would be widened as a shared entrance drive between the proposed Project and the Armory Annex building in order to provide access to the upper parking level, the residential lobby, and a 50-space public parking area to be constructed on the Armory parcel with a walkway connection to the waterfront esplanade.

As required by SEQRA and the detailed Scoping Document adopted by the Lead Agency, this DEIS examines (in Section VI) the potentially significant environmental impacts of the Proposed Action with respect to land-use, zoning and planning consistency; land, water and ecology; utilities; visual resources; transportation and parking; noise and air quality; socioeconomic and fiscal conditions; community facilities and services; historic and archaeological resources; hazardous materials; and construction impacts. The DEIS also examines (in Section V) six alternatives to the Proposed Action and compares the expected impacts from each of those alternatives to those of the Proposed Action.

B. LIST OF INVOLVED AGENCIES AND REQUIRED APPROVALS AND PERMITS

The “Involved” Agencies are defined under the State Environmental Quality Review Act (617.2) as those state or local agencies that have jurisdiction by law to fund, approve or directly undertake an action. If an agency will ultimately make a discretionary decision to fund, approve or undertake an action, then it is an involved agency, notwithstanding that it has not received an application for funding or approval at the time the SEQR is commenced. The Lead Agency is also an Involved Agency. The Involved Agencies and the permits and approvals they may grant for the Project, include:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. New Rochelle City Council</td>
<td>• Amendments to the City Zoning Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Amendments to the Main/Echo Urban Renewal Plan, if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Disposition of the Project Site to the Applicant for redevelopment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Special permit approval for the Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. New Rochelle Planning Board</td>
<td>• Site plan approval for the Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Subdivision approval for the Project, if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. New Rochelle Bureau of Buildings and</td>
<td>• Approval of the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Public Works</td>
<td>• Tree Removal Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demolition Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Building Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. New Rochelle Professional Architectural</td>
<td>• Review of building architecture and urban design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Committee (PARC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. New Rochelle Industrial Development</td>
<td>• Approval of Payment-In-Lieu-Of-Tax Agreement (&quot;PILOT Agreement&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Westchester County</td>
<td>• Planning Board 239-m review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Department of Environmental Facilities approval of sewer line relocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and extensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Department of Health approvals related to water and sewer line extensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and connections, water supply backflow device; and resident pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. New York State</td>
<td>• Office of General Services for administration of state-owned lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Department of Environmental Conservation approvals related to stormwater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>discharge, stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP), tidal wetlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>permit, any required environmental remediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Department of State for Long Island Sound Coastal Management Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consistency review and coastal consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Department of Transportation referral jurisdiction related to Main Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>roadway improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• State Historic Preservation Office related to impact on cultural resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Possible State legislative approval for disposition of waterfront land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>• Approvals related to water’s edge improvements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND POTENTIAL MITIGATION MEASURES

As required by the Lead Agency’s Scoping Document, Section VI of this DEIS examines in detail the expected environmental impacts of the Proposed Action in the year 2016, when both the residential and commercial components of the Project are expected to be complete and substantially occupied. The DEIS identifies those impacts that would be “significant” under SEQRA and then identifies and assesses any feasible measures (“Mitigation Measures”) to mitigate those impacts.

Section VI (and the accompanying technical reports attached as Appendices to this DEIS) provides complete analyses of all potentially significant environmental impacts of the Project. For purposes of this Executive Summary, those analyses can be summarized briefly as follows:

1. LAND USE, ZONING AND PLANNING CONSISTENCY

The Project is consistent with the City’s long standing redevelopment vision for the Echo Bay area. The Project advances many of the goals and objectives in the Comprehensive Plan related to the Echo Bay area, as well as other general City-wide objectives. However, one component of the Urban Renewal Plan related to the type of permitted commercial land use would need to be modified: the URP does not identify retail or restaurant commercial uses as permitted on the lower floors and the URP would need to be modified to permit the approximately 25,000 square feet of neighborhood and service retail and restaurants proposed for the ground floor of the mixed-use building. The inclusion of retail and restaurant uses on the first floor of mixed-use buildings is consistent with the land use in the area and is not expected to have a significant impact on the redevelopment of the parcel.

The Project is consistent with the City’s overall vision for the Echo Bay redevelopment area as well as with the overall design concepts and guidelines of the PWD-5 District. However, in order to implement the Project, certain zoning requirements would need to be amended.

To permit the required density, the maximum floor area ratio (FAR) for residential uses, maximum building height, maximum total FAR, minimum lot area per dwelling unit, and maximum building coverage in the PWD-5 District must be amended. It should be noted that the City Yard parcel and Armory parcel are the only two parcels in the City in the PWD-5 Zoning District. Architectural articulation of the building and careful location of the building within the Site’s existing topography have been incorporated into the site plan design in order to reduce the potential impacts associated with an increase in building height and density. As a result, the Project is not anticipated to have significant adverse impacts on zoning or the neighboring land uses, and no additional mitigation is required.

2. LAND, WATER AND ECOCLOGICAL RESOURCES

In order to prevent potential adverse impacts from soil loss due to tidal erosion and stormwater runoff, the Project includes permanent stabilization of the shoreline with a rip rap stone or concrete armor and reconstruction of the deteriorated seawalls with a concrete
or timber bulkhead system. In order to prevent potential adverse impacts to adjacent properties and the waterway from soil loss due to stormwater runoff, the Project includes permanent stabilization of the shoreline with vegetative cover. An Erosion and Sediment Control Plan for the Project has been developed to protect the waterway. As a result of the current degraded conditions, proposed modifications to the shoreline would provide positive benefits for the ecological resources in this area, particularly through a reduction in industrial intensity and a change in nature of light industrial uses.

3. **Utilities**
   The proposed Project will increase water, sewer, electric and energy demand for natural gas. However, no significant impacts are expected upon completion of the Project as the existing infrastructure network is expected to be either capable of or upgraded to support the utility demands of the Project.

4. **Visual Resources**
   Portions of the building would be more visible from public vantage points than the existing buildings on the City Yard. The architectural character of the proposed building complements the nearby residential areas unlike the current City Yard buildings which are currently seasonally visible. The Echo Bay Center redevelopment would replace a semi-industrial use, while complementing adjacent commercial and mixed uses, as well as provide visual improvements to neighborhoods seeing the site. The Project would also utilize a combination of cut-off street lights and lighted bollards to provide a safe environment for visitors in the evening hours. Public parking areas would utilize appropriately-scaled street lights styled to complement the architecture. Proposed landscaping would utilize native and salt-tolerant species. The use of shrubs, ornamental grasses, and flowering trees in addition to street and shade trees accent both the building architecture and public open space areas. The Project would not result in any significant visual impacts.

5. **Transportation and Parking**
   Certain traffic movements may experience some delays at the signalized intersections during the Peak Hours even without the Project. However, overall all intersections would generally operate at an acceptable Level of Service and the Project would not have a significant impact on these locations. The Project would also not have an impact on the nearby unsignalized intersections. Since the proposed Project would not have a significant impact on traffic operating conditions, no improvements are required, except as described below.

   As recommended under No-Build conditions, at the intersection of Echo Avenue and Main Street, additional green time should be provided to the eastbound Echo Avenue advance phase. At the intersection of Main Street and Armory Place, as part of the Project, modifications would be provided to the existing U-turn in order to enhance traffic movement from the new Armory Place driveway. Armory Place has been designed to provide one lane per direction. A left-turn lane would be provided along southbound Main Street/Huguenot Street. A traffic signal would be installed. This traffic signal would not meet typical signal warrants based solely upon the volumes exiting Armory Place but would meet signal warrants when incorporating the U-turn from Main Street and the non-standard
configuration of the intersection. The traffic signal would be located between two existing traffic signals, at Stephenson Boulevard and at Echo Avenue, and thus speeds will be limited in that area. The proposed Project has been designed to avoid adverse impacts relating to access, circulation and traffic generation. As part of the Project, the following mitigation measures are proposed:

(1) **Signal Timing**  
At the intersection of Echo Avenue and Main Street, approximately eight seconds of additional green time would be provided to the eastbound Echo Avenue advance phase. This should be performed without or with the Project.

(2) **Traffic Signal**  
At the intersection of Main Street/Huguenot Street and Armory Place, a new traffic signal would be installed. This signal should be timed in coordination with the existing traffic signals at Stephenson Boulevard and at Echo Avenue.

(3) **Modify Median**  
At the intersection of Main Street/Huguenot Street and Armory Place, the median would be modified to provide a left-turn lane on southbound Huguenot Street.

(4) **Armory Place**  
At the intersection of Main Street/Huguenot Street and Armory Place, Armory Place would be designed to permit a full entrance lane and an exit lane. Some on-street parking would need to be modified slightly to accommodate a full entrance to the Project Site. The adjacent roadway network with the proposed Project would generally continue to operate similarly to the 2016 No-Build conditions. With the mitigation measures described above, the proposed Project will not have significant adverse impacts on traffic and transportation, and no additional mitigation is required.

The proposed Project has been designed to avoid impacts related to parking, mass transit, pedestrians and bicycling and no significant adverse impacts are expected. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

### 6. Noise and Air Quality

Construction activities associated with the Project would result in temporary construction impacts, including noise and dust. The Project would comply with the New Rochelle Noise Control Ordinance, which regulates noise during construction periods. Noise levels may temporarily increase due to construction-related traffic and on-site use of construction equipment. Project generated traffic would not cause significant noise impacts at the six affected intersections, and operation of Project uses would not result in any significant noise impacts. Mitigation measures would be implemented as appropriate during construction phases to minimize emissions of fugitive dust and emissions from trucks and on-site equipment. Fugitive dust impacts from excavation and storage of materials are temporary in nature and would be mitigated by using best construction practices such as wetting the soil.
surfaces, covering trucks and stored materials with a tarpaulin to reduce windborne dust, and proper maintenance of equipment.

7. **Socioeconomic and Fiscal**

The Project will add approximately 524 new residents, of which 22 are expected to be public school students. At the same time, overall population is projected to decrease in Census Tract 59.02, Block Group 1 and within a one mile radius of the Project Site by the year 2016. The addition of the new residents would either arrest this projected population decline, or cause the population in these geographies to increase only slightly from the existing condition. With the projected decline in population for the area surrounding the Project Site, it is expected that the introduction of 524 new residents (of which 22 would be public school students) would not have a significant adverse impact on the City or neighborhood demographic conditions. No significant adverse impacts associated with socioeconomic conditions are expected and therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

Additionally, with the expected 12% projected decreases in residents age 0 to 19 in the Census Tract and Block Group in which the Project is located, it is expected that the introduction of 22 public school aged children to the project area would not have significant adverse impact on demographic conditions and therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

Finally, the construction and operations phases of the proposed Project would create approximately 127 construction jobs, 59 retail and residential property jobs, and induce an additional 1,022 jobs in the regional economy. As these job creation projections are highly positive for both New Rochelle and the greater New York City region, no mitigation measures are required.

The Project would generate both fiscal benefits and costs for the City of New Rochelle. The Project would generate approximately $434,069 in municipal costs and $385,000 in education costs per year. In contrast, the proposed Project would also generate approximately $1.22 million in annual municipal and school district tax revenues, over $138,500 in municipal refuse and parks and recreation fees, and over $275,000 in utility and general sales tax revenue for the City. Thus, the proposed Project is projected to have a net positive fiscal impact on the City of New Rochelle of $818,738 per year. In addition, the Project would result in approximately $1.02 million in one-time fees and charges. As the fiscal impact of the proposed Project is positive, no mitigation measures are required.

In addition to the estimated fees and miscellaneous revenues generated by the proposed Project, the Applicant has offered to contribute to the City (1) $2.5 million to help the City defray debt service costs to be incurred in connection with the relocation and reconstruction of the City’s DPW facility, and (2) approximately $2.5 million to defray any costs the City might incur in connection with the City’s acquisition and reuse of the Nelstad parcel and/or reuse of the Mancuso Marina parcel. These contributions would be paid over the three years of 2014-2016. The Nelstad and Mancuso Marina parcels are located to the west of the Armory parcel. Over the years, these parcels have been part of the City’s vision for future
development of Echo Bay due to their proximity to the Project Site and the opportunity for future expansion of the waterfront esplanade, parking and pedestrian access. The Mancuso Marina parcel is currently owned by the City.

