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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>
</table>
| 1. New Rochelle City Council | • Amendments to the City Zoning Code  
• Amendments to the Main/Echo Urban Renewal Plan, if applicable  
• Disposition of the Project Site to the Applicant for redevelopment  
• Special permit approval for the Project |
| 2. New Rochelle Planning Board | • Site plan approval for the Project  
• Subdivision approval for the Project, if applicable |
| 3. New Rochelle Bureau of Buildings and Department of Public Works | • Approval of the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP)  
• Tree Removal Permit  
• Demolition Permit  
• Building Permit |
| 4. New Rochelle Professional Architectural Review Committee (PARC) | • Review of building architecture and urban design |
| 5. New Rochelle Industrial Development Agency | • Approval of Payment-In-Lieu-Of-Tax Agreement ("PILOT Agreement") |
| 6. Westchester County | • Planning Board 239-m review  
• Department of Environmental Facilities approval of sewer line relocation and extensions  
• Department of Health approvals related to water and sewer line extensions and connections, water supply backflow device; and resident pool |
| 7. New York State | • Office of General Services for administration of state-owned lands  
• Department of Environmental Conservation approvals related to stormwater discharge, stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP), tidal wetlands permit, any required environmental remediation  
• Department of State for Long Island Sound Coastal Management Program consistency review and coastal consistency  
• Department of Transportation referral jurisdiction related to Main Street roadway improvements  
• State Historic Preservation Office related to impact on cultural resources  
• Possible State legislative approval for disposition of waterfront land |
| 8. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers | • Approvals related to water’s edge improvements |
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 ECOLOGICAL 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>$1,481,253</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>-$892,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$669,963</td>
<td>$1,595,130</td>
<td>-$895,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$686,712</td>
<td>$1,635,028</td>
<td>-$848,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>$703,880</td>
<td>$1,673,904</td>
<td>-$897,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>$721,477</td>
<td>$1,717,802</td>
<td>-$896,325</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 RECReCs 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 Amory, 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.

4. **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 Nelsstad properties for public parking and Huntington Place for access to Armory parcel)**

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 Armory 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”.

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*.
Both parcels within the Project Site are currently owned by the City of New Rochelle.

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.
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
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
wing. 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 Armory 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,
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)”.  

---
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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
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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.
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 façades 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.6 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.
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- **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. **INVOVED 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>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>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Department of Health approvals related to water and sewer line extensions 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&lt;br&gt;• Department of Environmental Conservation approvals related to stormwater discharge, stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP), tidal wetlands permit, any required environmental remediation&lt;br&gt;• Department of State for Long Island Sound Coastal Management Program consistency review and coastal consistency&lt;br&gt;• Department of Transportation referral jurisdiction related to Main Street roadway improvements&lt;br&gt;• State Historic Preservation Office related to impact on cultural resources&lt;br&gt;• 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>

### 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 Rochelle 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
A. LAND USE, ZONING AND PLANNING CONSISTENCY
A. LAND USE, ZONING AND PLANNING CONSISTENCY

The analyses in this Section IV.A are divided into three sections: Land Use, Zoning and Planning Consistency. The Land Use section describes current land uses within ¼ mile of the Project Site and identifies other projects planned within ½ mile of the Project Site in order to evaluate the compatibility of the Project with the surrounding area, as well as the cumulative impact of the Project and other pending or approved projects on land use patterns and community character. The Planning Consistency section describes New Rochelle and Westchester County planning documents and policies for the Project Site and identifies amendments to local land use plans that might be necessary as part of the Proposed Action. The Zoning section provides an overview of the current zoning related both to the Project Site and the adjoining properties, as well as proposed amendments to the City’s Zoning Ordinance. Each analysis considers the following: 1) Existing Conditions; 2) Future Conditions Without the Project; 3) Potential Impacts; and 4) Mitigation Measures.

1. LAND USE

The proposed Project consists of the development of a mixed-use residential and retail building and associated parking on the City Yard parcel. In addition, the Project includes the public waterfront improvements on the City Yard parcel and Armory parcel, along with the creation of Armory Place drive and public parking for access to the public waterfront. In order to accommodate Armory Place and provide efficient vehicular access from Main Street, the Project includes the removal of the metal shed located behind the Annex on the Armory parcel. The Applicant is aware that the City is currently considering proposals for redevelopment of the Armory building, including a proposal by “Good Profit.”. The Applicant has met with representatives of Good Profit to explore ways in which the Good Profit site plan can be coordinated with the Applicant’s site plan. However, the Good Profit development program is not yet certain, and the site plan for that parcel 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. However, removal of the Annex building would permit a wider boulevard driveway and a greater viewshed to Echo Bay from Main Street. The removal of the Armory Annex is an Alternative to the Project evaluated in Section V of this DEIS.

The Project Site consists of two parcels totaling approximately 9.4 acres, as designated in Table No. IV.A-1 below and shown on Figure No. IV.A-3, Project Development Parcels. The easternmost parcel is used as the City Yard operated by the New Rochelle Department of Public Works (DPW). The parcel is 6.5 acres and includes a number of large garage and warehouse type buildings, single-story office buildings, parking areas for employee vehicles and City trucks, and uncovered storage of salt and sand piles. The parcel has minimal landscape including a row of trees along the western property edge and a few street trees
along Main Street. The City is in the process of relocating the DPW operations from this property and a second site to one consolidated location.

The parcel to the west of the City Yard is located at 260-70 East Main Street and is also owned by the City of New Rochelle. The main Armory building, Annex and several outbuildings are located on this parcel. According to the City\(^1\), the Armory was a repository for armaments and a site for military drills and readiness during World War II and the Korean War. Throughout the years, it also served as a locale for civic functions. It was acquired by the City in 1997, after which it 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. In May 2012, the City prepared a Request for Proposals (RFP) for the reuse of the Armory facility and invited interested groups to submit creative visions and 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 selected “Good Profit,” the sponsor of a proposed local food marketplace with restaurants. In November, 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. Upon the expiration of the six-month time period, Good Profit is required to submit a detailed site plan, analysis of public costs and benefits and a detailed financing program to the City. The development program and site plan for the Armory has not been finalized at this time.

### TABLE NO. IV.A-1: PROJECT SITE PARCELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Tax Lot</th>
<th>Area (sf)</th>
<th>Area (ac)</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Yard – Department of Public Works</td>
<td>Block 84 Lot 5</td>
<td>285,600</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>City of New Rochelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armory</td>
<td>Block 84 Lot 22</td>
<td>126,690</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>City of New Rochelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>412,290</td>
<td>9.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The parcel west of the Armory parcel is the site of the former Nelstad Materials Corporation Concrete Plant (0.97 acres), which is currently vacant and privately owned. Future development of the parcel would be subject to separate State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) review. The other adjacent parcel is the former Mancuso Marina (1.23 acres), which is currently vacant and owned by the City of New Rochelle. This property

---

was acquired through In Rem tax foreclosure proceedings. However, future development of the parcel would also be subject to separate SEQRA review.

**a. Existing Conditions**

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*. The 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.

1. **Existing Land Use**

Land uses in the area surrounding the Project Site are a mix of commercial, industrial and residential, with East Main Street and Huguenot Street, a one-way pair that splits from Route 1, exhibiting the greatest diversity of commercial and mixed uses, and residential neighborhoods extending from the central commercial core.

North and southwest of the Project Site predominately residential uses exist, while adjacent to the Site along Main Street, commercial, institutional, and mixed-use non-residential make up the majority of the land uses, with a park serving as a small buffer between the Armory site and commercial zone along Huguenot Street. Both sides of Main Street and Huguenot Street are lined by sidewalks and provide on-street parking. However, two auto-oriented commercial uses to the east are set back from the road with on-site parking near the front property line. Several other commercial uses along Main and Huguenot Streets are built to the sidewalk line, providing a street wall with pedestrian-oriented store windows. To the north of the Main Street corridor, the Stephenson Park and Spencer Park residential neighborhoods primarily include a mix of single and two-family land uses with residential amenities such as the Stephenson Boulevard Park. Manufacturing, auto sales and hotel land uses are found along the Cedar Street and River Street frontage to the west of the Stephenson Park neighborhood. To the south of the Site, across the Echo Bay inlet, the Sutton Manor neighborhood is low-density single-family residential homes, with minimum lot size of 7,500 square feet, or approximately two to six dwelling units per acre. To the southwest of Echo Avenue, the Residence Park neighborhood includes a mix of single-family residential, multi-family residential and institutional land uses, including Monroe College. To the east of the Project Site are commercial uses, including automotive sales and services; the Westchester County Wastewater Treatment facility; and the Hazelhurst Park neighborhood, which consists of single-family residential homes.

The commercial uses include the Radisson Hotel to the northwest, 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 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, an institution that awards associates, bachelors, and graduate level degrees; and Salesian High School, an all-male 9th-12th grade Catholic school. The open space land uses include Faneuil Park with the Boston Post Road Memorial and a memorial dedicated to World War I servicemen located immediately north of the Project Site, and Five Islands Park to the southeast of the 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 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.

(2) **Critical Environmental Area: “Long Island Sound”**
The Long Island Sound was designated by Westchester County as a Critical Environmental Area (CEA) in January 1990. The designation relates to a number of factors including:

- a shoreline that exhibits many areas of tidal marsh;
- the occurrence of several areas of scenic and historic interest; and
- the inclusion of many areas of important environmental features.

The boundary of this area follows roads and other cultural features, tying in the direct relationship between the Sound and its adjacent land. In a 2010 assessment of the New York State Coastal Management Program, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration noted a number of concerns about the Long Island Sound. Among these concerns, water quality and habitat degradation were deemed to be high-level concerns, and changes to the shoreline and alteration of community character were deemed to be mid-level concerns. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration recommended that these factors be taken into consideration in the creation of any development plan in the Long Island Sound CEA.

(3) **Other Projects Planned Within One-Half Mile of Project Site**
The City of New Rochelle Department of Development identified the following two projects under review within one-half mile of the Project Site:

(a) **Gateway Transit Oriented Design(TOD) @ Garden Street**
The City seeks to establish Class “A” office presence in the “Gateway TOD @ Garden Street,” adjacent to the City’s intermodal transit center. Gateway TOD @ Garden Street is located within walking distance of downtown New Rochelle and is only a few minutes from the Long Island Sound. Gateway TOD @ Garden Street (Sites A & B) is bounded by Interstate 95 (north), MTA’s Metro-North Railroad tracks (south), Cottage Place/I-95, Exit 16.
(east) and North Avenue (west). The site has immediate access to the I-95 corridor sitting midway between New York City and Connecticut’s “Gold Coast” in Fairfield County, including Greenwich and Stamford’s urban centers.

Site A, comprised of a City-owned parking area and several privately-owned parcels, is approximately 1.5 acres. Site B is nearly all privately-held, except for one parcel which is operated by the City as a parking area. Site B is approximately 1.7 acres. The City received one response to its April 2012 Request For Proposals, and the submittal is in the initial review stages with the Evaluation Committee. No approvals are currently pending.

(b) Main Street Core Project
This project area is located near Church and Division Streets in the downtown, just outside the one-half mile land use study radius. The Main Street Core project includes the City-owned Prospect Street surface parking lot consisting of 334 spaces and the 388 space two-level Church-Division Parking Garage, also owned and operated by the City of New Rochelle.