In addition to the net fiscal impact calculation described above, an additional scenario was examined to assess the potential fiscal impacts of the Project with a PILOT proposed by the Applicant. The scenario assumes a PILOT, which would generate revenue sufficient to cover the projected education costs associated with the new housing units. The assumed Build Year is 2016, and the PILOT period was assumed to be 20 years. The PILOT Agreement would be made with the New Rochelle Industrial Development Agency (“NRIDA”). The Uniform Tax Exemption Policy of the NRIDA provides that the term of a PILOT Agreement shall be 15 years, but gives the agency the flexibility to extend the term to the 20 years proposed by the Applicant. The PILOT scenario assumes that in 2014 all of the permit fees for the Project would be collected by the City. The PILOT would first be due when the development comes on-line in 2016 and general government and education costs begin to be incurred by the City and School District. From and after the termination of the PILOT agreement in 2036, the Project Site would be subject to real property taxes in the same manner as any other non-exempt property in the City. This scenario results in an annual net fiscal positive for the City during the PILOT period, followed by much more substantial fiscal positives in the years that follow 2036. The table below illustrates a comparison of the City tax revenue streams under both the PILOT and non-PILOT (taxation) scenarios:
Table No. II-1: Annual City Revenue, PILOT vs. non-PILOT Scenarios
(Section IV.H, Table No 35)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tax Revenue w/PILOT</th>
<th>Tax Revenue w/o PILOT</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$577,707</td>
<td>$1,375,493</td>
<td>-$797,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$592,150</td>
<td>$1,409,880</td>
<td>-$817,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$606,953</td>
<td>$1,445,127</td>
<td>-$838,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$622,127</td>
<td>$1,481,255</td>
<td>-$859,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$637,680</td>
<td>$1,518,286</td>
<td>-$880,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$653,622</td>
<td>$1,556,244</td>
<td>-$902,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$669,963</td>
<td>$1,595,130</td>
<td>-$925,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$686,712</td>
<td>$1,635,028</td>
<td>-$948,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>$703,880</td>
<td>$1,675,904</td>
<td>-$972,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>$721,477</td>
<td>$1,717,802</td>
<td>-$996,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>$739,514</td>
<td>$1,760,747</td>
<td>-$1,021,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>$758,001</td>
<td>$1,804,765</td>
<td>-$1,046,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>$776,952</td>
<td>$1,849,885</td>
<td>-$1,072,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>$796,375</td>
<td>$1,896,132</td>
<td>-$1,099,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>$816,285</td>
<td>$1,943,535</td>
<td>-$1,127,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>$836,692</td>
<td>$1,992,123</td>
<td>-$1,155,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2032</td>
<td>$857,609</td>
<td>$2,041,926</td>
<td>-$1,184,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>$879,049</td>
<td>$2,092,975</td>
<td>-$1,213,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2034</td>
<td>$901,026</td>
<td>$2,145,299</td>
<td>-$1,244,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>$923,551</td>
<td>$2,198,931</td>
<td>-$1,275,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td>$2,233,905</td>
<td>$2,233,905</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2037</td>
<td>$2,310,252</td>
<td>$2,310,252</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2038</td>
<td>$2,368,009</td>
<td>$2,368,009</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2039</td>
<td>$2,427,209</td>
<td>$2,427,209</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>$2,487,889</td>
<td>$2,487,889</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2041</td>
<td>$2,550,086</td>
<td>$2,550,086</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2042</td>
<td>$2,613,838</td>
<td>$2,613,838</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. **Community Facilities and Services**

The impact on publicly provided emergency services from the Project is not expected to be significant. Given the proximity of the nearest firehouse and the code safety requirements included in the building design and the relatively small number of calls estimated for the Project as a percentage of overall City calls and Station 1 calls, significant adverse impacts on emergency services are not expected as a result of the Project and therefore, no mitigation measures are required. In addition, the Project would generate property and sales tax
revenue for the City on sites that are currently tax exempt, which could be utilized to offset any increased emergency service staffing or equipment required as a result of cumulative development in the area.

The demographic projections show a trend that the school age population in the Project Site area is declining over the next few years, and therefore the addition of 22 new public school students to the School District would have minimal impacts. Using the School District’s marginal cost figure per new student ($17,500), education costs for the 22 project-generated public school children of $385,000. Since the Project’s commercial and residential components would generate tax revenues (via a PILOT for 20 years and full tax revenue when the PILOT ends) to the City School District, the cost associated with educating the children in the Project would be paid by the proposed development. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

9. **HISTORIC AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL**
   The Project assumes the retention of the main barrel-vaulted Armory building and Annex with the proposed mixed-use development on the Project Site. The main Armory building and Annex would remain, and could be re-used in a manner consistent with the City’s approved redevelopment proposal. The mixed use building and Echo Bay waterfront esplanade has been designed with a majority of the development occurring within areas of previous development on the City Yard parcel, including many parking lots, maintenance garages, and office buildings, where extensive site disturbance exists. Since the prehistoric and historic potential of the City Yard property is ranked as low, no impacts are expected and no additional mitigation measures are required.

10. **HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**
    A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Phase I) was performed by Roux Associates, Inc. on the City Yard and Armory parcels in July 2012. According to the Phase I Environmental Site Assessments of the City Yard and Armory parcels, there are a number of existing conditions, both within and adjacent to the Site, that present current and future potential risks for contamination. A Phase II Investigation is recommended to further examine the RECs identified for both the City Yard and Armory parcels. Prior to acquisition of each project parcel, additional investigation would be performed to address any RECs. The findings from these investigations would be used to create a Remedial Action Work Plan(s) which would include all mitigation necessary to ensure that the redevelopment is compliant with all Federal, State and Local regulations and guidelines and that it is protective of human health and the environment.

11. **CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS**
    Construction of the Project has been designed and would be managed to minimize and mitigate potential short-term construction-related impacts to the greatest extent possible. Measures to reduce any negative impacts during construction include the following: best management practices for earthwork and erosion control, blasting protocol (including pre-construction surveys and vibration monitoring), hazardous materials remediation program,
limiting construction traffic between the hours of 7:00 am and 3:30 pm, and construction equipment maintained and muffled in compliance with noise emission standards.

D. REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED ACTION

Six alternatives have been analyzed with regard to the same types of potential environmental impacts assessed in in this DEIS for the Project. The alternatives evaluated include the following:

- Alternative A: “No Build” (No Action);
- Alternative B: Proposed Project with vacant Armory building and removal of the Annex building;
- Alternative C: Existing zoning alternatives:
  - C-1: Development of the City Yard parcel and Armory parcel as an assembled single project site;
  - C-2: Separate development of the Armory parcel and City Yard parcel;
- Alternative D: Proposed Project with Armory Building and preservation of the Annex building (i.e., the current Good Profit proposal based on its site plan dated July 20, 2012 which includes use of Mancuso Marina and Nelstad properties for public parking and Huntington Place for access to Armory parcel):
  - D-1: Development of the proposed Project and the Good Profit site plan with minor modifications to Armory Place design for improved on-site traffic circulation.;
  - and
  - D-2: The D-1 Alternative without minor modifications to Armory Place design.

1. ALTERNATIVE A: NO BUILD (NO ACTION) ALTERNATIVE

Under the “No-Build” alternative, the Project Site would remain in its existing condition, with single-story DPW office and storage buildings, garages, sand/salt storage, recycling storage and surface parking for employee and City vehicles. The Armory buildings would remain in their current condition. Armory Place would not be constructed and the Echo Bay waterfront would remain deteriorated and lack public access.

This alternative would have fewer impacts than the Project in with regards to utility use, increased building height, transportation and parking, noise and air quality, population and public school children increase, community facilities, and construction impacts.

This alternative, as compared to the proposed Project, would not have the benefits of developing an underutilized waterfront parcel consistent with the City’s vision for Echo Bay, providing public amenities and waterfront access to Echo Bay, providing view corridors to Echo Bay, improving the deteriorating shoreline, improving stormwater treatment, improving the Main Street streetscape and general views of the site from surrounding areas, and providing new residential units, affordable housing and increased tax revenue to the City.
2. **ALTERNATIVE B: PROPOSED PROJECT WITH ARMORY BUILDING AND REMOVAL OF THE ANNEX BUILDING**

This Alternative assumes that the proposed Project will be developed. Figure No. V-3A, *Alternative Design without Annex*, shows how the Project can be enhanced with the removal of the Annex building.

In this Alternative, all aspects of the Applicant’s development program and site plan remain the same as the proposed Project, with the exception of the removal of the Annex portion of the Armory, the Armory Place boulevard design, and the provision of public parking along Armory Place. Because the development program and site plan are almost identical to the proposed Project, the analyses for each impact area are the same for this Alternative, with the exception of three impact areas: *Visual Resources, Historic and Archaeological Resources, Transportation and Construction Impacts*.

This Alternative is substantially similar to the proposed Project in terms of retention of the majority of buildings on the Armory parcel. The primary difference in this Alternative is the removal of the Annex portion of the Armory. In this Alternative, the Amory Annex would be removed which would allow a wider boulevard driveway and a greater viewshed from Main Street across the site to Echo Bay and the Echo Bay waterfront esplanade. In this Alternative, the Annex would be removed and Armory Place would be widened from approximately 70 feet wide in the proposed Project to 120 feet wide in this Alternative. This widened separation between buildings would allow for the entrance drive to include a landscaped median, additional plantings that flank both sides of the drive, and grading adjustments that would not require the use of retaining walls along the drive. Removal of the Annex would provide less obstruction of the views to the waterfront area.

In order to accommodate a wider entrance drive and viewshed at Armory Place, this Alternative includes the removal of the Annex building and the shed located behind the Annex on the Armory parcel. Since the Armory Annex is located in a distinct structure attached to the left side of the entrance tower, in significant disrepair and not listed on the National Register of Historic Places, the removal of the Annex block would not have significant adverse impacts on historic resources.

This Alternative is substantially similar to the proposed Project in terms of traffic generation and level of service. The primary difference in this Alternative is the design of Armory Place. Under this Alternative, Armory Place would be located slightly south, allowing for a longer southbound left turn lane along Main Street and more vehicle storage in this lane. The design of the intersection of Main Street and Armory Place would be slightly modified.

This Alternative is substantially similar to the proposed Project in terms of construction impacts. The primary difference in this Alternative is that the demolition of the Annex portion of the Armory building would occur at the same time as the demolition of the DPW buildings. Materials removed from the Annex would be removed at the same time and in
the same manner as those removed from the DPW site. The demolition of the Annex building does not substantively change the construction schedule or construction phasing.

3. **ALTERNATIVE C: EXISTING ZONING ALTERNATIVES**

The Project Site consists of two parcels totaling approximately 9.4 acres. The City Yard parcel (6.5 acres) and the Armory parcel (2.9 acres) are both owned by the City, and are located in the Planned Waterfront Development – 5 Story District (PWD-5 District). The Scoping Document included the evaluation of the maximum build-out of the Project Site both as an assembled single parcel and as two individual parcels under current zoning regulations; however, given that the City selected a developer for the Armory buildings in September 2012, evaluating the maximum development of the Armory parcel as an assemblage with the City Yard parcel is no longer a feasible alternative. The Applicant has prepared an analysis of the redevelopment of the City Yard parcel under current PWD-5 District zoning regulations.

**a. Development of an Assembled Single Project Site (Alternative C.1)**

As noted above, the development of an assembled single project site is not feasible given the City’s decision to pursue separate redevelopment of a majority of the Armory parcel.

**b. Development of Individual Parcels Included in the Proposed Project Site (Alternative C.2)**

This Alternative for the City Yard parcel complies with all current PWD-5 District zoning regulations. The Armory parcel does not meet the minimum lot size requirement for a parcel in the PWD-5 District, so development of that parcel is likely already maximized with the existing Armory buildings. This Alternative assumes the existing Armory Drill Hall building, Administrative Block (“Annex”) and shed building to the east of the Administrative Block would remain. Armory Place would not be constructed and the public parking for the Echo Bay waterfront esplanade would be eliminated. The Echo Bay waterfront esplanade and walk would end at the City Yard property line.

This Alternative provides for a mixed-use building located along East Main Street. The building includes 22,360 square feet of retail facing East Main Street, with three floors of residential apartments above the retail. The residential apartments include 81 dwelling units. Retail and residential amenity space is located above a partially below-ground parking structure with 212 parking spaces and a loading area. Access for both the retail and residential uses would be from the existing driveway across from Stephenson Boulevard.

This alternative would have fewer impacts than the Project with regards to utility use, transportation and parking, noise and air quality, population and public school children increase, community facilities, and construction impacts.
This alternative, as compared to the proposed Project, would not have the benefits of introducing residential density to the site consistent with the City's vision for Echo Bay, providing an approximately 70-foot wide view corridor to Echo Bay via Armory Place, providing as many residential units and as many affordable housing units, and providing as much tax revenue to the City.


The Applicant is aware that the City is currently considering proposals for redevelopment of the Armory building, including a proposal by “Good Profit”, that include retention of the Annex building. The Applicant has met with representatives of Good Profit to explore how the Project can be coordinated with the potential future development of the Armory, Alternative D shows the proposed Project (without public parking on the Armory parcel) and the current Good Profit proposal, based on Good Profit's July 20, 2012 site plan.

However, the Good Profit development program is not yet certain, and the site plan for that proposal has not yet been finalized. Good Profit has indicated its desire to retain the Amory Annex building. Retention of the Annex building would not impact the Applicant’s proposed Project. This Alternative shows how the proposed Project can be developed with the current Good Profit site plan, dated July 20, 2012.

Alternative D-1 includes slight modification to the Armory Place drive and parking based on the Good Profit site plan. The City’s traffic consultant has indicated that Huntington Place would provide secondary access to the Armory site for all vehicles, including truck, service and emergency vehicles. Alternative D-2 incorporates the Good Profit site plan exactly as illustrated in the July 20, 2012 proposal to the City Council without the minor site plan modifications described above in Alternative D-1 with the site plan for the proposed Project.

**a. Alternative D-1:**

This Alternative assumes that the Project and Good Profit proposal will both be developed. This Alternative incorporates the Good Profit site plan with a slight modification to Good Profit’s proposed layout and parking of Armory Place. The following two minor modifications would be required for improved on-site traffic circulation:

1) Provide access to the parking structure within the Project building from Armory Place (just east of the Annex building); and
2) Remove angled parking along Armory Place due to the potential conflict of cars entering Armory Place from Main Street and the proposed drop off zone, the narrow drive aisle, and the potential for cars to queue while waiting for angled spaces to become available.
3) The City’s traffic consultant has also indicated that Huntington Place would provide secondary access to the Armory site for all vehicles.

In this Alternative, all aspects of the Applicant’s development program and site plan remain the same as the proposed Project, with the exception of the Armory Place access drive location, Armory Place boulevard design and the provision of public parking along Armory Place. Because the development program and site plan are almost identical to the proposed Project, the analyses for each impact area are the same for this Alternative, with the exception of two impact areas: Transportation and Parking and Utilities.

This Alternative includes the cumulative traffic generation from the Good Profit proposal, using the limited information available from the July 20, 2012 site plan. Although the Good Profit proposal did not include a traffic generation analysis, it did include a preliminary development program. Therefore, this Alternative would have greater traffic impacts than just the proposed Project due to the Good Profit development program of a market hall, restaurants and various supporting uses. Because this Alternative would include the Armory Place entrance drive to the public parking for the Echo Bay waterfront esplanade, the new traffic signal at Armory Place would be recommended as part of this redevelopment alternative, similar to the proposed Project. Traffic impacts have been identified with the Proposed Project and the addition of the Good Profit Armory redevelopment. The mitigation proposed with the two projects would be similar to for the Proposed Project except as described below.

As part of the Good Profit site plan, the public parking located at the end of Armory Place for the waterfront esplanade has been eliminated. The Good Profit site plan does include approximately 23 at-grade parking spaces, though it is unclear whether those spaces are for public waterfront access. Seven at-grade parking spaces are shown on the proposed Project’s site plan just north of the resident lobby drop-off area. Due to the realignment of Armory Place for this Alternative and the removal of the median, angled parking along Armory Place does not appear to be optimal so the overall site plan for this Alternative has been adjusted to illustrate a more efficient circulation layout between the Armory and the proposed Project. All required retail and residential parking for the proposed Project is accommodated within the building structure. With the modified Armory Place parking and circulation layout, approximately 16 at-grade parking spaces are shown for waterfront esplanade public parking.

The water and sanitary demand from the Good Profit proposal is based on the limited information available from the July 20, 2012 site plan. The potential water and sanitary demand for Good Profit based on its development proposal would be 59,768 gallons per day for sanitary and 65,745 gallons per day for water. The sanitary demand would be approximately 10,400 gallons per day more and the water demand would be approximately 11,500 gallons per day more, than the Project.
Therefore, this Alternative would have greater impacts to water and sanitary demand than just the proposed Project.

b. **Alternative D-2**

This Alternative incorporates the Good Profit site plan exactly as illustrated in the July 20, 2012 proposal to the City Council without any modification to Armory Place.

The potential environmental impacts associated with this Alternative are identical to Alternative D-1 described above, with the exception that all the at-grade parking proposed for the Armory redevelopment is as illustrated on the Good Profit site plan. Impacts with this Alternative are primarily related to the close proximity of the Armory Place driveway to the northeast corner of the Annex building and the circulation and layout of Amory Place as proposed by the Good Profit site plan:

- Potential queuing of cars along East Main Street turning right into the site, in the proposed Armory drop-off area north of the building, and along the east façade of the Annex building while waiting for angled parking spaces.
- Potential conflicts of cars entering and exiting the Project parking structure from the Armory Place entrance with cars queuing for angled parking spaces along Armory Place.
- Potential circulation conflicts with cars attempting to park in the lot adjacent to the Good Profit aquaponics pavilion with inadequate turn-around at the end of Armory Place.
A. PROJECT OVERVIEW

1. Project Sponsor

Forest City Residential, Inc. (the Applicant), the project sponsor, is an affiliate of Forest City Enterprises (Forest City). Founded in 1920, Forest City is a national real estate company with expertise in creating long-term value through its portfolio of residential, commercial and land development properties nationwide. Forest City is principally engaged in the ownership, development, acquisition and management of premier residential, commercial, mixed-use, science and technology real estate throughout the United States.

Currently, Forest City owns and operates properties and/or is involved in development projects in 26 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. As of March 2012, its portfolio assets at cost are valued at $10.7 billion. Publicly traded for nearly fifty years (NYSE: FCEA & FCEB), Forest City is a traditional C corporation, not a Real Estate Investment Trust (REIT) and thus is able to focus on long-term objectives, rather than short-term dividend requirements. Historically, Forest City has managed and operated the vast majority of properties it develops, and often holds its assets long-term.

Forest City’s overall portfolio includes numerous high-quality residential communities, retail centers, office and research facilities, smart-growth communities and a range of large-scale, mixed-use projects, several involving significant urban infill opportunities. Forest City is well diversified by geography and product type, offering a national breadth and local depth of real estate expertise that is unmatched by other firms in the industry.

Headquartered in Cleveland, Ohio, Forest City maintains significant development and management regional offices in Boston, New York, Chicago, Washington, D.C., Denver, San Francisco and Los Angeles. In addition, Forest City establishes local, project-related offices at its development and operating properties across the country in cities such as Honolulu, Philadelphia, Dallas, Seattle and Albuquerque. Forest City Residential Group, Inc. is a Strategic Business Unit within Forest City Enterprises.

Forest City has a proud and extensive record of forging productive public-private partnerships with institutional and governmental entities from small towns up to the largest cities and states in the nation. Its public-private relationships extend to the level of the federal government and Department of Defense. Forest City is committed to developing high-quality urban projects that – through careful consideration of planning, architectural design, market sensitivity, quality construction and sustainable operating systems – provide enduring value and capital appreciation. The communities and buildings Forest City creates enhance the urban environment, are respectful of historical context, become part of the city fabric and enliven the pedestrian experience. Below is a portfolio summary as of March 2012:
RESIDENTIAL
- 34,200 Units in 123 Apartment Communities (market rate, tax exempt and adaptive re-use)
- 14,000 Military Housing Units

RETAIL
26.5 Million Square Feet in 46 Locations
- Urban Retail
- Lifestyle Centers
- Entertainment-Based Retail
- Regional Malls
- Community Centers
- Power Centers
- Multiple Use Projects

OFFICE
- 13.5 Million Square Feet in 49 Properties

B. PROJECT HISTORY

The Echo Bay Redevelopment Project is a direct outgrowth of the Main/Echo Urban Renewal Plan (URP), written in 1983 and updated in 1994, that designated the area south of East Main Street, from Echo Avenue to Stephenson Boulevard, for redevelopment. During that period, the sites that front Main Street were zoned light industrial and the remainder was zoned for heavy industrial. The designation of this urban renewal area, along with the planning initiatives that followed, laid the framework for the City of New Rochelle’s vision of redevelopment of City Yard and the Armory parcel as a catalyst to waterfront revitalization and thereby, reestablishment of New Rochelle as the "Queen City of the Sound." The City’s goals, as established through a series of public participation processes were to enhance the waterfront and public access to Echo Bay; promote mixed-use to revitalize downtown and encourage sustainable development; and to leverage City-owned property as the spur for redevelopment.

1. PROCEDURAL HISTORY OF THE PROJECT

In 2002 the City hired Smith Group JJR and Thomas Balsley Associates to conduct a Feasibility Analysis in order to help refine the Echo Bay Redevelopment Project vision within the limits of market demand and cost efficiency. This process was accomplished with public participation, coordination with the Echo Bay Steering committee, and advice from the City Council. The vision for the project was compatible with the Comprehensive Plan (1996), Harbor Management Plan (1999), and Local Waterfront Revitalization Program (1998). The market analysis portion of the April 2002 Feasibility Analysis concluded that low-rise high-end residences should be constructed with niche retail and office space, and the design recommendations went on to elaborate that the building would be mixed-use residential with commercial at ground level on East Main Street and would incorporate enhanced view corridors and pedestrian waterfront access along the eastern entrance that
would align with Stephenson Boulevard. In order to ensure the success of waterfront revitalization, the study recommended dredging from Snuff Mill Creek to the City Marina and environmental testing of the sites. The next step suggested by the study was to issue a Request for Qualifications or Proposals (RFQ or RFP).

The City of New Rochelle issued a Request for Qualifications in 2004 with the purpose of compiling a short-list of developers with waterfront development experience for the RFP process. At the time of the RFQ, additional sites within the urban renewal area were under review for inclusion in the development. The RFQ laid out the two-step process for developer selection. The selection criteria for qualification were: project experience with waterfront development and public-private partnerships; financial capacity and capability; developer and team member individual past performance; and developer vision refinement and/or strategy for development of Echo Bay.

The City’s vision for the project was outlined by its consultant Smith Group JJR in the March 2006 Echo Bay Redevelopment Plan. The 2006 Redevelopment Plan outlined details including clarification of project intent, community vision, project boundaries and funding sources as well as important barriers and opportunities. The project intent was confirmed as: link development to Main Street revitalization through pedestrian access to adjacent neighborhoods and to balance economic development and environmental quality through project design. At the time, the project area was described by the Redevelopment Plan as bound by Main Street, Five Islands Park, the Municipal Marina, and Hudson Park. The interconnection of the project to Main Street was underlined as critical to the long-term success. The Redevelopment Plan discussed the value of a continuous street grid for connection and wayfinding in addition to the priority of public access to the waterfront. In terms of barriers and opportunities, the plan discussed environmental issues such as buffers for incompatible land uses such as the Westchester County Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP), stormwater management, and suggested use of the NYS Brownfield Cleanup Program for environmental remediation. Another opportunity mentioned was the affordable housing compliance density bonus, which increases allow density by 15% for provision of 10% of total floor area to affordable units.

The City of New Rochelle’s Department of Development issued an “Echo Bay Request for Proposals” in March 2006 to five pre-qualified developers for the mixed-use redevelopment of the Echo Bay Redevelopment Area in follow up to the 2004 RFQ and the Feasibility Study and Preliminary Redevelopment Plan. Four proposals were received and the City Council and City staff heard public presentation and reviewed in detail the four proposals. In 2006, the Applicant I was chosen as the developer through the Request for Proposal review process, and the City executed a Master Redevelopment Exclusivity and Planning Agreement with Forest City in 2007. In 2007, the Applicant began the due diligence and planning process and prepared a conceptual Master Redevelopment Plan for the Echo Bay Redevelopment Area. The City executed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Applicant in May 2008, and the City Council declared itself Lead Agency for the purpose of conducting the State Environmental Quality Review Act process, conducting a public scoping session on June 30, 2008 for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.
A Scoping Document was adopted by the City Council on July 30, 2008. The Applicant began preparing the DEIS when the global financial crisis and national economic distress occurred at the end of 2008.

In 2010, the Applicant re-evaluated the project in light of the economic climate and continued to work with the City to develop a more centralized and focused project as the first step in successful redevelopment of the Echo Bay Redevelopment Area. In January 2012, the City Council extended the MOU and in May 2012 adopted an Amended Scoping Document for the Echo Bay Center Waterfront Redevelopment project which is the subject of this DEIS (the Project). The Echo Bay Center project site (Project Site) is comprised of two parcels currently owned by the City of New Rochelle – the Department of Public Works City Yard parcel and a portion of the City Armory parcel. The Restated MOU between the City and the Applicant contemplates that two additional parcels could be developed in the future: the former Nelstad property (Block 84, Lot 120) and possibly the former Mancuso Marina property (Block 84, Lot 110). The Nelstad property is currently in private ownership and the City owns the Mancuso Marina property. Redevelopment of these parcels is not currently proposed by the Applicant. However, future redevelopment of the Echo Bay area would benefit from the physical connection and access provided between the Armory parcel and the Mancuso Marina parcel via the Nelstad parcel.