The Church-Division Parking Garage is over 40 years old and the City is investigating how it could optimally revitalize the area by replacing the existing garage site and developing a mixed-use project using existing zoning parameters. A Request for Qualifications was sent out in March 2010. From the applicants, the City selected a preferred developer, Albanese Organization, Inc., and their proposal is under review by the Department of Development. No approvals are currently pending.

b. Future Land Use Conditions Without the Project
Without the Project, the Project Site would remain in its current condition, owned by the City of New Rochelle. It is probable the City Yard property would continue to be used as the City Yard operated by the Department of Public Works. The Armory parcel would remain in its current condition until, and if, the City Council selects a developer for the redevelopment of the Armory buildings. Proposals for the redevelopment of the Armory were reviewed by the City Council. At its September 19, 2012 meeting, the City Council selected Good Profit, the sponsor of a proposed local food marketplace with restaurants. In November, the Council approved a six-month, non-binding “letter of agreement” between the City and Good Profit pursuant to which Good Profit and the City would explore the redevelopment of the Armory buildings. Upon the expiration of the six-month time period, Good Profit is required to submit a detailed site plan, analysis of public costs and benefits and a detailed financing program to the City. The development program and site plan for the Armory has not been finalized at this time. A copy of the LOA was not available for this DEIS.
Additionally, without the Project, the land use characteristics of the parcels would be unchanged. The current use of the City Yard parcel and the vacant Armory building are not consistent with the permitted uses or special permit uses in the Planned Waterfront Development District (PWD-5). Without commercial and residential land uses, the parcels would not provide the associated economic benefits of those uses, nor the public benefit of 29 affordable rental housing units. Additionally, without the Project, no public land use amenities such as the proposed Echo Bay Walk esplanade, seating areas, public parking and boat access would be provided. Both parcels would remain under City ownership and continue to be tax-exempt.

**c. Potential Land Use Impacts**

As stated in §331-28 of the Zoning Code, the intent of the PWD Planned Waterfront Development Districts is to “encourage mixed-use water-dependent and water related [uses], possibly including residential and commercial development, to preserve views of the water and smaller harbor area, particularly where the visual quality of the area is an important component to the area’s appeal and identity, and limiting the bulk and height to dimensions considered appropriate in different areas and to encourage, whenever possible, public access to and enjoyment of the waterfront”. The Project’s commercial and residential land uses, as well as the proposed waterfront public access, Echo Bay Walk, and other amenities, are consistent with the intent of the of the PWD District.

As set forth in §331-115 of the Zoning Code, special permit land uses in the PWD-5 District are subject to special conditions imposed by the City Council. The Project includes a special permit residential land use that would comply as follows:

- The residential special permit use would not displace any active water-dependent uses, as no water-dependent uses exist on the parcels or on the immediately adjacent parcels.
- The proposed mixed-use building includes screening, buffering and soundproofing from existing nearby or adjacent manufacturing use or other use that is potentially incompatible.
- The Project provides an attractive waterfront yard area and physical access to the waterfront.
- The Project provides water views from public rights-of-way.
- The Project adheres to waterfront design guidelines, with nautical building design, water orientation and views, salt-water-tolerant vegetation, lighting, and screening.
(1) **Compatibility of Proposed Development with Adjacent Land Uses, Including the Westchester County Wastewater Treatment Plant**

The Project’s proposed land uses are consistent with the adopted development plans and zoning for the Project Site. The City’s vision for the Site has contemplated commercial, residential and public access land uses for many decades, as outlined in documents such as the Main/Echo Urban Renewal Plan written in 1983 (and revised in 1994) and the City’s Comprehensive Plan written in 1996 and updated in 2006. The proposed retail stores and/or restaurants, to be located along the Site’s East Main Street frontage, are consistent with the existing varied commercial uses located along the East Main and Huguenot Street frontage. The existing Main Street commercial uses include larger-scale auto service and drugstore retail along with various restaurants. Small scale neighborhood retail and service retail is located in many of the mixed-use buildings on the first floor, with office and residential uses located on the upper floors. In terms of the mix of residential land uses located above commercial land uses within the same building, the Project is compatible with the mixed-use buildings in the area, including the recently developed Huguenot Hills development northeast of the Project Site.

(a) **Adjacent Land Uses**

Adjacent land uses include auto service (Aamco) to the east, commercial (various small scale retail store) to the north, and a chain restaurant (McDonald's) and vacant land (former Nelstad concrete plant) to the west. The proposed mix of ground floor commercial uses, upper floor residential uses, and public uses along the waterfront is compatible with the redevelopment that has occurred in the Echo Bay area in the recent past as the industrial land uses have ceased. None of the adjoining uses would be adversely impacted by new commercial uses or residential uses.

(b) **Westchester County Wastewater Treatment Plant**

The County’s Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) is located across an inlet to the southeast of the Project Site between the City Yard parcel and Five Islands Park. The WWTP parcel is 13.8 acres and the facility is currently undergoing improvements consistent with a 2008 Consent Order with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) in relation to enforcement of the Federal Clean Water Act. The WWTP has long been part of the neighborhood, and single-family residential neighborhoods, Salesian High School and Five Islands Park all currently exist in this area. The Project would be in close proximity to the WWTP, with views of the facility to the southeast. Currently, a line of mature trees buffer the southwest edge of the WWTP parcel to limit seasonal views of the facility. DEIS Section VI.D describes the visual conditions related to the Project in more detail. Given the other residential developments within
proximity of the WWTP, the Project would not be incompatible with the facility.

(2) Existing Commercial and Industrial Uses To Be Displaced
The Project includes the development of the City Yard parcel, which is currently being used for City of New Rochelle DPW operations. The relocation of the DPW yard has been contemplated for many years as part of the redevelopment of the Main/Echo Urban Renewal Area (1983, revised 1994), as reflected in the City Comprehensive Plan (1996) and the City Harbor Management Plan (1999). The City Council has indicated its intention to consolidate and relocate the DPW operations to a new location. The potential impacts associated with relocating the DPW operations were reviewed by the City Council, as lead agency, in a separate SEQRA process, and an Environmental Findings Statement was 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.

The Project also includes the creation of Armory Place, a new driveway from East Main Street to provide both visual and physical access to the Echo Bay waterfront and public parking for the waterfront amenities. In order to provide efficient access that can be shared by both the Project’s mixed-use commercial/residential building and the existing Armory building (with its associated potential future redevelopment), as well as provide public parking for the waterfront, the removal of the metal shed behind the Annex building is required. The metal shed is currently vacant with no commercial or industrial uses that would be displaced.

Although they are not part of the Project Site, the two adjacent parcels to the west (Mancuso Marina and Nelstad) are both vacant and future redevelopment would therefore not displace any commercial or industrial uses.

(3) Cumulative Impact of this Project and Other Pending or Approved Projects Within One-Quarter Mile of the Project Site on Area Land Use Pattern and Community Character
As noted above, the City of New Rochelle Department of Development identified two projects under review within one-half mile of the Project Site: Gateway TOD @ Garden Street and Main Street Core Project, but no development of either project is currently approved. No other projects within a quarter mile of the project site have any pending approvals.

The cumulative impact of this Project would change the land use pattern and community character of the existing City Yard parcel from an industrial land use to mixed-use commercial and residential. The Site is a fenced property that provides little community character or pedestrian benefits along the East Main Street
frontage. From the surrounding neighborhoods southwest of the Site and Five Islands Park southeast of the Site from across Echo Bay, the Site has low-rise buildings but no visual or landscape buffer for the exposed salt/sand pile storage, recycling and DPW trucks and vehicles. It is expected that the cleanup and redevelopment of the City Yard parcel with landscaping and public waterfront improvements, including the shoreline restoration and Echo Bay Walk, would improve the community character of the Site as seen and experienced from surrounding residential neighborhoods and Five Islands Park.

Along the East Main Street frontage, it is expected that the architectural building façade, pedestrian-oriented streetscape, animated commercial uses and the open viewshed to Echo Bay from Armory Place would enhance the community character for the neighborhoods experiencing the Site from the north, as well as for those traveling via auto or foot along East Main and Huguenot Streets. The height of the proposed mixed-use building would be taller than the existing single-story DPW buildings on the Site, and would be taller than the 45 foot mixed-use Huguenot Hills building across East Main Street from the Site, but would not be out of character with the general scale of the main barrel-vaulted Armory building to the west of the City Yard parcel. The proposed building would be five stories along East Main Street and four stories in the rear of the Site. See Figure No. IV. A-2, Proposed Building Height Measurement.

(4) Critical Environmental Area: “Long Island Sound”
The existing shoreline conditions along the City Yard and Armory parcels are significantly deteriorated. In particular, the City Yard parcel includes a steeply sloped bank with a timber retaining wall serving as a barrier for the upland salt pits, concrete pipe barrier, intermittent concrete over-pour, asphalt platform, mixed stone and concrete armor, two outfalls, and general debris. The existing shoreline conditions along the Armory parcel include mixed stones, concrete platform, and a stone seawall with intermittent collapse. The “soft shoreline” sections of the area exhibit signs of tidal erosion of varying degrees with loss of overburden. The “hard shoreline” areas, whether timber, concrete block, steel sheet pile or placed stone, show severe deterioration, with significant loss of backfill and highly visible signs of collapse. As part of the Project, the shoreline of the Project Site would be improved from existing conditions. Stabilization of the shoreline would occur with medium-sized armor stone riprap in order to prevent further tidal erosion.

Currently, a large portion of the two primary parcels drains to the southwest and directly into the Long Island Sound via the two outfalls with no water quality treatment measures. The Project would include new pervious areas consisting of planting areas, lawns and low gradient slopes in order to improve stormwater infiltration. Additionally, the reduction in impervious cover on the Site and installation of a hydrodynamic separator on the Armory parcel to remove sediment
and pollutants from the stormwater would significantly improve the overall water quality of the stormwater runoff from the Site, and thus improve the water quality conditions of Echo Bay and the Long Island Sound.

The Project also includes the creation of a waterfront esplanade, along with a boulevard driveway between the City Yard and Armory parcels with public parking for waterfront access, which currently does not exist at the Site. Current conditions prevent public access to or scenic views of Echo Bay from the upland portion of the surrounding neighborhoods. The Project would open a limited view to Echo Bay via Armory Place and provide physical access to the community. As a result of these actions, the Project would improve shoreline conditions and public access to Echo Bay and is therefore not expected to have significant adverse impacts on the Long Island Sound CEA.

d. Potential Mitigation Measures
The proposed mixed-use commercial and residential uses are compatible with the adjacent commercial and institutional uses, as well as the surrounding commercial uses along East Main and Huguenot Streets and single-family, two-family and multi-family residential land uses extending from the nearby residential neighborhoods. As there are no significant adverse environmental impacts identified related to land use, no mitigation measures are required.

2. Consistency with Land Use Plans and Policies
This section describes and evaluates the consistency of the Project with a number of land use plans and policies adopted by the City of New Rochelle with respect to the Project and the Long Island Sound area, as well as other regional land use plans. The following documents were reviewed: New Rochelle Comprehensive Plan, Main/Echo Urban Renewal Plan, City Harbor Management Plan and Map, New Rochelle Local Waterfront Revitalization Program, The Long Island Sound Coastal Management Plan, and Westchester County 2025.

a. Existing Conditions
(1) New Rochelle Comprehensive Plan
The New Rochelle Comprehensive Plan was adopted in 1996 in accordance with Section 28-a of New York State General City Law, and was amended in 2006. The City prepared a Generic Environmental Impact Statement in connection with the Comprehensive Plan.