2. **City of New Rochelle’s Relocation of the City Department of Public Works Yard from the Project Site**

The Department of Public Works Yard (City Yard) is owned and operated by the City of New Rochelle, and is located along the Boston Post Road at 235 East Main Street. The City Yard parcel is approximately 6.5 acres with 645 linear feet of coastline that would potentially offer views to Echo Bay and the Long Island Sound. The property contains a number of structures, with the major structure being the 17,000 square foot warehouse, which would be removed for the Project. The City Yard would be relocated by the City of New Rochelle to a proposed site on Beechwood Avenue approximately 1,000 feet north of the intersection with Main Street (US Route 1) that is zoned for light industry and is surrounded by other commercial/industrial buildings. In 2004, the City began the SEQRA process related to the relocation of the City Yard in order to facilitate the City’s plans for sound redevelopment of the Echo Bay area. The DEIS was completed in 2007 and adopted by the City Council on December 4, 2007. The FEIS was filed on March 25, 2008 and the Environmental Findings Statement adopted on June 17, 2008. In November 2012, the City Council approved the issuance of up to $25 million of general obligation bonds to finance a new public works facility on Beechwood Avenue.

3. **City’s Deed of Acquisition of the Armory Building and Property from New York State**

The City Armory parcel is owned by the City of New Rochelle. The property was conveyed by the State of New York to the City in 1997, is currently unoccupied and is located along the Boston Post Road, adjacent to the City Yard parcel.
The site, located at 270 Main Street, includes 2.9 acres of property with approximately 200 feet of frontage on Echo Bay. The parcel includes the two-story, 25,000 square-foot Armory built by the NY State in 1932; a metal panel warehouse building to the rear of the armory; a 3-car garage; and two small stone storage buildings. According to the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) letter dated August 1, 2012, the property was conveyed for the purposes of “park, recreation, street and highway purposes, including incidental, necessary municipal business in conjunction therewith”\(^1\).

C. PROJECT PURPOSE, NEED AND BENEFITS

1. PUBLIC PURPOSE, NEED AND BENEFITS

The Project is intended to be a catalyst, along with the renovation and re-use by others of the Armory, for the redevelopment of the overall Main/Echo Urban Renewal Area. The public purposes for the Project include:

- Take the critical first step in redevelopment of the Echo Bay area;
- Clean up contaminated land on City’s waterfront;
- Activate a central piece of New Rochelle with open access to the Long Island Sound;
- Restore approximately 10 acres of underutilized waterfront land to a productive and attractive use for long term benefit of City residents;
- Enhance the long-term sustainability of the Bay through stormwater improvements, water-enhanced uses and ecological restoration;
- Open view corridors to the bay from Main Street;
- Make available waterfront land for public use and activity;
- Increase retail activity on East Main Street; and
- Enable options for future use by others of the Armory.

The Project provides downtown New Rochelle with a “toe in the water” via a mixed-use building and public open space amenities with its front door on Main Street and its backyard in Echo Bay. The Project would anchor Main Street and activate the street frontage, while opening up both a visual corridor to the bay via the proposed Armory Place and a physical connection to the bay via the proposed pedestrian esplanade around the perimeter of the Project Site. The esplanade would provide public access to the waterfront and connections to Five Islands Park and future development west of the Armory.

The Project would also replace a semi-industrial use at the US Route 1 east gateway to New Rochelle, while complementing adjacent commercial and mixed uses, as well as provide visual improvements to neighborhoods seeing the Project Site. The waterfront esplanade in the Project has been designed to be publically accessible, rather than a private enclave, and would provide the community with an opportunity to enjoy the Echo Bay waterfront.

---

\(^1\) See New York State Department of Environmental Conservation letter dated, August 1, 2012, Appendix 2, Relevant Correspondence and Contacts.
2. **OBJECTIVES OF THE APPLICANT**

The Applicant has a long and proud history of investing the time, energy, resources, and expertise required to accomplish notable “place-making” projects that become important components of the cities in which it builds. The company’s primary objective is to bring that same level of care and thoughtful development to the New Rochelle community with the development of the Project. The components of the Project – 285 apartments, Main Street retail, and publically accessible waterfront open space – would reflect that objective. Essential to the success of these individual elements however, is the ongoing collective effort of the development team in conjunction with representatives of the City and individual residents. It is this thoughtful collaboration which would result in a successful development for the New Rochelle community and Forest City.

Completing the Project is an important step in the long-term success of the larger Main/Echo Urban Renewal Plan. The Applicant’s objectives extend beyond the construction of the Project. Across the country, the Applicant has demonstrated a commitment to long-term ownership and continued participation in the projects it develops. This long-term focus is evident in all facets of the process, from the way it engages with the community to the building materials chosen and the ongoing quality of on-site management and property upkeep. The company’s philosophy is one of investment in cities and neighborhoods. In the Applicant’s view, the Main/Echo Urban Renewal Area has tremendous potential, which would begin to be realized with the development of the Project.

D. **PROJECT LOCATION AND SETTING**

1. **SITE LOCATION**

The Project Site is comprised of the City Yard parcel and the Armory parcel, located at 224 East Main Street and 260-70 East Main Street, and consists of two tax lots, totaling approximately 9.4 acres in the City of New Rochelle. The Project Site is located on the northeastern side of the City, with the eastern edge adjacent to Echo Bay, which is a sheltered inlet off the Long Island Sound. See Figure No. III.D-1, *Regional Location Map*.

The Project Site is bounded by East Main Street to the north, Echo Bay inlet to the south, a McDonald’s restaurant and the former Nelstad Materials Corporation parcel to the west, and an Aamco auto service facility to the east. In addition, the Westchester County Wastewater Treatment Plant is located across an inlet to the east of the Project Site. The City Yard parcel is approximately 6.5 acres, and is designated on the City Tax Map as Block 84-Lot 5. The Armory parcel is approximately 2.9 acres, and is designated on the City Tax Map as Block 84-Lot 22. Both parcels are located within the PWD-5 Zoning District (PWD-5 District). See Figure No. III.D-2, *Area Zoning Map*, and Figure No. III.D-3, *Aerial*
2. **LOCAL AND REGIONAL ACCESS TO THE PROJECT SITE AND SURROUNDING AREA**

The Project Site is adjacent to US Route 1, also known as East Main Street in front of the Project Site, which provides local and regional access to the Project Site. Route 1 connects the majority of municipalities along the Long Island Sound and provides regional access to New Rochelle, as well as connecting with local neighborhood streets within the City. Route 1 is generally a north/south roadway, though in this area of the City, it travels more northeast/southwest. Just west of the site, Main Street becomes a one-way northbound road, with Huguenot Street providing southbound access through downtown New Rochelle. Further west of the Project Site, Huguenot and Main Streets intersect with North Avenue, which provides access through much of the City of New Rochelle and connects to the Hutchinson River Parkway interchanges 17 and 18.

Echo Avenue and River Street to the west provide direct connections to Interstate 95 interchange 16, providing convenient regional access to the Project Site. Stephenson Boulevard and River Street provide local access to Palmer Avenue’s commercial corridor. Downtown New Rochelle and the Intermodal Transit Center (with Metro North and Amtrak trains, and Bee Line Bus service) are just over a half mile from the Project Site and the Intermodal Transit Center provides regional and local mass transit opportunities.

3. **EXISTING USES WITHIN THE PROJECT SITE AND THE SURROUNDING AREA**

The eastern portion of the Project Site is currently used by the City of New Rochelle Department of Public Works as the City Yard. The City Yard parcel includes a number of large garage and warehouse type buildings, single-story office buildings, and parking areas for employee vehicles and City trucks. The City Yard parcel is currently used for office space; equipment, parts and fleet vehicle storage; vehicle repair within various onsite buildings; recycling program for commingled waste; fleet vehicles storage; and sand/salt storage. See Figure No. III.D-3, *Aerial Photograph*, and Figure No. III.D-4, *Existing Conditions*.

The Armory parcel houses the main Armory building, Administrative building (also referred to as the “Annex”) and several outbuildings. The Armory was acquired by the City in 1997 and was utilized for a variety of uses such as Fire and Police Department training, movie screenings, and storage of building materials for Habitat for Humanity. The Armory buildings are currently vacant. In May 2012, the City prepared a Request for Proposals for the reuse of the Armory facility and invited interested groups to submit creative visions and

---

2 The City of New Rochelle would continue to own the Armory parcel, but per the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), would transfer ownership of the City Yard parcel to the Applicant under terms of a Land Development Agreement (LDA) to be negotiated and executed following the completion of the SEQRA process.
concepts. The City seeks to “rehabilitate and preserve a historic structure with distinctive architectural features; activate a currently underutilized site for the public’s enjoyment and benefit; and complement and enhance the surrounding revitalization of the New Rochelle shoreline”. Two proposals were submitted in July 2012 and have been reviewed by the City Council. At its September 19, 2012 meeting, the City Council agreed to negotiate a memorandum of understanding with the “Good Profit” team for the redevelopment of the majority of the Armory parcel, including the Armory building. Good Profit proposes multi-use programming, centered on a local food marketplace.

The existing land uses within ¼ mile of the Project Site are varied with commercial, mixed-use and industrial uses located along the East Main Street and Huguenot Street corridor and single- and multi-family residential uses, as well as institutional uses, located in the neighborhoods north and southwest of the Project Site. Commercial uses include the Radisson Hotel to the northwest of the Project Site, a number of fast food chain restaurants, including McDonald’s along the western boundary of the Armory parcel, as well as auto services and car dealerships that are interspersed throughout the corridor. Auto-related commercial comprises a large amount of commercial land use in the area and includes a Honda and Chevy dealership in addition to auto body shops and gas stations. Institutional land uses include Monroe College and Salesian High School. The open space land uses include Faneuil Park located immediately north of the Project Site, and Five Islands Park to the southeast of the site. Also to the southeast of the site is the Westchester County Wastewater Treatment Plant, a municipal land use, located across an inlet to the east of the Project Site. Residential uses are single family to the east and south, and a mix of single-family and multifamily to the north and southwest, with the Huguenot Hills mixed-use residential development just northeast of the Project Site with an on-site restaurant and a few small shops on the Main Street side of the property and condominium units facing Old Main Street. Existing land uses within ¼ mile of the Project Site are illustrated on Figure No. IV.A.-1, Existing Land Use Within ¼-Mile of Project Site which is located in Section IV.A: Land Use, Zoning and Planning Consistency.

E. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

1. ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS ON THE PROJECT SITE

Historic uses on the City Yard parcel have contributed to potential contamination of the Project Site. Appendix 7 includes the Phase 1 Environmental Reports for the City Yard and Armory parcels. Infrastructure that has contributed to these potential hazards include: the oil/water separator and its associated drainage piping, an associated holding tank, in-ground lifts and, potentially, buried containers of hydraulic oil, if any exist. The City Yard parcel was occupied by a boat yard in 1911, was operated as a Department of Public Works facility since 1917, included a sewage disposal plant that operated from 1926 until circa 1955 and serviced by outdoor transformers, and several onsite buildings have been used for vehicle repair, prior to construction of the existing vehicle repair garage in 1969. According to the Phase I Report eight (8) Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) were identified on the City Yard parcel.
(1) **Open Release Cases**

Three spill cases are open with the NYSDEC (Spill Nos. 10-11242, 01-01307 and 98-00763). The spill incidents pertain to the release of gasoline and fuel oil into the subsurface from former underground storage tanks (USTs) located between the vehicle storage building and the vehicle repair building.

(2) **Four Locations of Staining Indicative of a Release**

Staining indicative of a release of petroleum products or hazardous substances was observed at four locations.

(3) **Current Fuel Dispensers and Product Piping**

The integrity of the gasoline and diesel dispensers, and of the associated underground piping, is not known. As such, the fuel dispensers and underground piping may pose a material threat of release of petroleum products to the subsurface.

(4) **Closed Release Case**

A spill occurred on March 4, 1998, when an unknown petroleum product seeped into Long Island Sound from an embankment at the Site (NYSDEC Spill No. 97 13423). The spill was closed on May 4, 1998. However, there was no indication of an investigation or remediation of on-site subsurface media in connection with the release in available records.

(5) **Former Petroleum USTs**

Nine former USTs that stored motor oil, waste oil, fuel oil, gasoline and diesel fuel were installed at the time of construction of the vehicle repair garage and, at the time of their removal, releases to the subsurface were reported. The above-mentioned three open release cases and an additional five closed release cases are associated with these USTs.

One former 3,000-gallon No. 4 fuel oil UST was reported to service the vehicle storage garage and to have been removed, with exact location unknown. A former kerosene AST was also located in the central region of the Site, near the existing washdown station. The status and integrity of these storage tanks and associated piping is not known. As such, these tanks posed a material threat of subsurface contamination.