The main goals of the Comprehensive Plan include:
- Construction of an Intermodal Transportation Center
- Creation of a physical link between downtown and the waterfront
In order to meet the goals set forth in the Comprehensive Plan, development plans and zoning changes were proposed that encourage increased density downtown, mixed-use, and the best utilization of the City's 9.3 miles of shoreline. In order to capitalize on the City's existing strengths, particularly its waterfront location, the Plan proposes to increase density of development as a way to draw more business to the commercial districts and to increase the visual and physical connection to the waterfront. To that end, mixed-use development, in addition to water-related uses, is encouraged along Main Street in order to improve the functioning of downtown, to create a critical mass of new development, and to increase access to the waterfront (III-5). Coordinated development and a common aesthetic downtown (III-5) and along waterfront areas (III-7) and throughout the East Main Street entryway are prioritized in connection with provision of both physical and visual access to the waterfront (III-7). Coordination of development and improved access to the waterfront through the creation of a planned waterfront development district, in which the Site is located, and development of a pedestrian esplanade from the Municipal Marina to Five Islands Park (III-48) is encouraged. The Plan proposes that relocation of City Yard and acquisition of the Armory could serve as key catalysts for redevelopment of the waterfront (III-47) and allow the pedestrian link to reach fruition (III-48). These actions are to be implemented within the framework of New Rochelle as a diverse, historic waterfront town with a variety of commercial, recreational and educational opportunities (II-3).

(2) Main/Echo Urban Renewal Plan
The Main/Echo Urban Renewal Area was designated by New Rochelle City Council Resolution No. 132 on June 21, 1983. The Main/Echo Urban Renewal Plan (URP) was adopted in 1983 and updated in 1994. The main goals of the URP are the elimination of substandard, deteriorating and obsolete structures; remediation of
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environmental deficiencies through management of well-balanced land uses consistent with neighborhood character, as outlined in the Master Plan; and restoration of structures deemed suitable for retention as part of community’s housing supply.

The URP proposes a number of actions that include both retention of current characteristics and retrofitting. To improve quality of life for residents, actions include expansion of the market rate housing supply through site management, protection of the quality of residential uses by enforcing compatible uses and scales in adjacent development, and establishment of an improved street system to serve both existing and proposed uses. The URP recommends, in an effort to increase the tax base and increase job opportunities, the acquisition of property that would permit proper and meaningful development and retention in concert with expansion of commercial development. Finally, to preserve the neighborhood character, the plan suggests facilitating the development of an urban design for the area that reflects the characteristics of the topography, its waterfront location, site configuration, and surrounding development, while promoting a standard of design for all its components, as well as preserving and enhancing environmental factors that define the area.

The proposed land uses for the Main/Echo Urban Renewal Area are designed to achieve residential development in both west and east portions of the area. Medium density residential is proposed for western portion of the area and high-density residential use is proposed for the eastern portion of the area, including the City Yard and Armory parcels. The western portion, with the exception of the Consolidated Edison site which could be developed with 30 dwelling units per acre, is designated residential land use limited to 3 stories and 8 dwelling units per acre. The eastern portion, composed of the two parcels that comprise the Project Site, is designated as a high-density area, with higher maximum height and more dwelling units per acre than the western portion, and mixed-use development.

The URP recommends residential, office and accessory land uses for the high-density residential area. Residential uses could include multifamily (4+ dwelling units for rent or sale), attached single family homes; detached one, two, and three family homes. Commercial office uses are permitted, provided they do not exceed 20% of total floor area designated to residential use. Buildings could be up to 12 stories, have 85 dwelling units per acre, with 1.5 parking spaces per dwelling unit, and 2.5 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of office area. Accessory uses include off-street parking, boat docks, pedestrian waterfront promenades, and other incidental uses to residential. Office uses on lower floors would serve as a buffer for separation of residential uses from Main Street traffic, and the placement of residential use on higher floors would benefit from waterfront views. All building on properties to be
acquired in accordance with the URP would be demolished to allow for the development of structures that support the proposed uses.

(3) City Harbor Management Plan and Map
The Harbor Management Plan (HMP), required by the New York State Department of State (NYSDOS), is in compliance with the NYSDOS "Guidelines for the Preparation of Harbor Management Plans" and was adopted by the City Council in November, 1999 following environmental review in accordance with SEQRA. The HMP was produced in part from analysis undertaken for the Local Waterfront Revitalization Plan (LWRP) and the New Rochelle Comprehensive Plan, as well as input from public participation processes.

The main goals of the HMP are to ensure public and vessel safety; continued and enhanced public enjoyment of the harbor, including increased access and recreational opportunities; and preservation and improvement of natural resources. The mix of uses supported by the plan are recreational boating in the Inner Harbor Area; private beach clubs on the eastern shore of Davenport Neck; vessel mooring and the City Marina at Echo Bay; as well as public park facilities and open space throughout the waterfront, including Five Islands Park and Hudson Park on Echo Bay. Further, projected results of implementation are to enhance property values, improve overall quality of life for residents and to attract both private and public funds.

The plan proposes zoning that encourages continuation of existing water-dependent uses allows for acceptable expansion of uses in accordance with the LWRP. The plan prioritizes recreational water uses because of their importance to users as well as their significance to the local economy. Further, the plan supports stricter rules separating uses of water by vessels and land based users. In addition, consistent with the Long Island Sound Coastal Management Plan, development of water-dependent and water-enhanced uses is prioritized by the HMP in Maritime Centers so as to support current uses, protect natural resources, and to serve as a general regional growth management strategy.

As a result of environmental concerns and barriers to use, the HMP proposes projects that involve improving navigational safety, removal of deteriorated structures, physical improvements in Five Islands Park, wetland restoration, and formulation of structural solutions to conditions of the stormwater drainage system. The plan recommends that deteriorated structures, especially those in the Main/Echo Urban Renewal Area, be removed to improve both views and physical access and use of the waterfront. The HMP recommends Five Islands Park remain a low intensity use. Passive recreation improvements proposed by the HMP include sun shelters or other means of increased shade, a canoe/kayak launch and expanded shoreline fishing. Improvements to stormwater management are identified as crucial due to its contribution to water pollution.
The Main/Echo Urban Renewal Area is highlighted as an area that provides opportunities for improvements that would bolster the vitality of the New Rochelle waterfront. The plan states that the existing facilities in the Main/Echo Urban Renewal Area detract from the scenic nature of the area due to deteriorated structures, debris, soil erosion, and contamination, as well as prevent access to the waterfront, both physically and visually. Acquisition of the Armory parcel is suggested to further enhance the opportunity for waterfront development.

The primary factor described by the HMP that impacts water quality is contaminants from stormwater runoff. Chronically high levels of coliform have placed New Rochelle waters in the uncertified category for shellfish harvesting by the NYSDEC. A noted contributor to pollution from stormwater runoff is sediment and floatable debris and the drains in the watershed lacked measures to trap these pollutants. An oil stream floatable debris collection device was installed in the east branch of Snuff Mill Creek with a matching grant from the NYSDEC, shortly after the plan was published, to catch surface debris from this outfall.

(4) New Rochelle Local Waterfront Revitalization Program

The Local Waterfront Revitalization Program (LWRP), drafted in 1998 but not adopted by the City, builds upon recommendations and project proposals from the 1996 Comprehensive Plan. Because the City’s LWRP has not been adopted, the Long Island Coastal Management Program is the official coastal management plan for waterfront development within the City of New Rochelle.

The LWRP uses the 44 New York State Coastal Policies as a guide for its recommendations. The New York State Coastal Policies are divided into seven categories: Development, Fish and Wildlife, Flooding and Erosion Hazards Policies, Public Access, Recreation, Agricultural Land, and Water and Air Resources. The key objective of the LWRP is to provide regulatory controls for revitalization and redevelopment in the Coastal Zone, which is designated as South of Pelham Road and Main Street between the Pelham Manor border on the west and the Larchmont border to the east.

The LWRP reaffirms the importance of coordinated development of water-related and water-enhanced uses and the development of mixed uses within the Main/Echo Urban Renewal Area. However, water-dependent uses are marked conditional, dependent upon the ability to dredge surrounding waterways. In order to encourage the prioritization of water-enhanced uses within the Coastal Zone, the City Yard parcel, the largest publicly-owned parcel, is identified as an important component to increasing quality of life and property values within the vicinity. The City Yard parcel is equidistant from the Municipal Marina and Five Islands Park and, since the City also owns the adjacent Armory, it provides an opportunity to connect these
nodes through a pedestrian corridor, as suggested by both the Comprehensive Plan and HMP. The pedestrian corridor not only fulfills the criteria for compatible uses that give priority to water-related uses, but, given the 30 foot minimum setback proposed by the LWRP, it also allows for unhindered physical and visual access to the waterfront, while creating a natural buffer from the built environment.

Another key priority of the program is mitigation of storm water pollution. Two actions suggested by the program are through regulation and physical improvements as well as by way of educational initiatives. In support of this goal, the City Council adopted more stringent stormwater management requirements as part of its land development requirements. As for education, the New Rochelle Environmental Partnership has initiated water testing and labeling drains as linking to the Long Island Sound, in addition to clean-up and environmental restoration projects of various types.

The LWRP elaborates on design and zoning proposals from the Comprehensive Plan, particularly with respect to the areas designated as planned waterfront development. Recommendations for the Municipal Marina include either renovation and infill or major redevelopment, including entertainment and residential uses of up to 3 stories. Recommendations for the Main/Echo Urban Renewal Area in general include providing visual and physical water access to the public as well as the inclusion of mid to high-density mixed-use.

Specific projects proposed by the LWRP include removal of underground gas tanks on the City Yard parcel to avoid pollution of soils and groundwater, improvements to waterfront parks, and restoration of Echo Bay tidal wetland vegetation. Medium to high-density residential is encouraged just north of Pelham Road. It is recommended that on-street parking be replaced by off-street parking, in order to decrease accidents in the area related to on-street parking movements. It is also recommended that an easement be acquired across the County Wastewater Treatment Plant site in order to provide a pedestrian pathway link between Echo Bay and Five Islands Park.

The following actions are identified for implementation of the LWRP:
- Coordination of Watershed Management with Neighboring Municipalities
- Sanitary Sewer Improvements
- Public Education and Awareness – Boat Tours, Lectures, Walks
- Request for Proposals for the Main/Echo Urban Renewal Area
(5) **Other Local and Regional Land Use Plans**

(a) **Westchester 2025**

Westchester 2025 builds upon *Patterns for Westchester: the Land and the People*\(^{10}\) and is a web-based update of the County-wide comprehensive policies. Westchester 2025’s Context and Policies document\(^{11}\) was adopted in 2008 and amended in 2010 and presents a series of subjects which provide the basis for Westchester 2025’s policies and strategies. Specifically related to locating future development, Westchester 2025 indicates that the “future of development in Westchester will be found in redevelopment of residential, commercial and industrial space with most new construction located in the county’s downtowns in the largest cities and village centers, especially those with access to a rail station. New employment is expected to come primarily through the growth of small enterprises. Now well underway, waterfront parcels on both the Hudson River and Long Island Sound are expected to complete a transition from industrial use to residential, commercial and recreational uses in the next decade…” The following Policies relate to the Project:

**Policy 1: Channel development to centers**

*Channel development whenever possible to centers where infrastructure can support growth, where public transportation can be provided efficiently and where redevelopment can enhance economic vitality.*

The Project Site is located approximately one-half mile from downtown New Rochelle and is within close proximity of the Transit Center and the Bee Line Bus system along Main Street. The Project would be consistent with the existing community character of the surrounding neighborhood and the vision established by the City for the redevelopment of Echo Bay.

**Policy 3: Assure interconnected open space**

*Assure a diverse and interconnected system of open space to shape development, to provide contrast in the texture of the landscape, to separate developed areas and to provide linkages among open space systems of the region.*

The Project would include the Echo Bay Walk esplanade and waterfront improvements with a pedestrian bridge connection to the Westchester County WWTP parcel for future connection to Five Islands Park, as well as a connection to parcels west of the Armory property in the future.
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\(^{10}\) *Patterns for Westchester, the Land and the People.* 1996. Westchester County Planning Board.

Policy 4: Nurture economic climate
Nurture the economic climate of the county with use of municipal, county, state and federal resources to improve infrastructure, housing and programs that attract and support business enterprise, with consideration of intermunicipal impacts.
The Project would be developed on land that is currently municipally-owned and would be considered a resource to spur economic development in the Echo Bay redevelopment area. The Project would provide market rate and affordable housing, commercial retail and public waterfront uses.

Policy 5: Preserve natural resources
Preserve and protect the county’s natural resources and environment, both physical and biotic.
The Project would improve the tidal wetland and coastal zone area along the shoreline of the City Yard, as well as improve significantly upon the existing stormwater management conditions of the City Yard parcel.

Policy 6: Support development and preservation of permanently affordable housing
Encourage a range of housing types that are permanently affordable to renters and home buyers, with the County working with each municipality to address its needs for fair and affordable housing as well as a share of the regional need.
The Project would include 29 new units of affordable rental housing.

Policy 8: Provide recreational opportunities to serve residents
Enhance use of Westchester’s parks, beaches and recreation facilities by improving public access and by providing a variety of settings for passive and active use. New recreational opportunities should take into account the recreational needs of higher density population areas and the needs and interests of the county’s changing population.
The Project would include new public access to the waterfront via the Echo Bay Walk esplanade with a small boat launch dock and pedestrian bridge connecting Echo Bay to Five Islands Park in the future.

Policy 13: Define and protect community character
Encourage efforts to define the desired character of each municipality and neighborhoods within the broader, diverse palate of Westchester County.
The Project is consistent with numerous aspects of the adopted land use plans, vision plans and zoning regulations related to the Echo Bay redevelopment area and the City Yard parcel.

(b) Long Island Sound Coastal Management Program
The Long Island Sound Coastal Management Program was adopted in 1999 by the New York Department of State, Division of Coastal Resources and
Waterfront Revitalization, under the regulatory authority given by Article 42 of the Executive Law. The program presents 50 recommendations and 13 policies across four themes: the developed coast, the natural coast, the public coast and the working coast. These policies and recommendations set priorities for federal and state government actions by drawing on components of the New York State Coastal Management Program, including law governing activities in the coastal area and suggested practices. The purpose of the Long Island Sound Coastal Management Program is to balance ecological protection and restoration with appropriate economic development strategies. Its contents complement the Long Island Sound Study Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan, which contains recommendations that focus on improvement of water quality within the upland watershed, harbor and nearshore waters. In terms of regulatory authority, this document is the State Coastal Management Program for the Sound shorelines of Westchester County, New York City to the Throgs Neck Bridge, Nassau County and Suffolk County, excluding jurisdictions for which there is an approved Local Waterfront Revitalization Program.

b. Potential Impacts
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 URP related to the type of permitted commercial land use would need to be modified as discussed below.

(1) Required Amendments to Local Land Use Plans
(a) Main/Echo Urban Renewal Plan
The URP provides development recommendations for the east section and the west section of the Main/Echo Urban Renewal Area. The Project is located in the east section, which is designated high-density residential. The URP indicates the east section is primarily intended for residential uses, with office uses permitted on lower floors not to exceed 20% of the total floor area devoted to residential uses. 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 retail and restaurant uses would provide services to existing and future residents, as well as provide attractive storefronts along the Main Street commercial corridor. The required parking for the retail uses would be located within the building on site.
(2) Relationship and Conformity of the Project to Identified Local Land Use Plans

(a) New Rochelle Comprehensive Plan
The Project furthers several of the main goals of the City’s Comprehensive Plan by helping to create a physical link between downtown, East Main Street and the Echo Bay waterfront by implementing the first phase of the Echo Bay Walk and providing views to the bay from Main Street and physical connections to the waterfront via new Armory Place.

The Project’s mixed-use building would include both market-rate residential rental apartments and affordable rental apartments in an appropriately designed building with streetscape and nautically-inspired façade design, as well as landscape design to restore the shoreline and provide beautification along the esplanade. The City has contemplated the redevelopment of the City Yard and Armory parcels for many decades and the Project would be a public/private partnerships between the City (as the property owner) and the Applicant (as the developer). The Project would increase the density of development along this area of Main Street from the existing DPW operations at the City Yard and the mix of residential and commercial uses would draw more business and capital to the commercial corridor along Main Street, creating synergies between the Project, future development of the Armory parcel and existing commercial and mixed-use projects along the corridor. Streetscape design would help to establish a coordinated aesthetic along the East Main Street entry to the City and both the physical and visual access to the Echo Bay waterfront at Armory Place would be consistent with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan. Physical access would be provided by the Echo Bay Walk esplanade, including a pedestrian bridge link to the north side of the Westchester County WWTP parcel in order to connect, in the future, to Five Islands Park.

(b) Main/Echo Urban Renewal Plan
While the URP covers both a broader site area and broader development goals than the Project, the proposed mixed-use building and Echo Bay Walk esplanade are consistent with the main goals of the URP to eliminate substandard, deteriorated and obsolete structures; and to remediate environmental deficiencies through management of well-balanced land uses consistent with neighborhood character. See Figure No. IV.A-4, Main/Echo Urban Renewal Area.

The Project would improve the quality of life for residents through the expansion of quality market-rate and affordable housing and the establishment of an improved street system to serve both existing and proposed uses. The Project would increase the tax-base and increase job
opportunities, and would allow for the beginning of proper and meaningful development as well as the retention of the Armory building in concert with expansion of commercial development. The Project has been designed to preserve and enhance the neighborhood character through the development of urban design in addition to waterfront restoration and esplanade design for the area that reflects the characteristics of the topography, its waterfront location, site configuration, and surrounding development, as well as preservation and enhancement of environmental factors that define the area.

For the City Yard parcel (eastern portion of the urban renewal area), the URP contemplates high-density residential use with a higher maximum height and greater number of dwelling units per acre than the western portion of the area. The URP contemplates residential, office and accessory uses for the “high residential” area. The only commercial use for the City Yard parcel is office in connection with residential use. However, the City Yard property is currently zoned PWD-5 (Planned Waterfront Development – 5 stories) which limits the development on the site from what was proposed in the URP.

In terms of zoning, the Project would comply with both dimensional specifications and uses proposed by the URP. The Project would be well under the 12 stories and 85 dwelling units per acre identified as the maximum in the URP, with a proposed 5-story, 60 foot tall building and 44 dwelling units per acre, along with 1.5 parking spaces per residential unit. The Project is also consistent with permitted accessory uses, including off-street parking, small boat launch dock, and a pedestrian waterfront promenade.

The Project would not be consistent with the URP with respect to the type of commercial land use on the first floor of the building, though placement of commercial uses on lower floors to act as a buffer for separation of residential uses from Main Street traffic, and the placement of residential use on higher floors to benefit from waterfront views, would be consistent. The Project would include retail, service or restaurant land uses in lieu of the office uses recommended in the URP. The inclusion of retail, service or restaurant uses along the Main Street commercial corridor is consistent with the existing retail and restaurant uses and would complement the proposed residential uses and future Armory redevelopment, as well as the existing residential uses located in the adjoining neighborhoods.

(c) City Harbor Management Plan and Map
The Project would be consistent with many of the broad goals defined by the HMP, including continued and enhanced public enjoyment of the harbor,
increased access and recreational opportunities as well as preservation and improvement of natural resources. The HMP supports vessel mooring and the City Marina at Echo Bay, public park facilities and open space throughout the waterfront and the Project provides the Echo Bay public esplanade and small boat launch dock. The Project would enhance property values of the City Yard parcel (currently tax exempt) and would improve overall quality of life for neighborhood residents and merchants by redeveloping an underutilized City-owned parcel on the waterfront through a public-private partnership.

The HMP also proposes that the City Zoning Code encourage existing water-dependent uses to continue and allow for accepted expansion of uses, where appropriate. The HMP prioritizes recreational water uses because of their importance to users as well as their significance to the local economy. The Project would not be displacing a water-dependent use, as the City Yard DPW operations are not water-dependent. However, the proposed mixed-use building also would not be water-dependent, but would include the Echo Bay Walk waterfront esplanade and small boat launch dock which would be water-enhanced. The Project also would include removal of a number of deteriorated structures on the City Yard and Armory parcels, future physical connection to Five Islands Park via a pedestrian bridge to the north edge of the Westchester County WWTP parcel; tidal wetland restoration along the shoreline of the City Yard parcel; and significant improvements to the stormwater drainage system on the City Yard and Armory parcels.

(d) Local Waterfront Revitalization Program and Long Island Sound Coastal Management Plan
The Project is consistent with the draft LWRP key objective of coordinated development of water-related and water-enhanced uses as well as the development of mixed uses within the Main-Echo Bay Urban Renewal Area. The LWRP indicates that water-dependent uses are conditional, and dependent upon the ability to dredge surrounding waterways. The City Yard parcel is identified, due to its location equidistant from the Municipal Marina and Five Islands Park and adjacent to the Armory, as an opportunity to connect these public marina and park nodes by way of a pedestrian corridor, which is the Project’s Echo Bay Walk esplanade and pedestrian bridge to the north edge of the County’s WWTP parcel. The pedestrian esplanade would fulfill the criteria for compatible uses that give priority to water-enhanced uses and, given the proposed 30 foot minimum setback, also allows for physical and visual access to the waterfront, while creating a natural buffer from the built environment.
The Project also would provide visual and physical water access to the public via Armory Place and the new public parking area, as well as provide a mixed-use commercial and residential building to enhance the economic return of the project parcels, surrounding neighborhood and future Echo Bay development parcels.

Specific components of the Project recommended by the LWRP include removal of underground gas tanks on City Yard parcel to avoid pollution of soils and groundwater, improvements to and creation or waterfront parks, and restoration of Echo Bay Tidal wetland vegetation. All required retail and residential parking is provided within the proposed building.

The Project is consistent with all relevant Long Island Sound Coastal Management Program recommendations, which are listed in Table No. IV.A-2, at the end of this chapter. Some of these recommendations include: working with local governments to advance development in brownfields and underused urban waterfronts; to maintain and enhance historic maritime communities to strengthen the region’s coastal heritage and economy.