One former 2,000-gallon fuel oil UST was reportedly located in the rear (west) of the sanitation garage and removed. However, a vent pipe and two apparent ports to a subgrade void filled with rainwater were observed in a concrete platform in that area, indicative of a potential UST. The status and integrity of this storage tank and associated piping is not known. As such, this tank, whether still in place or removed, may pose a material threat of subsurface contamination.

(6) **Current On-Site Use for Vehicle Repair**

Presently the southernmost building is used as a vehicle repair garage. One in-ground oil/water separator collects wastewater from the drainage system of the garage. The
oil/water separator, associated drainage piping, and possibly an associated holding tank represent a potential material threat of release of hazardous substances and petroleum products into the subsurface. Additionally, in-ground lifts are present in the garage. The buried containers of hydraulic oil associated with the lifts, if any, pose a threat of a release to the subsurface.

(7) **Historic On-Site Uses**

The Site was occupied by a boat yard in 1911, and has been operated as a Department of Public Works facility since 1917, which included a sewage disposal plant that operated from 1926 until circa 1955 and was serviced by outdoor transformers. Several on-site buildings were used for vehicle repair prior to construction of the existing vehicle repair garage in 1969. The occupants had reasons to handle hazardous substances or petroleum products during the conduct of operations. The potential exists for releases of hazardous substances or petroleum products into the subsurface media at the Site.

(8) **Offsite Sources of Groundwater Contamination**

There are several current and historic, adjacent and nearby hydraulically upgradient properties with activities, conditions or incidents likely to cause or contribute to releases or threatened releases of hazardous substances and petroleum products. The collective potential exists for hazardous substances and petroleum products migration from these properties to the Site, particularly through groundwater migration.

The Armory parcel was historically used as an armory and training ground for servicemen, including a shooting range and the storage of ammunition. More recent uses included the screening of movies, training sessions of the Fire Department, and the staging of fleet vehicles and equipment by an unknown business. Five (5) RECs were identified on the Armory parcel.

(1) **Former Petroleum Storage Tank**

A 7,500 or 8,000 gallon No. 2 fuel oil storage tank was located in the former coal room within the basement of the Administration Building (also known as the “Annex”). The tank was removed on April 7, 2009. The tank was placed on soil in an area cut out from the pitched concrete floor of the former coal room. The soil was stained and a petroleum odor was present in the room. The integrity of this storage tank at the time of removal is not known. As such, this tank posed a material threat of subsurface contamination.

(2) **Historic On-Site Uses**

The Site was historically used as an armory and training ground for servicemen, including a shooting range and the storage of ammunition. More recent uses included the screening of movies, training sessions of the Fire Department, and the staging of fleet vehicles and equipment by an unknown business. Small quantities of hazardous waste were generated by the entity that screened movies. These operators, in the aggregate, handled or had reasons to handle hazardous substances or petroleum
products during the conduct of business. The potential exists for releases of hazardous substances or petroleum products into the subsurface media at the Site.

(3) Staining Indicative of a Release
Heavy staining which may be indicative of a release of petroleum products or hazardous substances was observed on the soil near the entrance to a small ancillary building located off the southwest corner of the Drill deck.

(4) Abandoned Drum
A drum approximately one third filled with a suspected petroleum product or hazardous substance was observed in the basement of the three-story building that connects the Drill Deck to the Administration Building. The drum may pose a material threat of a release to the subsurface.

(5) Offsite Sources of Groundwater Contamination
There are several current and historic, adjacent and nearby hydraulically upgradient properties with activities, conditions or incidents likely to cause or contribute to releases or threatened releases of hazardous substances and petroleum products. The collective potential exists for migration of hazardous substances and petroleum products from these properties to the Site, particularly through groundwater migration.

A Phase II Investigation is recommended to further investigate the RECs identified for both the City Yard and Armory parcels, and would be completed prior to the submission of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS).

a. State Brownfield Cleanup Program
The New York State Brownfield Cleanup Program was established in 2003 in order to encourage the cleanup and redevelopment of contaminated sites. Through these efforts, the goal is to mitigate the threat to public health from and the environment from contaminated sites and to divert development practices away from undeveloped parcels, known as “greenfields,” in favor of revitalization of abandoned properties in blighted communities.

In June 2007, the City of New Rochelle and the Applicant jointly applied for participation in the Brownfields Cleanup Program for the Project. At that time the Project area included the City Yard and Armory parcels, and the Mancuso Marina property. In October 2010, the co-applicants submitted a letter to the NYSDEC requesting the termination of the Brownfields Cleanup Program application, which was made effective November 5, 2010. It is anticipated that the Project Site would be remediated under the NYSDEC Brownfields Cleanup Program, through a new joint application by the City of New Rochelle and the Applicant.

b. Site Remediation
Prior to acquisition or development of either Project Site parcel, additional investigation and/or a Phase II Environmental Site Assessment investigation would
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be performed to address any RECs. The findings from these investigations would be used to create a Remedial Action Work Plan(s) and would include all mitigation necessary to ensure that the redevelopment is compliant with all Federal, State and Local regulations and guidance and that it is protective of human health and the environment.

F.  PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LAYOUT

The proposed mixed-use commercial and residential building is located along the Echo Bay waterfront and East Main Street in New Rochelle. The building contains approximately 25,000 square of commercial retail space located along East Main Street and 285 residential units. The residential units include 71 studio apartments, 137 one-bedroom apartments and 77 two-bedroom apartments, for a total residential gross floor area of approximately 302,500 square feet. An additional 15,900 square of residential amenity/leasing space is included on the Main Street level of the building. Of the 285 dwelling units, 29 units (10%) would be designated “Moderate-Income Housing Units” affordable for households with annual incomes not exceeding 80% of the Westchester County median annual income. The Project also includes the cleanup and restoration of the Echo Bay shoreline and the creation of a public waterfront esplanade providing physical public access to the waterfront, a small non-motorized boat launch area and a pedestrian bridge connection to the northern edge of the Westchester County WWTP parcel with future connection to Five Islands Park. The waterfront esplanade also has been designed to connect to any future open space west of the Armory parcel.

The Project would anchor Main Street and extend its retail frontage, while opening up both a visual corridor to the bay via the proposed new “Armory Place” and a physical connection to the bay via the proposed esplanade around the perimeter of the Project Site. Two levels of structured parking would be located within the building to shield all residential and retail parking from view. Access to the lower parking level would be through a driveway at the location of the existing City Yard driveway. The existing Armory driveway would be widened between the proposed Project building and the existing Armory Annex to approximately 70-feet wide in order to provide access to the upper parking level, the residential lobby, and a 50-space public parking area on the Armory parcel with a walkway connection to the waterfront esplanade.

1.  PROJECT SITE UTILIZATION, LAYOUT AND BUILDING HEIGHT

The design of the Project mixed-use building reflects the Applicant’s recognition of the importance of this being the first and central architectural element in the redevelopment of the larger Main/Echo Urban Renewal Area. The building’s form, operational characteristics and architectural detailing all relate to it having essentially four “fronts” and no backs, as it faces and would have entries along East Main Street, new Armory Place, the eastern access drive, and Echo Bay. See Figure No. III.F-1, Site Plan.

The main section of the building is roughly square in footprint, with the west side of the square facing the Armory parcel continuing towards Echo Bay to form an extended south
The building’s East Main Street frontage contains ground level retail stores with three levels of residential units above. One floor of structured parking is located behind the retail stores, while a second floor is located below street level under the full building footprint. The depth of the footprint is such that all on-site parking is located within the structure, hiding it from view and maximizing exterior areas on the site for open space use. The building’s corners and center of the retail space are reinforced by one-story mezzanines that lift up the roofline 10 feet to mark the gateway elements of both the mixed-use building itself and the larger Echo Bay area. See Figure Nos. III.F-2 through 4, Building Floor Plans, and III.F-6 through 8, Building Elevations.

As the building steps down towards the south to reflect the slope of the Project Site from Elev. 22-24 along East Main Street to Elev. 10 along the southern shoreline, its height is measured in two sections. See Figure No. IV.A-2, Proposed Building Height Measurement, which is located in Section IV.A: Land Use, Zoning and Planning Consistency. The main section of the building has a mean existing grade of Elev. 18.4 and a zoning height of 59.6 feet, measured to the highest level of the flat roof surface. The south wing of the building has a mean existing grade of Elev. 14.7 and a zoning height of 53.3 feet. In both the main building and south wing, approximately 10 feet of the zoning height is comprised of the gateway architectural elements described above.

The Project includes the creation of Armory Place, a landscaped boulevard providing physical access to the mixed-use building’s residential lobby, to the east side of the Armory parcel, and parking for the waterfront esplanade, as well as providing a visual invitation to the waterfront from East Main Street. Armory Place also provides access to the interior parking level directly behind the retail stores. The lower interior parking level and residential loading area are accessible from the eastern access drive. Armory Place would not require the removal of the main Armory building or the Annex building, but would include the removal of a metal shed and storage building behind the Annex in order to provide public parking on the Amory parcel for waterfront access.

2. **Proposed Mixed-Use Development**

   a. **Retail Uses and Residential Units**

   The Project includes 25,000 square feet of commercial retail uses located along the East Main Street frontage. These ground level retail stores would provide a retail facade with transparent glass walls between building columns in order to animate the retail environment along the street. The building frontage would include opportunities for retail merchandising and display, as well as spaces for cafe tables and other outdoor seating. The retail space deliberately wraps around the corner from Main Street onto Armory Place. This corner is intended to be the dynamic,

---

3 Per section 331-4 of the New Rochelle Zoning Code, “Height of Building” is defined as the “vertical distance measured from the mean existing grade to the highest level of the roof surface of roofs, the slope of which is not more than one inch vertical to one foot horizontal, or to the mean height between the eaves and the highest point of the roof if the roof is of any other type.”
pedestrian-centric, invitation to the Project Site and waterfront beyond. Although specific retail tenants cannot be identified at this time, it is expected that retail and restaurant uses would be consistent with the character of the scale of the neighborhood retail and restaurant uses in the other mixed use buildings in the area.

The Project also includes the construction of 285 residential units to be located in three floors above the retail stores, and the four story residential wings to the south. The residential units would be studio, one-bedroom and two-bedroom rental apartments, with 29 of the rental units designated as “Moderate-Income Housing Units”\(^4\). The residential development program includes:

- **Studios:** 71 units (8 below market rate)
  Unit sizes between 450 and 620 square feet
- **One-bedrooms:** 137 units (13 below market rate)
  Unit sizes between 770 and 875 square feet
- **Two-bedrooms:** 77 units (8 below market rate)
  Unit sizes between 1,035 and 1,300 square feet

Total gross floor area for each of the buildings floors is illustrated in Figure Nos. III.F-2 through 4, *Building Floor Plans*.

**b. Access and Entrances to All Uses**

The mixed use building would include access and entrance to commercial retail and restaurant uses directly from East Main Street, as well as via walkways from the structured parking located within the building. The residential portion of the building includes a main lobby entrance on the west side of the building located off Armory Place with a vehicular drop-off area. Visitors to the residential portion of the building would use the Armory Place entrance and park on the upper interior parking level. Primary entrance to the building for residents would be through either parking level, both of which would connect to the lobby. Residents using mass transit or walking would enter the building via the Armory Place residential lobby, via the sidewalks provided along Armory Place.

Public access to the waterfront esplanade walkway and the kayak dock would be provided for those arriving by vehicle via the public parking lot at the center of the Project Site accessed from Armory Place. For public visitors to the waterfront arriving by mass transit, by foot or by bicycle, pedestrian connections to East Main Street would be provided via Armory Place and the pedestrian pathway located along the eastern edge of the Project Site. Additionally, future access to the waterfront open space also would be available via the proposed pedestrian bridge connecting to northern edge of the County WWTP property and ultimately to Five

\(^4\) Section 331-52 of the New Rochelle Zoning Code defines moderate income as “annual household income which does not exceed 80% of the Westchester County median annual income for its household size (based on U.S. Census and updated by HUD)".
Islands Park. Future connections to Huntington Place would connect to the esplanade at the western edge of the Project Site.

c. Parking Plan, Space Layout and Loading Areas
The Project includes 430 parking spaces for all uses. All required retail and residential parking is located on-site within the building structure. The parking ratio utilized in the Shared Parking Analysis for the residential units is one and a half parking spaces per residential unit and four spaces per one thousand square feet for the retail/restaurant uses. Shared parking principles account for the retail parking being more heavily utilized at the times when the residential parking demands are lower, and vice versa.

Although not calculated in the Project parking count, there would be public on-street parking along Main Street in front of the Project Site, as well as the approximately 50 public parking spaces proposed on the Armory parcel for public waterfront access.