(3) **Analysis of Potential Impacts of the Required Plan Amendments**

The Project is consistent with the majority of recommendations outlined in local and regional land use planning documents. The Echo Bay redevelopment area has been studied by the City since at least 1983, when the Main/Echo URP was adopted. The URP is the only planning document that would need to be amended to accommodate retail and restaurant land uses on the lower floors of mixed-use buildings. Given the existing retail and restaurant uses located along the Main Street corridor, and the consistency with other mixed-use projects in the area (Huguenot Hills with retail and restaurant uses on the first floor), amending the URP to permit retail and restaurant uses on the first floor of the proposed building would not have significant adverse impacts on surrounding land use. The only other high-density designated parcel that would be affected by the amendment would be the Armory parcel, which is also owned by the City. The inclusion of retail and restaurant uses on the first floor of mixed-use buildings designated as high-density residential in the URP is not inconsistent with the Armory proposals and is not expected to have a significant impact on the redevelopment of the parcel. It should be noted that retail sales, service establishments and restaurants are currently permitted land uses with a special permit in the PWD-5 Zoning District, which correlates to the URP’s high-density area.
3. **Zoning**

As noted earlier, the Project Site consists of two parcels totaling 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).

a. **Existing Zoning Conditions**

Zoning in the surrounding area is a mix of commercial, planned waterfront, industrial, residential, and recreation open space zoning, with East Main Street and Huguenot Street providing the primary commercial and mixed-use corridor around which the waterfront and residential uses extend. Main Street and Huguenot Street between Cedar Street to the west and Stonelea Place to the east include the following zoning districts: C-1M (General Commercial Modified) and PWD-5 and PWDE-5 (Planned Waterfront Development - 5 Story and PWD Extension Floating Zones). To the north of Main Street, the Stephenson residential neighborhood includes R2-7.0 (Two-Family Residence) and R1-7.5 (One-Family Residence) zoning, with C-1M and LSR (Large Scale Retail) zoning along the Cedar Street and River Street frontage. The Residence Park neighborhood southwest of Echo Avenue includes RMF-0.4 (Multi-Family Residence) and R2-7.0 (Two-family Residence) residential zoning, and the Sutton Manor neighborhood south of the Project Site across the bay is R1-7.5 (One-Family Residence). To the east of the Project Site is PWD-3 and I (Industry) zoning, with R1-10A (One-Family Residence) and ROS (Recreation Open Space) zoning occurring east of LeFevres Avenue.

(1) **PWD-5 District**

The City has defined certain design concepts and guidelines for the PWD Districts:

- That pedestrian access and public uses be encouraged at the water's edge, and obstructions to waterfront access be removed and that view corridors from East Main Street be created and maintained.
- On properties owned by the City of New Rochelle, preference will be given to development proposals which create unobstructed views from East Main Street to Echo Bay and beyond.
- That a minimum thirty-foot public waterfront walkway be provided at City Yard and the Armory, as well as on any other City owned properties, when redevelopment, relocation, etc., is undertaken.
- That development be visually and acoustically buffered from nearby residential areas.
- That all structures, facilities, and public areas reflect a high-quality level of architectural expression and abundant landscaping be provided in order to achieve attractiveness, quality, and permanence.
The permitted uses are as follows:

A. Permitted principal uses; 1.0 maximum FAR for the following principal uses:
   (1) Pier, dock, marina, boat launching and wet boat storage.
   (2) Boat building and boat/sail repair.
   (3) Boat service facilities, including the sale and storage of fuel, lubricants, parts, accessories, ice and bait as an incidental marina use.
   (4) Dry boat storage for boats 16 feet or longer.
   (5) Tanks and pumps for dispensing gasoline and fuel for motors.
   (6) Establishments for the sale of boats, motors, and accessories.
   (7) Yacht, boat, rowing, beach and other water-dependent membership clubs.
   (8) Ferry, water taxi, excursion, fishing and charter boat services.
   (9) Beach, park, promenade, boardwalk at or near the water's edge.
   (10) Navigation aids, marine police and fire station.
   (11) Houses of worship.

B. Permitted accessory uses.
   (1) Uses and structures which are clearly incidental and customarily accessory to the permitted principal use on the lot on which they are located.
   (2) Swimming pools.
   (3) Satellite earth station or dish antennas, but only when accessory to a permitted principal use on the lot on which it is located.
   (4) Outdoor dining.
   (5) Facilities for the pumping out of marine holding tanks.
   (6) Shore protection structures.

C. Uses allowed by special permit by the City Council.*
   (1) 0.75 maximum FAR for the following nonresidential uses:
      (a) Aquarium, maritime museum, marine sciences institute.
      (b) Inn, bed-and-breakfast, hotel.
      (c) Conference center, exhibition halls, theater.
      (d) Enclosed sports/amusement/recreation complex.
      (e) Dry boat storage for vessels under 16 feet in length.
      (f) Retail sales and service establishments.
      (g) Business, professional or government offices.
      (h) Studios, theater, auditorium (up to a capacity of 200 people).
      (i) Enclosed restaurant with outdoor dining.
      (j) Greenhouse, nursery, arboretum.
      (k) Municipal uses.
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(l) Yacht, boat, rowing, beach, and other water-dependent membership clubs.
(m) Public utility uses.

(2) 0.75 maximum FAR (maximum 30 dwelling units per acre) for the following residential uses:
(a) One-family attached and detached dwelling.
(b) Two-family dwellings.
(c) Multifamily dwellings.

*NOTE: All special permit non-water-dependent buildings and uses shall be subject to waterfront design guidelines, which shall encourage nautical building design decoration, water-orientation and views, salt-water-tolerant vegetation, lighting, and screening.

b. Future Zoning Conditions Without the Project
Without the Project, the Project Site would remain in its current condition, owned by the City of New Rochelle (City Yard and Armory parcels) and zoned PWD-5. Future development of the parcels could include a variety of permitted uses with buildings up to 5 stories and 50 feet (within 300 feet of Main Street) and 3 stories and 30 feet (beyond 300 feet of Main Street), with a maximum floor area ratio of 1.0 and building coverage of 40%.

Without the proposed amendments to the regulations PWD-5 District discussed below, and the development of the Project, the Project Site would not provide commercial land uses along Main Street, nor residential land use on the City Yard parcel. Additionally, without the Project, no public land use amenities such as the proposed Echo Bay Walk esplanade, seating areas, public parking or boat access would be provided.

c. Potential Impacts

(1) Description of Proposed Re-Zoning
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 (see below) of the PWD-5 District. However, in order to implement the Project, certain zoning requirements would need to be amended. See Proposed Zoning Text Changes at the end of this chapter.

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 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.

(2) **Compliance with Zoning Regulations**

The Project’s compliance with applicable zoning requirements is shown in Table No. IV.A-3, Zoning Compliance Table. The City’s Zoning Code identifies design concepts and guidelines for the PWD-5 District as the following:

- *That pedestrian access and public uses be encouraged at the waterfront, and obstructions to waterfront access be removed and that view corridors from East Main Street be created and maintained.*
  The Project provides a public esplanade along the City Yard and Armory parcels with a pedestrian bridge connection to the Westchester County WWTP parcel for future pedestrian pathway to Five Islands Park and a pedestrian path connection to future Echo Bay redevelopment west of the Armory parcel. By removing the fencing and low industrial buildings on the City Yard site, the existing Armory driveway would be re-designed into an attractive entry driveway (Armory Place) with a view to the Echo Bay waterfront and public parking for accessing the public esplanade and small boat launch dock. The new Armory Place would provide a view corridor to the Bay from East Main Street.

- *On properties owned by the City of New Rochelle, preference will be given to development proposals which create unobstructed views from East Main Street to Echo Bay and beyond.*
  The new Armory Place would provide a shared driveway between the mixed-use building and the Armory building, providing a view corridor to the Bay from East Main Street.

- *That a minimum thirty-foot public waterfront walkway be provided at City Yard and the Armory, as well as on any other City owned properties, when redevelopment, relocation, etc., is undertaken.*
  The Echo Bay Walk esplanade and adjoining landscaped area would vary in width along the shoreline, but would never be less than thirty feet and would include the pedestrian bridge connection to Five Islands Park, public seating areas, public parking and a small boat launch dock.

- *That development be visually and acoustically buffered from nearby residential areas.*
  The Echo Bay Center landscape plan includes various landscaping improvements to provide a buffer from nearby residential neighborhoods, including street trees.
along East Main Street, tree and shrub plantings around the residential building and parking, and shoreline restoration plantings at the along the waterfront esplanade.

- That all structures, facilities, and public areas reflect a high-quality level of architectural expression and abundant landscaping be provided in order to achieve attractiveness, quality, and permanence.

The Project building is architecturally designed with nautical references and extensive landscaping to reflect both the shoreline character and the urban streetscape character.

The Project is consistent with all of the general design concepts and guidelines for the PWD-5 District.

The proposed zoning amendments to permit the development of the Project would allow the permitted height of the building to be increased from 50 feet to 60 feet within 300 feet of East Main Street and from three stories and 30 feet to four stories and 55 feet in the area beyond 300 feet. See Figure No. IV. A-2, Proposed Building Height Measurement. The maximum FAR would also be increased from 0.75 to 1.15 for residential uses and to 1.25 for all special permit residential and non-residential uses. In terms of density, the maximum permitted dwelling units per acre would need to be increased from 30 to 45, and the minimum lot area per dwelling unit requirement would need to be eliminated. Permitted building coverage would need to be increased from 40% to 45%. However, these changes in zoning requirements would be limited to the Project Site, because no other land is currently zoned PWD-5 District. Currently, of the two parcels, only the City Yard parcel meets the minimum lot size requirement (6 acres) of the PWD-5 District, as the Armory parcel is just under 3 acres.

Since the Project advances the general design concepts and guidelines for the PWD-5 District, provides significant public amenities along the Echo Bay waterfront, provides visual and physical access to the Bay that currently does not exist, and is consistent with the surrounding neighborhood development, it is not anticipated that the Project would have significant adverse impacts on zoning or surrounding land uses.

d. Potential Mitigation Measures

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.
## TABLE NO. IV.A-2:
LONG ISLAND SOUND COASTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM COMPLIANCE TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>LWRP Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developed Coast</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECTIVE: Enhance community character by improving the quality of existing development, promoting a sense of connection to the Sound, and focusing growth and investment to preserve the positive relationship between the built and natural landscapes and between existing and new development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Foster a development pattern which focuses on the 17 existing centers of development, strengthens the waterfront economy, and preserves natural resources.</td>
<td>Not applicable. Relates to the greater region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Work with local governments to advance development in the brownfields and underused urban waterfronts to produce regional economic benefits, meet the demand for new large-scale development, and restore deteriorated environments.</td>
<td>The project site is comprised of site parcels that are considered to be underused urban waterfront and this project was initiated by a Request for Proposals issued by the City of New Rochelle. The Project would produce residential and commercial uses and economic benefits, as well as restore the deteriorated shoreline.</td>
<td>Policy 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Advance cooperative public and private efforts to establish desired uses on large sites which are in single ownership and which are the most suitable for new appropriate development.</td>
<td>This project would be developed by a public/private partnership and its purpose is to initiate water-enhanced development along a portion of the Echo Bay coastline, including new public access to Echo Bay.</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Maintain and enhance historic maritime communities to strengthen the region's coastal heritage and coastal economy. (water-dependent uses should be promoted)</td>
<td>The purpose of this project is rooted in the visions set forth in the Urban Renewal Plan of 1983, Harbor Management Plan of 1996, Comprehensive Plan of 1998 and other planning documents. The goal of these plans was to enhance the development along the New Rochelle coast.</td>
<td>Policy 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Assist local governments to use their existing land use authority to protect recreational lands for their associated open space, habitat, and aesthetic purposes.</td>
<td>Not applicable. Relates to the greater region.</td>
<td>Policy 21A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Advance LWRP, specific issue or geographic components of LWRP for all municipalities on Long Island Sound. Revise existing LWRP to incorporate the relevant components of the Long Island Sound Coastal Management Program.</td>
<td>Not applicable. Relates to the greater region.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Survey the historic and archaeological resources of the Long Island Sound coastal region.</td>
<td>Historic and archaeological resources were surveyed as part of Phase IA Archaeological Literature Review and Sensitivity Analysis and Phase 1B Archeological Field Reconnaissance survey.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Assist local governments to protect historic and archaeological resources through LWRP and strengthened local laws.</td>
<td>Not applicable. Relates to New York State.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Protect scenic resources within the Long Island Sound coastal region.</td>
<td>The Project includes shoreline restoration to protect scenic resources and other environmentally sensitive areas, as well as redevelopment of the coastline as a public waterfront esplanade in place of the deteriorated City Yard facilities.</td>
<td>Policy 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Coast</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>LWRP Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OBJECTIVE:</strong> Reclaim value and achieve sustainable use of the Sound's natural resources by improving the quality and function of ecological systems, respecting the dynamics of shoreline change, and providing high quality coastal waters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Protect and restore unique areas of regional significance characterized by a diversity of outstanding natural resources, which are at risk.</td>
<td>Measures will be taken to restore and enhance adjacent wetlands and to plant indigenous and appropriate coastal vegetation.</td>
<td>Policy 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Achieve a net gain in the quality and quantity of tidal wetlands and no net loss in the quality and quantity of freshwater wetlands in the Long Island Sound coastal area.</td>
<td>Measures will be taken to enhance the quality of wetlands adjacent to the project site through setback of development from sensitive areas and appropriate plantings along the shoreline.</td>
<td>Policy 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Promote use of indigenous Long Island plants.</td>
<td>The landscape plan will focus on the use of indigenous plants and appropriate coastal vegetation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Protect wildlife corridors in the Long Island Sound coastal and watershed areas by avoiding fragmentation.</td>
<td>Development practices will protect environmentally sensitive areas. Landscape design and other measures will be taken to preserve enhance the ecological integrity of the coastline.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Amend Environmental Conservation Law Article 34 regulations to require mitigation for impacts of hard erosion control structures and to guarantee mitigation through performance bonds.</td>
<td>Not applicable. Relates to New York State.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Establish a coastal processes monitoring program for critical erosion areas along the Long Island shore.</td>
<td>Not applicable. Relates to the greater region.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Establish permanent sediment bypassing systems along the Long Island Sound coast to correct problems caused by past structural intervention and where there is a demonstrated public benefit.</td>
<td>Not applicable. Relates to the greater region.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Assist local governments to manage development in flood and erosion prone areas, through erosion management plans that include a post-storm redevelopment component.</td>
<td>Not applicable. Relates to the greater region.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Encourage development of local zoning regulations to adequately address siting of structures and land uses in flood and erosion hazard areas.</td>
<td>Not applicable. Relates to New York State and the greater region.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Implement the Long Island Sound Study nitrogen reduction targets and the Final Phase 3 Nitrogen Reduction Strategy approved by the Long Island Sound Study Policy Committee.</td>
<td>Not applicable. Relates to municipality.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Reduce loadings of toxic substances in order to reduce risk to humans, wildlife, and ecological communities.</td>
<td>Relocation of City Yard and remediation of parcels that comprise the site will decrease land uses that involve the use of toxic substances. Furthermore, the replacement of non-native plants with native plants will decrease the need for fertilizers, pesticides and fungicides, and, therefore, will reduce the level of toxins.</td>
<td>Policy 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Control combined sewer overflows to minimize pollution by pathogens, nutrients, toxic materials, and floatable debris.</td>
<td>Not applicable to this site.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>LWRP Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developed Coast</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Provide vessel pumpout stations and support designations of no discharge zones to reduce direct contamination of waters and shellfish by vessel sewage discharge.</td>
<td><em>Not applicable. Relates to municipality.</em></td>
<td>Policy 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Advance intermunicipal efforts to reduce nonpoint source pollution in Long Island Sound’s embayments.</td>
<td><em>Not applicable. Relates to New York State or the greater region.</em></td>
<td>Policy 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Coast</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Identify, preserve, and provide access to regionally important vistas.</td>
<td>Site remediation and proposed development, including Armory Place, will open visual corridors to Echo Bay from East Main Street.</td>
<td>Policy 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Complete a coastal network of community and regional greenways and blueways that link public waterfront access points, the foreshore, the nearshore surface waters, and large and small public parks and open spaces to improve access to the coast and coastal recreation facilities.</td>
<td>The Project includes the development of a walkway that will eventually extend along the shoreline from the Municipal Marina to Five Islands Park. Initially, it will include a pedestrian bridge to the County’s WWTP parcel to connect to LeFevres Lane and Five Islands Park, as well as the Echo Bay walkway along the periphery of the project site to the west near the Nelstad parcel and Huntington Place.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Maintain the public interest in public trust lands along the Sound coast by identifying these lands and ensuring that all private use of these lands comport with the public trust doctrine.</td>
<td><em>Not applicable. Relates to New York State.</em></td>
<td>Policy 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Reassert public trust rights on public trust lands that are used in a manner that is incompatible with the public trust doctrine.</td>
<td><em>Not applicable. Relates to New York State or the greater region.</em></td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Develop educational materials to inform the public and local governments on coastal resources and issues that affect the wise management and use of those resources.</td>
<td><em>Not applicable. Relates to municipality or the greater region.</em></td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Prepare and distribute a guide to public access and recreational areas and facilities for the Long Island Sound region.</td>
<td><em>Not applicable. Relates to the greater region.</em></td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Continue interagency efforts to protect shipwrecks and other underwater sites of historic or archaeological importance.</td>
<td><em>Not applicable. Relates to the greater region.</em></td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Develop an appropriate mix of, and establish priorities for, public access and recreation facilities, and open space areas to meet needs.</td>
<td>In addition to encouraging access to Five Islands Park, the site will include a public waterfront esplanade along the coastline. The installation of a kayak launch on the Project Site will further contribute to this priority.</td>
<td>Policy 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Working Coast</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECTIVE: Connect people to the Sound and its public resources by improving visual and physical access, and providing a diversity of recreational opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Improving siting requirements for marinas and other docking facilities.</td>
<td><em>Not applicable. Relates to the greater region.</em></td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Increase efforts to protect the Sound’s shellfishery.</td>
<td><em>Not applicable. Relates to the greater region.</em></td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Implement a state oil spill contingency plan.</td>
<td><em>Not applicable. Relates to the greater region.</em></td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Provide for petroleum transshipment and encourage phase-out of certain oil storage facilities.</td>
<td>The relocation of the City Yard and repurpose of the Amory will remove fuel storage tanks and oil tanks that are currently located on site.</td>
<td>Policy 36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE NO. IV.A2:
LONG ISLAND SOUND COASTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM COMPLIANCE TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>LWRP Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37. Protect agriculture and farmland.</td>
<td>Not applicable. Relates to this site.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Improve the economic viability of maritime centers, by working with local governments and the private sector to identify opportunities and priorities for public and private investments to upgrade necessary infrastructure such as: water and sewer lines; maintenance dredging of navigation channels and anchorage basins, docks, and piers; bulkheads; boat ramps; sidewalks and parking lots; rest rooms; pumpout stations; and waterfront parks.</td>
<td>The Project includes water and sanitary sewer improvements, shoreline infrastructure improvements, a kayak launch, public parking lots, waterfront open space, and stormwater infrastructure improvements.</td>
<td>Policy 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Investigate options to obtain capital funds needed for necessary infrastructure in the Sound’s maritime centers.</td>
<td>Not applicable. Relates to the greater region.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Assist the commercial fishing industry in providing adequate commercial fishing infrastructure.</td>
<td>Not applicable. Relates to the greater region.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Construct artificial fishing reefs.</td>
<td>Not applicable for this site.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Encourage private enterprise to develop private ferry services which are compatible with community needs.</td>
<td>Not applicable for this site.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Support private initiatives to complete a system of offshore unloading terminals and a pipeline distribution system to transport petroleum to inland locations.</td>
<td>Not applicable for this site.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Ensure that property tax assessments appropriately reflect the use value of waterfront land occupied by water-dependent commercial and industrial uses.</td>
<td>Not applicable. Relates to municipality.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Expedite regulatory approvals for appropriate water-dependent uses in maritime centers.</td>
<td>Not applicable. Relates to New York State or the municipality.</td>
<td>Policy 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Continue efforts with the private sector to market fishery products.</td>
<td>Not applicable. Relates to New York State.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Encourage the private sector development of aquaculture.</td>
<td>Not applicable. Relates to municipality or the greater region.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Work with local governments to improve the safety and efficiency of harbors.</td>
<td>Not applicable for this site.</td>
<td>Policy 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Ensure that dredging is done to the extent necessary to meet the current and future needs of water-dependent commercial and industrial uses of the Long Island Sound.</td>
<td>Not applicable for this site.</td>
<td>Policy 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Expedite and coordinate dredging projects within maritime centers.</td>
<td>Not applicable for this site.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Coast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 1</strong></td>
<td>Foster a pattern of development in the Long Island Sound coastal area that enhances community character, preserves open space, makes efficient use of infrastructure, makes beneficial use of a coastal location, and minimizes adverse effects of development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE NO. IV.A.2:
LONG ISLAND SOUND COASTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM COMPLIANCE TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developed Coast</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1</strong> Concentrate development and redevelopment in or adjacent to traditional waterfront communities.</td>
<td>The Project is consistent with visions set forth in Urban Renewal Plan, Harbor Management Plan, Comprehensive Plan, and other planning documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.2</strong> Ensure that development or uses take appropriate advantage of their coastal location.</td>
<td>The Project will include public open space on the waterfront and a public esplanade along the shoreline leading to a pedestrian bridge connection to Five Islands Park. A kayak launch will also be included as part of the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.3</strong> Protect stable residential areas.</td>
<td>The Project has been designed to provide pedestrian and visual connections from Main Street, as well as nearby residential areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.4</strong> Maintain and enhance natural areas, recreation, open space, and agricultural lands.</td>
<td>The Project enhances natural areas and open space through tidal wetland enhancements and development of open space opportunities along the coast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.5</strong> Minimize adverse impacts of new development and redevelopment.</td>
<td>The Project has been designed with mitigation measure that would eliminate potential impacts. No significant adverse impacts have been identified for the Project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy 2 - Preserve historic resources of the Long Island Sound coastal area.**

| **2.1** Maximize preservation and retention of historic resources. | Not applicable to this site. |
| **2.2** Protect and preserve archaeological resources. | Not applicable. |
| **2.3** Protect and enhance resources that are significant to the coastal culture of the Long Island Sound. | Not applicable to this site. |

Policy 3 - Enhance visual quality and protect scenic resources throughout Long Island Sound.

| **3.1** Protect and improve visual quality throughout the coastal area. | Site remediation and development, including enhancement of vegetation and elimination of deteriorated site conditions, will improve the visual quality of site. |
| **3.2** Protect aesthetic values associated with recognized areas of high scenic quality. | Site development and design takes into account flood plain orientation and appropriate mitigation measures have been designed for the Project. |