One floor of structured parking is located on Main Street level behind the retail stores, with access directly from Armory Place. The majority of retail customers are expected to park on this upper level and access the stores via walkways at the northwest and northeast corners. A second level of parking is located below Main Street under the full building footprint, with access from the driveway opposite Stephenson Boulevard. Both parking levels have direct connections to the residential lobby. Loading access for the residential units is also from the eastern driveway. The depth of the building footprint is such that all on-site parking is located within the structure, hiding it from view and maximizing exterior areas on the site for open space use.

d. Passenger Vehicle, Truck and Pedestrian Routes
Primary access to the lower parking level for passenger vehicles and moving and delivery trucks would be through a driveway at the location of the existing City Yard driveway and opposite Stephenson Boulevard. A traffic light currently exists in that location.

New Armory Place would be a driveway to serve the upper parking level, the residential lobby, and the on-grade parking for Armory and public waterfront access would be provided opposite the existing U-turn that separates Main Street and Huguenot Street.

At the intersection of Main Street and Armory Place, the Project would include modifications to the existing U-turn that separates Main Street and Huguenot Street. In order to provide access to the Project Site for those vehicles traveling southbound on Huguenot Street and to provide northbound Huguenot Street access out of the Project Site, the Project would include the installation of a traffic signal, and left-turn lane along southbound Main Street/Huguenot Street. This traffic
signal would not meet typical signal warrants based solely upon the volumes exiting Armory Place but would meet signal warrants when incorporating the U-turn from Main Street and the non-standard configuration of the intersection. The traffic signal would be located between two existing traffic signals, at Stephenson Boulevard and at Echo Avenue, and thus speeds would be limited in that area.

The on-site pedestrian circulation has been designed to work safely and efficiently. Sidewalks with sufficient width and crosswalks at various signalized intersections currently exist in the area surrounding the Project Site. The Project includes the continuation of the sidewalk north of the current City Yard driveway around the perimeter of the Project Site as a public waterfront pedestrian esplanade. The pedestrian esplanade winds its way around the Project Site and connects to a pathway in the center of the Project Site with access to the public waterfront parking area, the Armory building and back out to East Main Street via Armory Place. The esplanade is shown ending at the west boundary of the Armory parcel to provide future pedestrian connections to the west.

New sidewalks, pedestrian paths and crosswalks on the Project Site would be provided as part of the Project. Pedestrian access to the retail stores would be available from Main Street, with walkway connections from the parking area within the building structure.

e. **Landscaping Plan**

The landscape plan for the Project contains a variety of coastal and salt-tolerant species of trees, shrubs, grasses, groundcovers and perennials. Proposed plantings include approximately 100 shade and street trees, 20 evergreen trees, 30 ornamental flowering trees, 365 deciduous and evergreen shrubs, 500 ornamental grass groupings. Proposed plantings would complement the architecture and provide a park-like setting to the visitors of the waterfront esplanade. Proposed plantings are generally located on the northern side of the esplanade so as to provide un-obscured views of the bay. Groupings of shade and ornamental trees are proposed along a gentle berm between the proposed building and the esplanade, providing an informal separation between the private and public uses in addition to providing dappled shade. The waterfront would be enhanced with a riprap slope and planting shelf featuring coastal wetland species and grasses which would contribute to the local ecosystem and support wildlife. See Figure No. III.F-5, *Landscape Concept Plan*.

f. **Setback and Buffer Treatments from Adjacent Uses and Shoreline**

The Project includes a mixed use building that has been designed to provide vibrant commercial activity along East Main Street and a dynamic, pedestrian-centric residential environment and waterfront area. The building has frontage along East Main Street with the building edge located adjacent to the property line, with approximately 20 feet available between the building face and curb to accommodate street trees, sidewalk, bus shelters and other streetscape elements. The proposed
building is setback approximately 45 feet from the eastern property line and 48 feet from the proposed centerline of Armory Place.

Consistent with the recommendation in the PWD-5 District regulations that a minimum thirty-foot public waterfront walkway be provided, the esplanade and adjoining landscaped area would vary in width along the shoreline, but would never be less than thirty feet. Buffer treatment at the shoreline would include small to medium sized armor stone riprap to restore the eroded shoreline, along with an inter-tidal planting shelf to diversify the habitat along the water’s edge. See Figure No. III.F-5, Landscape Concept Plan.

g. **Lighting**
The Project would utilize a combination of cut-off street lights and lighted bollards to provide a safe environment for visitors in the evening hours. Public parking areas would utilize appropriately-scaled street lights styled to complement the architecture. Walkways adjacent to the building as well as the waterfront esplanade would utilize lighted bollards to provide pathway lighting and would similarly complement the architecture.

h. **Utility Services**
Water for domestic, mechanical, fire and miscellaneous uses would be supplied from the existing United Water of New Rochelle water supply system in East Main Street and circulated throughout the Project Site by an expansion and modification of the existing on-site distribution system. Average daily water use for the Project is conservatively estimated at approximately 54,000 gallons per day (GPD) (or approximately 38 gallons per minute (GPM). Based on a discussion of the existing off-site, water supply system with United Water of New Rochelle, there is reportedly adequate supply in the system to service the water demands of the Project. United Water would determine whether any upgrades to the local distribution network are warranted to extend service to the Project Site at the flow demand estimates described herein based on the results of its independent system-wide hydraulic analysis.

The Project Site lies within the New Rochelle Sewer District. Sewage from the Project Site is conveyed to the County WWTP via two City of New Rochelle municipal sewer mains which traverse the Project Site. Flow from the City of New Rochelle municipal collection system is conveyed to the WWTP located just across Echo Bay through a Westchester County-owned and operated inverted siphon system. Diversion of a short segment of an existing 8-inch City-owned sanitary sewer main located within Main Street would be required to divert flow from and permit the abandonment of an existing 30-inch City-owned sewer main which traverses the Project Site. The on-site diversion of an approximate 200 LF segment of the existing 42-inch City-owned trunk sewer would also be required. There are no other anticipated off-site impacts to any existing municipally-owned and operated sewage collection and conveyance system components as a result of the Project.
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Estimated sewer demands for the Project are expected to be in the range of 45,000 GPD to 50,000 gallons per day based on NYSDEC standards. Sewage generated from the Project would be conveyed to the County-owned and operated WWTP via the on-site, 42-inch City of New Rochelle Trunk Sewer and the County-owned and operated inverted siphon. On-site collection and conveyance of the effluent would be through construction of both a new on-site collection system and possible direct connections to the existing City-owned 42-inch trunk sewer which traverses the Project Site. The on-site and off-site diversion of the existing municipal 30-inch and 42-inch sewer mains, to be constructed by the Applicant, would require the review and approval of the Westchester County Department of Health. In accordance with Westchester County Department of Health regulations, dedication of the new municipal mains would be required.

Gas and electric service to the Project Site is provided by Consolidated Edison, Inc. Con Edison would provide natural gas and electric service to the Project Site through its existing infrastructure network located within the public right-of-ways.

All buildings would be designed to comply with the 2010 New York State Energy Conservation Code and the 2010 New York State Building Code. Both residential and retail units would be individually metered to encourage conservation of electricity and high efficiency Energy Star rated consumer appliances, lighting fixtures and building mechanical systems would incorporate controls and operating strategies which would further minimize the consumption of electricity.

i. Stormwater Management Measures
The goal of the stormwater management plan for the Project is to maintain or improve the pre-construction hydrology and stormwater runoff conditions of the Project Site. Stormwater runoff from the Project Site is currently neither detained nor treated on-site. The majority of the Project Site, approximately 8.43 acres, currently drains southward directly to the Long Island Sound, with the remaining approximate one-acre portion of the Project Site draining toward the municipal stormwater system located within the Main Street/US Route 1 right-of-way. Stormwater entering the municipal system flows eastward discharging to the Stephenson Brook box culvert running beneath Stephenson Boulevard. Flow from the Stephenson Brook culvert ultimately discharges to the Long Island Sound via the Stephenson Brook Outfall. Approximately 6.69 acres of the approximate 9.44-acre Project Site is comprised of impervious surfaces and includes multiple buildings, asphalt pavement, and gravel surfaces.

(1) On-Site Measures
The Project would include the overall reduction in impervious cover through the introduction of new lawn and planting areas and the use of a NYSDEC accepted alternative stormwater practice (a hydrodynamic separator unit), the proposed peak rates of runoff from the Project Site would be reduced. Further, as a result, proposed stormwater discharge rates to both the municipal storm sewer in Main
Street and directly to the Long Island Sound are equal to or less than existing conditions for all storm events, including a 100-year storm event.

The stormwater management plan for the Project would provide significant reduction in on-site impervious coverage (greater than 25%) and the design of new planting areas and low gradient slopes for increased infiltration. These actions are expected to reduce stormwater runoff volumes and peak flows from the Project Site, as well as improve the water quality of the runoff by allowing for increased sediment removal and nutrient uptake into the planted regime. Further, the use of a hydrodynamic separator is proposed to treat runoff from approximately 0.60 acres of disturbed impervious area. This NYSDEC accepted alternative practice is expected to provide treatment for an additional 12% of design water quality volume, as well as remove up to 80% total suspended solids (TSS) from stormwater runoff passing through the structure.

(2) **Echo Bay Improvements**

Since stormwater runoff from the Project Site is currently neither detained nor treated on-site, the reduction in stormwater runoff volumes and peak flows from the Project Site, as well as improved water quality of the runoff would provide benefits to Echo Bay.

An existing debris skimmer is owned and maintained by the City of New Rochelle near the Project Site. The purpose of the structure is to intercept floating debris from the existing outfall from Stephenson Brook and Snuff Mill Creek prior to its discharge to Long Island Sound. The Project would not have any impact on either the operation or the maintenance of the skimmer.

**j. Architecture and Urban Design**

The exterior architectural character of the mixed-use building has been designed to reflect its combination of commercial, residential and waterfront influences. See Figure Nos. III.F-6 through 8, *Building Elevations*.

Brick, pre-finished metal siding, glass and metal accent panels comprise the non-combustible exterior skin of the building. The public / urban experience of the building would feature a number of predominant architectural components including (a) monumental brick framing elements, (b) the Main Street retail experience and (c) architectural mezzanines that serve to punctuate the corners of the building.

The monumental brick framing elements serve to organize the facades of the building and modulate the lengths of exterior wall. The rich and warm colors of the brick, and configuration of the metal siding and cable balcony railing style are intended to evoke a nautical building theme, as is encouraged in the PWD-5 District. The rich color of the “iron-spot” brick would be complemented by the
warm gray color of the pre-finished metal siding system, which would clad both the retail columns and corner anchoring elements of the design.

The retail program extends along the entire length of the Main Street elevation of the building. The architectural language of the retail facade is created through the offering of intermittent brick-clad columns with transparent glass infill between. The location and relationship of the glass walls may vary with the edge of the sidewalk in order to support different retail program needs and opportunities (i.e., along the edge of the sidewalk to support merchandising and display and pushed back in order to permit the use of cafe tables and other outdoor seating and retail experiences). A linear metal canopy would serve to reinforce the continuity of the retail experience while also offering opportunities for store signage. The retail program and architectural language deliberately wraps around the corner from Main Street onto Armory Place. This corner is intended to be the dynamic, pedestrian-centric, invitation to the Echo Bay site and waterfront beyond.

The mezzanine element at the corner of Main Street and Armory Place is another example of how the proposed design draws attention to the important gateway elements of the Project. The apartment-homes in these strategic locations would include two-story living rooms with mezzanines over the kitchen areas. The introduction of the mezzanines has a dramatic effect on the exterior architectural language of the building. Strategically located at the north-east corner of the Project Site, the corner of Main and Armory Place, and at the end of Armory Place, these architectural elements would capture and reinforce the gateway aspirations of the Project and its connection to the waterfront.

k. Solid Waste Disposal
The Project includes both commercial and residential uses, with parking and loading areas located within the building. Solid waste and recycling receptacles are located in the garage near the loading area, and the Applicant would contract with a private carter to remove the solid waste and recycling for both the commercial and residential uses.

l. Shoreline Repairs and Treatments
In order to prevent further deterioration from soil loss due to existing tidal erosion and stormwater runoff, the Project includes permanent stabilization of the shoreline with a rip rap stone or concrete armor and reconstruction of the deteriorated seawalls with a concrete or timber bulkhead system. In addition, inter-tidal planting shelves are proposed to provide an enhanced environment for ecological communities to become established. See Appendix 3: Shoreline Assessment Report and Appendix 5: Ecological Assessment Report. An Erosion and Sediment Control Plan for the Project has been developed to protect the waterway and is included in the set of full-sized drawings that accompany this DEIS. The plan includes limitations for the duration of soil exposure a criteria and specifications for the placement of the erosion and sediment control devices.
m. Pedestrian Bridge and Pedestrian Walkway Adjacent to Westchester County Wastewater Treatment Plant

The Project includes a pedestrian bridge on the eastern edge of the Project Site across the inlet from the Westchester County WWTP parcel. The City identified the physical connection of the Project Site with Five Islands Park through the WWTP parcel as a goal for the Project. The proposed pedestrian bridge would span from end-to-end approximately 80 feet. It would span from bank-to-bank to avoid piles in the waterway in order to impact the waterway as little as possible. The bridge width would likely be 8’-0” due to span length. The bridge would be a prefabricated aluminum structure, with some timber finishes and planking.