**Natural Coast**

| **4.1** Minimize losses of human life and structures from flooding and erosion hazards. | Erosion control methods are included in the site design and will avoid significant impact on adjacent public lands. |
| **4.2** Preserve and restore natural protective features. | The landscape plan includes shoreline protective plantings. |
| **4.3** Protect public lands and public trust lands and use of these lands when undertaking all erosion or flood control projects. | Sea level rise and location of flood plain were taken into account in the development of the project plan. |
| **4.4** Manage navigation infrastructure to limit adverse impacts on coastal processes. | Not applicable to this site. |
| **4.5** Ensure that expenditure of public fund for flooding and erosion control projects results in a public benefit. | Not applicable to this site. |
| **4.6** Consider sea level rise when siting and designing projects involving substantial public expenditures. | Sea level rise and location of flood plain were taken into account in the development of the project plan. |

**Policy 5 - Protect and improve water quality and supply in the Long Island Sound coastal area.**

| **5.1** Prohibit direct or indirect discharges which would cause or contribute to contravention of water quality standards. | The relocation of the City Yard and remediation of site parcels will reduce point source pollution on the site. The Project includes stormwater management measures that enhance water quality. |
TABLE NO. IV.A2:
LONG ISLAND SOUND COASTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM COMPLIANCE TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Developed Coast</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>LWRP Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.2- Manage land use activities and use best management practices to minimize non-point pollution of coastal waters.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Improvements will reduce stormwater runoff, and mitigate non-point pollution.</td>
<td>Policy 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3- Protect and enhance the quality of coastal waters.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Improvements will reduce stormwater runoff, floating debris and suspended solids.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4- Limit the potential for adverse impacts of watershed development on water quality and quantity.</td>
<td>The Project has been designed to enhance watershed quality. No significant adverse impacts have been identified for the Project.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5- Protect and conserve the quality and quantity of potable water.</td>
<td>Relocation of City Yard and remediation of parcels that comprise the site will decrease land uses that are likely to contribute to poor surface and groundwater quality.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy 6- Protect and restore the quality and function of the Long Island Sound ecosystem.

6.1- Protect and restore ecological quality throughout Long Island Sound.        | Ecological enhancements along the shoreline have been designed to protect the surrounding sensitive areas and to enhance their quality through indigenous plantings. |                                                                                                                                            | Policy 40     |
6.2- Protect and restore Significant Coastal Fish and Wildlife Habitats.        | Where applicable, significant wildlife habitats will be protected and restored.   |                                                                                                                                            | Policy 41     |
6.3- Protect and restore tidal and freshwater wetlands.                         | Tidal and freshwater wetlands adjacent to the site will be protected from adjacent development and enhanced as part of the project plan.          |                                                                                                                                            | Policy 44     |
6.4- Protect vulnerable fish, wildlife, plant species, and rare ecological communities. | Where applicable, actions will be taken to protect vulnerable flora and fauna. |                                                                                                                                            |               |
6.5- Protect natural resources and associated values in identified regionally important natural areas. | The Project has been designed to protect and enhance environmentally sensitive areas adjacent to project site. |                                                                                                                                            |               |

Policy 7- Protect and improve air quality in the Long Island Sound coastal area.

7.1- Control or abate existing and prevent new air pollution.                   | No significant adverse impacts associated with air quality have been identified for the Project. |                                                                                                                                            | Policy 41     |
7.2- Limit discharges or atmospheric radioactive material to a level that is as low as practicable. | Not applicable to this site.                                                                                                                   | Not applicable. |               |
7.3- Limit sources of atmospheric deposition of pollutants to the Sound, particularly from nitrogen sources. | No significant adverse impacts associated with atmospheric deposition of pollutants to the Sound have been identified for the Project. |                                                                                                                                            | Policy 43     |

Policy 8- Minimize environmental degradation in the Long Island Sound coastal area from solid waste and hazardous substances and wastes.

8.1- Manage solid waste to protect public health and control pollution.         | An effective solid waste management plan has been designed for the Project and recycling will be encouraged in accordance with the City of New Rochelle's recycling program. |                                                                                                                                            | Policy 39     |
8.2- Manage hazardous waste to protect public health and control pollution.    | If applicable, hazardous materials identified on the Project Site will be removed in accordance with all local, State and Federal regulations.           |                                                                                                                                            | Policy 36     |
8.3- Protect the environment from degradation due to toxic pollutants and substances hazardous to the environment and public health. | If applicable, hazardous materials identified on the Project Site will be removed in accordance with all local, State and Federal regulations.           |                                                                                                                                            | Policy 36     |
8.4- Prevent and remediate discharge of petroleum products.                    | If applicable, hazardous materials identified on the Project Site will be removed in accordance with all local, State and Federal regulations.           |                                                                                                                                            | Policy 36     |
**TABLE NO. IV.A2:**
LONG ISLAND SOUND COASTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM COMPLIANCE TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>LWRP Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developed Coast</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5- Transport solid waste and hazardous substances and waste in a manner which protects the safety, well-being, and general welfare of the public; the environmental resources of the state; and the continued use of transportation facilities.</td>
<td>If applicable, hazardous materials identified on the Project Site will be removed in accordance with all local, State and Federal regulations.</td>
<td>Policy 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6- Site solid and hazardous waste facilities to avoid potential degradation of coastal resources.</td>
<td>Not applicable. Relates to municipality or the greater region.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Coast</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 9- Provide for public access to, and recreational use of, coastal waters, public lands, and public resources of the Long Island coastal area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1- Promote appropriate and adequate physical public access and recreation throughout the coastal area.</td>
<td>The Echo Bay esplanade along the project site and waterfront open space will permit physical public access to the coastal area. The pedestrian bridge to Five Islands Park and installation of the kayak launch will permit enhanced recreational opportunities.</td>
<td>Policy 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2- Provide public visual access from public lands to coastal lands and waters or open space at all sites where physically practical.</td>
<td>Site design includes the creation of Armory Place and the removal of the Armory Annex, which would provide an open view from Main Street and visual access to coastal lands, waters and open space.</td>
<td>Policy 19A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3- Preserve the public interest in and use of lands and waters held in public trust by the state, New York City, and towns in Nassau and Suffolk counties.</td>
<td>Not applicable. Relates to municipality or the greater region.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4- Assure public access to public trust lands and navigable waters.</td>
<td>An on-site kayak launch and pedestrian bridge to Five Islands Park would permit access to public lands and navigable waters.</td>
<td>Policy 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Working Coast</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 10- Protect Long Island Sound's water-dependent uses and promote siting of new water-dependent uses in suitable locations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1- Protect existing water-dependent uses.</td>
<td>Not applicable to this site.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2- Promote maritime centers as the most suitable locations for water-dependent uses.</td>
<td>The uses on the proposed project site will be water-enhanced, whereas the current site uses are no longer water-dependent or water-enhanced.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3- Allow for development of new water-dependent uses outside of maritime centers.</td>
<td>Not applicable to this site.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.4- Improve the economic viability of water-dependent uses by allowing for non-water-dependent accessory and multiple uses, particularly water-enhanced and maritime support services.</td>
<td>The project site has been designed to include water-enhanced uses such as a publically accessible waterfront esplanade, open space and kayak launch.</td>
<td>Policy 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5- Minimize adverse impacts of new and expanding water-dependent uses, provide for their safe operation, and maintain regionally important uses.</td>
<td>Not applicable. Relates to municipality or the greater region.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.6- Provide sufficient infrastructure for water-dependent uses.</td>
<td>Not applicable to this site.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.7- Promote efficient harbor operation.</td>
<td>Not applicable to this site.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 11- Promote sustainable use of living marine resources in Long Island Sound.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1- Ensure the long-term maintenance and health of living marine resources.</td>
<td>The Project includes enhancement of the shoreline with plantings that provide opportunities for ecological and wildlife. The restoration of the shoreline edge and plantings support long-term health of living marine resources.</td>
<td>Policy 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE NO. IV.A.2:
### LONG ISLAND SOUND COASTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM COMPLIANCE TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Developed Coast</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>LWRP Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.2 - Provide for commercial and recreational use of the Sound's finfish, shellfish, crustaceans, and marine plants.</td>
<td>Not applicable to this site.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.3 - Maintain and strengthen a stable commercial fishing fleet in Long Island Sound.</td>
<td>Not applicable. Relates to the greater region.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.4 - Promote recreational uses of marine resources.</td>
<td>The project has been designed to provide physical access to Echo Bay and promote recreational uses of the bay through the public esplanade and kayak launch.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5 - Promote managed harvest of shellfish originating from uncertified waters.</td>
<td>The City of New Rochelle prohibits shellfish harvesting in most areas due to water quality.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.6 - Promote aquaculture.</td>
<td>Not applicable to this site.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 12 - Protect agricultural lands in the eastern Suffolk County portion of Long Island Sound's coastal area.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1 - Protect existing agriculture and agricultural lands from conversion to other land uses.</td>
<td>Not applicable to this site.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.2 - Establish and maintain favorable conditions which support existing or promote new coastal agricultural production.</td>
<td>Not applicable to this site.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.3 - Minimize adverse impacts on agriculture from unavoidable conversion of agricultural land.</td>
<td>Not applicable to this site.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.4 - Preserve scenic and open space values associated with the Sound's agricultural lands.</td>
<td>Not applicable to this site.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 13 - Promote appropriate use and development of energy and mineral resources.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1 - Conserve energy resources.</td>
<td>The Project has been designed for energy conservation as part of the site and building design.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2 - Promote alternative energy sources that are self-sustaining, including solar and wind powered energy generation.</td>
<td>The Project has been designed for energy conservation as part of the site and building design.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.3 - Ensure maximum efficiency and minimum adverse environmental impact when siting major energy generating facilities.</td>
<td>The Project has been designed for energy conservation as part of the site and building design.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.4 - Minimize adverse impacts from fuel storage facilities.</td>
<td>Not applicable to this site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.5 - Minimize adverse impacts associated with mineral extraction.</td>
<td>Not applicable to this site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**TABLE NO. IV.A-3:**  
ZONING COMPLIANCE TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEC. (1)</th>
<th>ZONING REQUIREMENT</th>
<th>All Districts</th>
<th>PWD-5</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning Amendments</th>
<th>Proposed Site Plan - Compliance with Zoning Amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Proposed Program**

- Multifamily Residential Units
- Retail / Restaurant Space

| Proposed Program | 285 | 25.000 |

**331-52 PWD-5 Planned Waterfront Development**

- C Uses allowed by Special Permit by City Council
  - 2 Maximum FAR for following residential uses
    - c. Multifamily dwellings
      - 0.75 (max 30 DU/acre)  
      - 1.15 (max 45 DU/acre)  
      - 1.13 (43.8 DU/ac)

**331-67 PWD-5 Planned Waterfront Development**

- A Dimensional requirements
  - 1 Max. building height
    - within 300 feet of East Main Street
      - 5 stories / 50 feet
    - beyond 300 feet of East Main Street
      - 3 stories / 30 feet
  - 2 Max permitted FAR
    - water dependent uses
      - 1.0
    - Special Permit residential/non-residential uses
      - 0.75
      - 1.25
      - FAR = 1.22
    - total
      - 1.0
      - 1.25
      - Total = 1.22

- B Standards for medium density residential use
  - 1 Min lot area per DU
    - 3,500 sf
    - remove
    - 996 sf