The proposed pedestrian bridge has been designed to land at the northern property line of the WWTP parcel. The Project does not include a pedestrian walkway along the northern property line of the WWTP, but a future path connecting the Project Site with Five Islands Park may be possible and would require coordination between the City and Westchester County.

3. Public Amenities

The waterfront esplanade and adjoining landscaped area would include the following amenities:

• Pedestrian bridge (approximately 80 feet long by 8 feet wide) connection to the County’s WWTP parcel for a future pedestrian path connection to Five Islands Park;
• One public seating area with three benches and a pergola overlooking Echo Bay;
• Gently sloped open lawn area oriented towards the waterfront for unlimited seating opportunities;
• Echo Bay walkway esplanade (approximately 2,100 linear feet with connections to adjacent parcels, the public parking area and Main Street);
• 45-car public parking lot (approximately 15,000 square feet) to be constructed on the Armory parcel; and
• a small non-motorized boat launch dock (approximately 1,200 square feet) and rehabilitated stone building (approximately 450 square feet).

4. Potential Acquisition of Private Parcel

The City of New Rochelle currently owns the two parcels that make up the Project Site: the City Yard and Armory parcels. The majority of the Project’s development would occur on the City Yard parcel, including the mixed-use commercial and residential building, associated parking, and the waterfront open space amenities. On the Armory parcel, the Project includes new Armory Place and public parking for the waterfront open space, along with the pedestrian esplanade and non-motorized boat launch dock.

The Restated MOU between the City and the Applicant contemplates that two additional parcels could be developed in the future: the former Nelstad property (Block 84, Lot 120)
and possibly the former Mancuso Marina property (Block 84, Lot 110). The Nelstad property is currently in private ownership and the City owns the Mancuso Marina property. Redevelopment of these parcels is not currently proposed by the Applicant. However, future redevelopment of the Echo Bay area would benefit from the physical connection and access provided between the Armory parcel and the Mancuso Marina parcel via the Nelstad parcel.

The City also owns the former Mancuso Marina property to the west of the Armory parcel. As required by the Restated MOU, the Applicant has made an offer to purchase the Nelstad parcel. The Restated MOU provides that “In the event that Forest City is unable, after a good faith effort, to consensually acquire the former Nelstad property, then, at the request of Forest City, and only as a last resort and subject to all applicable State and local laws, the City shall commence the use of eminent domain to acquire such private property…” At this time, the Applicant is not requesting condemnation of the Nelstad parcel or any other private property. If the eminent domain process does go forward, a fair market value would need to be established for the property, but no condemnation may take place prior to the completion of the SEQRA process for the proposed Project and the completion of all required procedures under New York Eminent Domain Procedure Law.

Although the proposed Project does not include the former Nelstad property, the Applicant has offered to contribute to the City approximately $2.5 million to defray any costs the City might incur in connection with the City’s acquisition and reuse of the Nelstad parcel and/or reuse of the Mancuso Marina parcel. These contributions would be paid over the three years of 2014-2016.

5. **Energy Conservation Measures and Other Green Building Practices**

The mixed-use building would be designed to comply with the 2010 New York State Energy Conservation Code and the 2010 New York State Building Code. Both residential units and retail spaces would be individually metered to encourage conservation of electricity. High efficiency Energy Star rated consumer appliances, lighting fixtures and building mechanical systems would incorporate controls and operating strategies which would further minimize the consumption of electricity.

The following water conservation practices are expected to be employed and in place post-construction of the Project to mitigate potential impacts of the development:

- Use of reduced flow, water conservation fixtures complying with the 2010 Plumbing Code of New York State or latest edition (expected to reduce the water demands of the Project by approximately 20%)
- Use of drip, landscape irrigation systems
- Restrict irrigation to early morning hours
- Individually metered water use
Consistent with the national mission of Forest City, a number of sustainable initiatives would be incorporated into the design of the Project including the following.

**Site Sustainability:**
- Recycling and repurposing of the Project Site
- Immediate access to public transportation
- Stabilization of shoreline with riprap and/or stacked stone seawall
- Restoration of shoreline habitat through creation of inter-tidal planting beds
- Provision of on-site stormwater management measures
- Planting of native, salt-tolerant plant materials
- Provision of publicly-accessible waterfront promenade and open space
- Use of full-cutoff light fixtures
- Provision of publicly-accessible pedestrian bridge to connect to walkways to nearby public park
- Provision of publicly-accessible kayak dock
- Potential reuse and recycling of demolition debris in site paving bases and landscape elements
- Adherence to construction activity pollution prevention plans

**Building Sustainability:**
- Super Insulated Building Envelope
- Decentralized / high-efficiency apartment-home heating and air conditioning systems
- Plumbing fixtures that meet or exceed water conservation criteria
- Kitchen and laundry appliances that meet or exceed energy conservation criteria
- Automated and variable controls on general building systems and infrastructure
- Energy recovery systems and equipment for systems that serve common areas
- Acoustically sensitive building and systems design
- Balcony / outdoor access to every apartment-home in the development
- Independent commissioning to ensure that all systems are functioning properly

6. **PROVISION OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN ACCORDANCE WITH CITY’S AFFORDABLE HOUSING ORDINANCE**

The Project is consistent with the City’s requirement that new mixed-used developments involving the construction of more than 10 new dwelling units include “Moderate-Income Housing Units” for individuals and families with annual income not exceeding 80% of the Westchester County median annual income for household size\(^5\). The Project includes 71 studio apartments, 137 one-bedroom apartments and 77 two-bedroom apartments, for a total of 285 dwelling units. Of the 285 dwelling units, 29 units (10%) would be designated Moderate-Income Housing Units. The Moderate-Income Housing Units would be distributed throughout the Project and distributed in the same proportion as the market rate dwelling units: 8 studios, 13 one-bedroom apartments and 8 two-bedroom apartments.

---

\(^5\) New Rochelle Zoning Code Article XIX.
Each Moderate-Income Housing Unit would have a floor area of not less than 90% of the average floor area of the market rate apartments.

7. **Proposed Governmental Funding, Payment in Lieu of Taxes, Tax Abatements or Land Grants**

The City of New Rochelle applied in July 2012 for the New York State Consolidated Funding Application (CFA), which would potentially provide Empire State Development Grant Funds. Empire State Development Grant Funds can only be used for capital expenditures such as acquisition or leasing of land, business or assets; demolition and environmental remediation; new construction, renovation, or leasehold improvements; acquisition of furniture or fixtures; soft costs; and planning or feasibility studies related to a specific capital project.

In December 2012, New Rochelle was awarded a $1.5 million Empire State Development Grant providing funding for public infrastructure improvements at the Echo Bay waterfront. The construction of new market rate and affordable housing and neighborhood retail opportunities and the creation of five acres of open space will support the revitalization of the City’s urban center. According to the City’s CFA application, the award would assist the City in leveraging the additional funds to provide the necessary streets, sewers, drainage, power, sidewalks, and landscaping of parkland. It would also leverage the City’s investment in a new public works yard needed as a result of the existing, aging facility that has become obsolete.

The potential fiscal impacts of a payment-in-lieu-of-taxes (PILOT) scenario were examined as part of the Socioeconomic and Fiscal Impacts Analysis (See Appendix 9). The scenario assumes a PILOT, which would generate revenue sufficient to cover the projected education costs associated with the new housing units. A 30-year time horizon was used for the analysis to project how the fiscal impact would change over a substantial portion of the Project’s effective lifetime. The 30 year horizon illustrates the 20 years proposed for the PILOT, with an additional 10 years after the PILOT ends. The PILOT Agreement would be made with the New Rochelle Industrial Development Agency ("NRIDA"). The Uniform Tax Exemption Policy of the NRIDA provides that the term of a PILOT Agreement shall be 15 years, but gives the agency the flexibility to extend the term to the 20 years proposed by the Applicant. In 2013, it is assumed that the bulk of the permit fees for the Project would be captured by the City, and in 2014 and 2015 existing property taxes would be collected along with a small amount of permit fees. When the Project comes online in 2016, the PILOT revenues are captured and all general government and education

---

6 Several factors were utilized to account for inflation. It was assumed that tax revenues would increase by 2.5% on an annual basis, while costs would increase by 1.5% annually between the 2012 and 2025 and then by 2.5% annually from 2026 to 2042. This increase in the assumed inflation in costs was utilized due to heightened uncertainty regarding the future inflationary environment. To adjust for the value of the fiscal impacts over time, cumulative fiscal impacts were adjusted using a 7% annual discount rate to arrive at the net present value of the fiscal impact for the scenario on an annual basis.
costs are assumed to begin accruing. When the PILOT ends in 2031, tax revenue from the Project is collected for the balance of the time horizon. This scenario results in an annual net fiscal positive for the City during the PILOT period, followed by much more substantial fiscal positives in the years that follow 2031.

G. PROPOSED REZONING

The Project is consistent with the City’s overall vision for the Main/Echo Urban Renewal Area as well as with the overall design concepts and guidelines (see below) of the PWD-5 District. However, in order to implement the Project as proposed, certain zoning requirements would need to be amended.

The Applicant needs to be able to develop sufficient density to make the public amenities of the Project economically feasible. To permit the required density, the maximum floor area ratio (FAR) for residential uses, maximum building height, maximum total FAR, minimum lot area per dwelling unit, and maximum building coverage in the PWD-5 District must be amended. Table No. IV.A-3, Zoning Compliance Table, shows PWD-5 District zoning requirements and the amendments requested by the Applicant.

It is noted that the City Yard parcel and Armory parcel are the only two parcels in the City in the PWD-5 Zoning District. Proposed text for the amendments to the City’s Zoning Ordinance are included at the end of Section IV.A: Land Use, Zoning and Planning Consistency. No changes to the City’s official Zoning Map are proposed as part of the Project.

H. CONSTRUCTION PHASING

Three construction phases have been identified and would extend over a 24 month period. The three phases enable construction logistics and reduce community impacts to the extent practicable. Major construction and milestones are indicated in each phase on the construction schedule and construction snapshot graphics located in Appendix 11.

1. PROJECT PHASING

Phase 1 - Snapshots 1-4
To reduce impacts to the community, heavy demolition and earth hauls would be scheduled in this early phase and would be condensed for minimal disruption. In Phase 1, demolition of existing DPW buildings would lead to sitework, sheeting, and then the start of Platform Residential construction and the South Residential Wing construction. The proposed parking area to the south of the new buildings and existing Armory would be used for staging, material storage (lumber, roofing material, MEP rough material) and employee parking.
Phase 2 - Snapshots 5-7
The Project would see finishes starting in February 2015 for the South Residential Wing and March 2015 for Platform Residential. The Clubhouse Amenities building would be completed in April 2015 (prior to the completion of Building 5) for a permanent leasing office. The new retail space would be completed October 2015. Reconfiguration at Huguenot Street and Main Street intersection would begin in Phase 2 but would be completed in Phase 3.

Phase 3 - Snapshots 8-10
Huguenot Street / Main Street reconfiguration would be complete and this Northwest entrance would be used for access by residents of the South Residential Wing. The entrance at the Northeast side of the Project Site would be used for construction access along with material being brought on and off site for site and landscape work. Grading, landscaping and finishes for walkways, public activity areas and the esplanade would be done at this time.

2. **Timing of the Various Public Amenities**
The public amenities include the waterfront esplanade and bridge, landscaped open space, non-motorized boat launch, public parking area and connecting pathways, and shoreline restoration. The public parking area and shoreline restoration sea-wall work and non-motorized boat launch would begin in Phase 2, snapshots 6 and 7. Construction for the pedestrian bridge would begin and be completed in Phase 2, snapshot 7. Grading, landscaping and final construction of walkways and seating areas would be completed in Phase 3, snapshot 9. Below is a list of the proposed public amenities and the approximate date in which they would be complete and available to the public.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Amenity</th>
<th>Date of Turnover</th>
<th>Snapshot for Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Activity area</td>
<td>10/1/15</td>
<td>Snapshot 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Bridge</td>
<td>8/20/15</td>
<td>Snapshot 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echo Bay Walk</td>
<td>11/2/15</td>
<td>Snapshot 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Open Space</td>
<td>11/2/15</td>
<td>Snapshot 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. **CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION**
This section describes the process by which the Applicant proposes to construct the Project. A phased construction program has been developed that maximizes the schedule and minimizes environmental impact on the surrounding community. Below is a description of the construction and operations planned for the Project Site by the Applicant.

1. **Construction Period Activity**

   a. **Total Construction Period**
The total construction period would last 24 months based on the construction
schedule estimate. See Figure No. III.1-1, *Echo Bay Center Concept Schedule*. It includes time for demolition, remediation, construction, and landscaping.

**b. Schedule of Demolition and Construction (Sequencing)**

The schedule of demolition and construction is indicated on the construction schedule with timeline and specific dates (see Appendix 11). Listed here are the key action items and their respective phases.

The Project would require abatement / demolition of:

- DPW facility buildings  Phase 1

The Project would require new construction of a mixed-use building including:

- Structured parking  Phase 1 & 2
- Ground level retail  Phase 1 & 2
- 3 floors of platform residential  Phase 1, 2 & 3
- South Residential Wing  Phase 1 & 2
- Roof garden and terrace.  Phase 3

The Project would require renovation/reconstruction/reconfiguration of:

- Sewer Main in the northeast quadrant  Phase 1
- Main Street/Huguenot Street intersection  Phase 2 & 3
- Seawall  Phase 2

**c. Construction Equipment and Staging Area**

The following chart outlines the equipment planned for the construction of the Project. The chart also indicates the quantities of each per phase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th># on site phase 1</th>
<th># on site phase 2</th>
<th># on site phase 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Track excavators</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeled loaders</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track dozers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End dump trucks</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water trucks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller compactors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following construction vehicles can also be anticipated: tractor trailers for material deliveries, flatbed trucks for equipment transport, dump trucks, and mobile cranes. Staging areas would be used throughout construction. They have been identified and located on the construction plans (see Appendix 11). Snapshot 4 illustrates the planned staging areas.

**d. Construction Activity Controls To Be Utilized During Construction**

During pre-construction the Construction Manager would use the following surveys and tools to evolve a logical and comprehensive Construction Management Plan.
• **Preconstruction Survey**: review and analysis of existing site conditions
• **Environmental Plan**: develop environmental protection plan for each phase of the Project inclusive of storm water management, hazmat, noise, dust/dirt, existing building, existing landscape and other considerations
• **Demolition and Land Remediation Plan**: development of safe, environmentally responsible and expedient plan
• **Emissions Control Plan**: implement a plan focused on keeping emissions from construction vehicles to a minimum
• **Building Information Modeling**: modeling of site, demolition and construction work to maximize logistics, schedule and work sequencing
• **Early Procurement Subcontractors**: bring key subs on-board early to provide design assist or design-build input during design development or construction documentation phases
• **Master Schedule Development**: develop realistic yet aggressive schedule
• **Safety Plan**: assess safety risks and work with OSHA and Safety Consultants to develop Life Safety Plan
• **Risk Assessment and Management Plan**: identify any project-specific risks and initiate risk management strategies
• **Close-out Management Plan**: outline close-out requirements and develop a day-one forward plan for achieving a smooth punchlist, commissioning and turnover process

**e. Blasting Protocol**

Preliminary reports indicate that bedrock is located in the northwestern quadrant, near Main Street, of the Project Site. Blasting would be required during Phase I of the Project to prepare for construction of the garage. The blasting work would be subcontracted to a Licensed Contractor and would be supervised by the Construction Manager’s Superintendent and a geotechnical engineer. Given that controlled blasting is anticipated, pre-construction condition surveys would be conducted for buildings and other vibration sensitive structures within approximately 250 feet of blasting, and vibration monitoring would be conducted during construction.

When blasting is required, the Construction Manager would follow best practices to minimize safety issues as well as disturbance to adjacent properties.

• **STORAGE OF EXPLOSIVES**
  The storage of explosives shall be in accordance with applicable Federal, State and City laws and requirements. The storage area of all explosive materials shall be located on the site at a location approved by the supervising blasting engineer of the blasting subcontractor. Caps or other detonating devices would not be stored with Class A explosives.

  The Construction Manager shall keep an accurate running inventory of all explosives and blasting agents stored and maintained on site. The designated
storage site, explosive transporting vehicles, and areas where explosives are being used shall be clearly marked and would display the required warning signs. A daily tally of all explosives delivered, used and stored would be maintained at the main Project construction office.

- **TRANSPORTATION OF EXPLOSIVE MATERIALS**
  All vehicles transporting explosive materials shall display all placards, lettering, and/or numbering required. Only authorized persons would transport and handle the explosives as designated by the authority of those licensed for this purpose. Vehicles transporting explosive materials shall not be left unattended.

- **HANDLING OF EXPLOSIVE MATERIALS**
  There shall be no smoking, open lights, or fire of any kind within 50 feet of any area where explosives are being handled. No source of ignition, except necessary means to light fuses or fire electric detonators, shall be permitted in an area containing loaded holes. After loading of a blast is completed, all excess explosive materials and detonators shall be removed to a safe location or returned at once to the storage area, observing the same rules as when being conveyed to the blasting area.

- **VIBRATION AND DAMAGE CONTROL**
  Blasting operations in or adjacent to residences, buildings, structures, utilities or other facilities shall be carefully planned with full consideration for all forces and conditions involved. The minimum amount of blasting material shall be used to effectively fracture the competent rock for the excavation depth. Independent monitoring of vibration and air concussion levels shall be carried out by the contractor during all blasting operations.

- **DRILLING AND LOADING**
  Drilling and loading operations shall not be carried on in the same area. Drilling shall be separated from loaded holes. The loading or loaded area shall be kept free of any equipment, operations, or persons not essential to loading, this includes vehicles and/or traffic. The blast site shall be guarded or barricaded and posted with danger signs to restrict unauthorized entry.

- **FIRING**
  Prior to the firing of a shot, all persons in the danger area shall be warned of the blast and ordered to a safe distance from the area. Blasts shall not be fired until it is certain that every person has retreated to a safe distance and no one remains in a dangerous location. Prior to the firing, a competent flag person shall be posted at all access points to danger areas.

All blasting operations shall use the following safety signals:
WARNING SIGNAL: A one-minute long series of long audible signals five minutes prior to blast signal;  
BLAST SIGNAL: A series of short audible signals one minute prior to the shot; and  
ALL CLEAR SIGNAL: A prolonged audible signal following the inspection of blast area.

For the protection of persons and adjoining property precautions would be taken and shall include the following:

- A blasting mat would be placed over the blasting surface. The blasting mat would remain in place until all shots are fired in the blasting zone.
- Appropriate signs would be erected in the area of blasting activities.
- Notification of blasting at the site would be published in newspapers prior to the scheduled blasting.
- A storm alert monitoring device would be used by the blasting contractor.
- Special care would be taken with detonating cords and connectors to protect from the impact of falling rocks or other impeding objects.
- Vehicles equipped with radio transmitters and portable 2-way radios would not be permitted within 100 feet of blasting operations.

In addition to the above, the Applicant would contact any establishments that may be impacted by noise and/or vibrations to provide a blast schedule and contact information.

2. **Operation of Uses Upon Completion**

   a. **Hours of Operation**
      
      The residential management and leasing office is expected to operate between 9:00 AM and 6:00 PM, Monday through Friday and 10:00 AM and 4:00 PM on Saturday, with Sunday hours by appointment. Specific retail/restaurant tenants are not known at this time, but hours are expected to be consistent with surrounding retail and restaurant business hours along the Main Street and Huguenot Street commercial corridor. Consistent with City regulations, sidewalk café and outdoor dining hours would be expected to be up to 10:00 PM Sunday through Thursday and 11:00 PM Friday and Saturday, unless the approving agency determined otherwise.

   b. **Deliveries**
      
      Residential deliveries and packages would be accepted by the building concierge and/or security desk attendant. Move-ins are scheduled as necessary. Commercial deliveries would be based on tenant requirements, but it is expected that deliveries to the commercial stores would occur during non-peak morning hours in order to minimized disturbance to Main Street traffic and parking operations.
c. **Lighting and Security**

The Project includes internal structured parking with controlled access to the resident-only parking level. A 24-hour attendant/security guard would be present on site. Access to the building is via the 24-hour attended lobby or controlled (key card/fab) doors. Lighting includes garage fixtures, exterior lighting and landscape lighting for security and to encourage mixed-use lifestyle.

j. **INVOLVED AGENCIES AND REQUIRED APPROVALS**

The “Involved” Agencies are defined under the State Environmental Quality Review Act (617.2) as those state or local agencies that have jurisdiction by law to fund, approve or directly undertake an action. If an agency will ultimately make a discretionary decision to fund, approve or undertake an action, then it is an involved agency, notwithstanding that it has not received an application for funding or approval at the time the SEQR is commenced. The Lead Agency is also an Involved Agency. The Involved Agencies and the permits and approvals they may grant for the Project, include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE NO. III.J-1: INVOLVED AGENCIES AND APPROVALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. New Rochelle City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. New Rochelle Planning Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. New Rochelle Bureau of Buildings and Department of Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. New Rochelle Professional Architectural Review Committee (PARC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. New Rochelle Industrial Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Westchester County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### K. INTERESTED PARTIES

Interested parties include other government agencies, groups or individuals who have expressed an interest or may have an interest in the Project.

1. New Rochell Board of Education and City School District  
2. United Water of New Rochelle  
3. Sutton Manor Civic Association  
4. Sean Reilley  
5. East End Civic Association  
6. Premium Point Park Association  
7. Tom McFarland  
8. Save the Armory Committee  
9. Good Profit
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Task Name</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Predecessors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Project Schedule</td>
<td>515 days</td>
<td>Tue 4/1/14</td>
<td>Mon 3/21/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Milestones</td>
<td>515 days</td>
<td>Tue 4/1/14</td>
<td>Mon 3/21/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>175 days</td>
<td>Tue 4/1/14</td>
<td>Mon 12/1/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Phase 1 ends</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Mon 12/1/14</td>
<td>Mon 12/1/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Construction Begins</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Tue 4/1/14</td>
<td>Tue 4/1/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Demo Existing Structures Complete</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Mon 6/2/14</td>
<td>Mon 6/2/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>196 days</td>
<td>Tue 12/2/14</td>
<td>Tue 9/1/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Phase 2 Begins</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Tue 12/2/14</td>
<td>Tue 12/2/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Huguenot St/Main St Reconfiguration Completion</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Tue 9/1/15</td>
<td>Tue 9/1/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Clubhouse Amenities</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Mon 4/6/15</td>
<td>Mon 4/6/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>144 days</td>
<td>Wed 9/2/15</td>
<td>Mon 3/21/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Phase 3 Begins</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Wed 9/2/15</td>
<td>Wed 9/2/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Public Activity Area Turnover</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Thu 10/1/15</td>
<td>Thu 10/1/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Echo Bay Walk Turnover</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Mon 11/2/15</td>
<td>Mon 11/2/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Public Open Space</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Mon 11/2/15</td>
<td>Mon 11/2/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Retail Turnover</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Fri 10/9/15</td>
<td>Fri 10/9/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Construction Complete</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Mon 3/2/16</td>
<td>Mon 3/21/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>428 days</td>
<td>Tue 4/1/14</td>
<td>Thu 11/18/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Garage</td>
<td>90 days</td>
<td>Tue 9/20/14</td>
<td>Mon 9/22/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Residence Building</td>
<td>190 days</td>
<td>Tue 9/9/14</td>
<td>Mon 6/1/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>20 days</td>
<td>Tue 9/9/14</td>
<td>Mon 10/6/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>55 days</td>
<td>Tue 11/4/14</td>
<td>Mon 1/19/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Rough</td>
<td>60 days</td>
<td>Tue 1/20/15</td>
<td>Mon 4/13/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Finishes</td>
<td>80 days</td>
<td>Tue 2/10/15</td>
<td>Mon 6/1/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Platform Residential</td>
<td>395 days</td>
<td>Tue 9/16/14</td>
<td>Mon 3/21/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Steel/Mason</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>Tue 9/16/14</td>
<td>Mon 10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>85 days</td>
<td>Tue 9/30/14</td>
<td>Mon 1/26/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Rough</td>
<td>90 days</td>
<td>Tue 1/27/15</td>
<td>Mon 6/1/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Finishes</td>
<td>270 days</td>
<td>Tue 3/10/15</td>
<td>Mon 3/21/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>90 days</td>
<td>Mon 6/8/15</td>
<td>Fri 10/9/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>48 days</td>
<td>Tue 6/16/15</td>
<td>Thu 8/26/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Club Amenities</td>
<td>100 days</td>
<td>Tue 11/18/14</td>
<td>Mon 4/6/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>