- 2 Req’d off-street parking spaces
  - 1.5 spaces / DU

- D Standards for planned waterfront development
  - 1 Min lot size
    - 6 acres

**331-126 Schedule of Parking Requirements**

- Restaurant
  - 1 / 3 seats or 1 / 200 GSF, whichever greater
  - To comply, with Shared Use

- Retail, national brand
  - 1 / 250 GSF + 1 / 1,000 sf accessory use
  - To comply, with Shared Use

- Retail shop, personal service establishment
  - 1 / 250 GSF
  - To comply, with Shared Use

**Table 331 Attachment 2 - Schedule of Dimensional Regulations, Mixed-Use Districts**

**PWD-5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Max FAR</th>
<th>Water-dependent special permit uses</th>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All other uses</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.22 (8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Max Height</th>
<th>5 stories/50’ w/in 300’ of East Main Street; elsewhere 3 stories/30’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max Coverage</td>
<td>5 stories / 60 Feet to 305 feet of East Main Street elsewhere 4 / 55 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 stories / 60 Feet to 305 feet of East Main Street elsewhere 4 / 55 Feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table No. IV.A-3: Zoning Compliance Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Requirement</th>
<th>All Districts</th>
<th>PWD-5</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning Amendments</th>
<th>Proposed Site Plan - Compliance with Zoning Amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
<td>45% ([9])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impervious surfaces</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

2. Amend 331-52 C.2: 1.15 maximum FAR (maximum 45 dwelling units per acre).
3. Amend 331-67 A.1: The maximum building height allowed within 300 feet of East Main Street is five stories or 65 feet. The maximum building height allowed beyond 300 feet of East Main Street is four stories or 55 feet.
4. Amend 331-67 A.2: The maximum permitted floor area ratio is 1.25 for all special permit residential units and nonresidential uses (in the PWD-5 District) as a mixed use. The maximum FAR shall not exceed 1.25.
5. Amend 331-67 B.1: Remove minimum lot area per dwelling unit: 3,500 square feet.
6. 425 parking spaces proposed for all uses located on-site within building structure.
7. Parking ratios used in Shared Parking Analysis: 1.5 parking spaces/residential unit and 4 parking spaces/1,000 sf of retail and restaurant uses.
8. Amend 331 Attachment 2, FAR column - PWD-5: 1.0 for water-dependent special permit uses, with not more than 1.25 for all other uses, but in no case shall the aggregate FAR exceed 1.25.
9. Amend 331 Attachment 2, Coverage column - PWD-5: 45%.
PROPOSED ZONING TEXT CHANGES:

§ 331-52
§ 331-67
§ 331-ATTACHMENT 2
ECHO BAY
PROPOSED ZONING TEXT CHANGES

§ 331-52. PWD-5 Planned Waterfront Development - 5-Story District.

See § 331-28B(6).

A. Permitted principal uses; 1.0 maximum FAR for the following principal uses:

(1) Pier, dock, marina, boat launching and wet boat storage.

(2) Boat building and boat/sail repair.

(3) Boat service facilities, including the sale and storage of fuel, lubricants, parts, accessories, ice and bait as an incidental marina use.

(4) Dry boat storage for boats 16 feet or longer.

(5) Tanks and pumps for dispensing gasoline and fuel for motors.

(6) Establishments for the sale of boats, motors, and accessories.

(7) Yacht, boat, rowing, beach and other water-dependent membership clubs.

(8) Ferry, water taxi, excursion, fishing and charter boat services.

(9) Beach, park, promenade, boardwalk at or near the water's edge.

(10) Navigation aids, marine police and fire station.

(11) Houses of worship.

B. Permitted accessory uses.

(1) Uses and structures which are clearly incidental and customarily accessory to the permitted principal use on the lot on which they are located.

(2) Swimming pools as regulated by § 331-17.

(3) Satellite earth station or dish antennas as regulated by § 331-24, but only when accessory to a permitted principal use on the lot on which it is located.

(4) Outdoor dining as per § 331-95 of the Zoning Chapter.

(5) Facilities for the pumping out of marine holding tanks.

(6) Shore protection structures.
C. Uses allowed by special permit by the City Council. *(See Article XII for body having jurisdiction to issue special permit.)*


(1) 0.75 maximum FAR for the following nonresidential uses:

(a) Aquarium, maritime museum, marine sciences institute.

(b) Inn, bed-and-breakfast, hotel.

(c) Conference center, exhibition halls, theater.

(d) Enclosed sports/amusement/recreation complex.

(e) Dry boat storage for vessels under 16 feet in length.

(f) Retail sales and service establishments.

(g) Business, professional or government offices.

(h) Studios, theater, auditorium (up to a capacity of 200 people).

(i) Enclosed restaurant with outdoor dining.

(j) Greenhouse, nursery, arboretum.

(k) Municipal uses.

(l) Yacht, boat, rowing, beach, and other water-dependent membership clubs as regulated by § 331-115.

(m) Public utility uses as regulated by § 331-106.

(2) 0.75 to 1.15 maximum FAR (maximum 3045 dwelling units per acre) for the following residential uses:

(a) One-family attached and detached dwelling.

(b) Two-family dwellings.

(c) Multifamily dwellings.

*NOTE: All special permit non-water-dependent buildings and uses shall be subject to waterfront design guidelines, which shall encourage nautical building design decoration, water-orientation and views, salt-water-tolerant vegetation, lighting, and screening.*
§ 331-67. PWD-5 Planned Waterfront Development - 5-Story District.

See §§ 331-28B(6) and 331-46 through 331-54. The following standards are hereby established as the minimum/maximum requirements, as the case may be, but may be made more restrictive where such is determined appropriate based upon consideration of the particular circumstances of the individual application to satisfy the purposes as set forth in § 331-28B(6) hereof.

A. Dimensional requirements.

(1) The maximum building height allowed within 300 feet of East Main Street is five stories or 5065 feet. The maximum building height allowed beyond 300 feet of East Main Street is threefour stories or 3055 feet.

(2) The maximum permitted floor area ratio (FAR) is 1.0 for all water-dependent permitted uses. The maximum permitted floor area ratio is .751.25 for all special permit residential units and nonresidential uses (in the PWD-5 District) as a mixed use. The maximum FAR shall not exceed 1.250.

B. Standards for medium-density residential use.

(1) Minimum lot area per dwelling unit: 3,500 square feet.

(2) Required off-street parking shall be 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit.

C. Standards for nonresidential use.

(1) Minimum lot size: six acres for office (business, professional and governmental).

D. Standards for planned waterfront development.

(1) Minimum lot size: six acres.

E. Design concepts and guidelines.

(1) That pedestrian access and public uses be encouraged at the water's edge, and obstructions to waterfront access be removed and that view corridors from East Main Street be created and maintained. On properties owned by the City of New Rochelle, preference will be given to development proposals which create unobstructed views from East Main Street to Echo Bay and beyond.

(2) That a minimum thirty-foot public waterfront walkway be provided at City Yard and the Armory, as well as on any other City owned properties, when redevelopment, relocation, etc., is undertaken.

(3) That development be visually and acoustically buffered from nearby residential areas.
(4) That all structures, facilities, and public areas reflect a high-quality level of architectural expression and abundant landscaping be provided in order to achieve attractiveness, quality, and permanence.
ZONING

331 Attachment 2

City of New Rochelle

Schedule of Dimensional Regulations
Mixed-Use Districts


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District/Use</th>
<th>Maximum Dimensional Requirements</th>
<th>Minimum Dimensional Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>Building Height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(stories)</td>
<td>(feet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMU Downtown Mixed Use</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;13&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>20&lt;sup&gt;13&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMUR Downtown Mixed Use Urban Renewal</td>
<td>5.5&lt;sup&gt;13&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>24&lt;sup&gt;13&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROS Recreation Open Space</td>
<td>0.05&lt;sup&gt;13&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR Water Related</td>
<td>1.0 for water-dependent uses and non-water-dependent special permit uses, with no more than 0.25 for all other uses, but in no case shall the aggregate FAR exceed 1.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWD-3 Planned Waterfront District 3-Story</td>
<td>1.0 for water-dependent special permit uses, with no more than 0.40 for all other uses, but in no case shall the aggregate FAR exceed 1.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWD-5 Planned Waterfront District 5-Story</td>
<td>1.0 for water-dependent special permit uses, with no more than 0.75 for all other uses, but in no case shall the aggregate FAR exceed 1.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWD-8 Planned Waterfront District 8-Story</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:

1 Where any parcel is contiguous to a residence district, an abutting rear yard shall be minimum of 30 feet and abutting side yards shall be a minimum of 20 feet.
2 See § 331-48.
3 See § 331-49.
4 Twenty where abutting a residence district or use.
5 Three stories or 35 feet for all water dependent and special permit uses.
6 Five stories or 50 feet within 300 feet of East Main Street; elsewhere, three stories, 35 feet.
7 1.0 for all water dependent permitted uses, 0.75 for residential uses, 0.4 for water dependent special permit nonresidential uses, 0.25 for water dependent special permit uses which restrict public access.
8 All buildings must be set back at least 35 feet from the mean high tide line.
9 The maximum height shall not exceed 39 stories or 390 feet for a primarily residential development on Block 416 on the Official Tax Map of the City of New Rochelle.
10 A height of 390 feet shall be allowed in the DMU only under the following conditions: 1) the parcel size is in excess of 75,000 SF and 2) the parcel has been subject to a land disposition agreement (LDA) approved by City Council subsequent to the adoption of Ord. No. 240 of 2001.
In the event less than 10% of a Building Lot is zoned ROS, and no structures containing Floor Area are constructed on such portion of Building Lot, the Floor Area Ratio of such portion shall be deemed the same as the Floor Ratio Ratio for the balance of the Lot, which Floor Area Ratio shall be multiplied by the square footage of such portion, with the product thereof transferred to and added to the maximum permitted Floor Area of the balance of the Lot.

Maximum of 10% Impervious Surfaces Coverage if Passive Recreational Use only. Maximum of 25% Impervious Surfaces Coverage, if uses include other Permitted Principal Uses.

In the DMU and DMUR Districts, increased FAR and Height may be granted by the City Council, in its sole and absolute discretion, pursuant to the Downtown Density Bonus (DDB) standards in § 331-85.3. [Editor's Note: Section 331-85.3 was repealed 12-9-2008 by Ord. No. 237-2008. See now Art. XX, Floating Overlay Zone.]
B. LAND, WATER AND ECOLOGICAL RESOURCES
B. LAND, WATER AND ECOLOGICAL RESOURCES

This section of the DEIS describes the land, water and ecological resources of the Project Site and the surrounding area in order to assess whether the proposed Project would have any significant impact on land, water and ecological resources. This section also provides a summary of the following: Preliminary Geotechnical Assessment by Haley & Aldrich; Phase I Environmental Site Assessment by Roux Associates, Inc.; Ecological Assessment Report (including wetland delineation and analysis) by William Kenny Associates, LLC; Stormwater Management Report by Divney Tung Schwalbe, LLP; and Marine Condition Investigation by McLaren Engineering Group. Each of these reports are included in the Appendix of this DEIS.

1. LAND RESOURCES

a. Existing Conditions

Site reconnaissance was undertaken by project consultants to determine the existing land resources for the project site (which includes two parcels: City Yard and Armory), including geology, topography, soil, subsurface, and the shoreline. In addition to site reconnaissance, project consultants reviewed available mapping, including USGS quadrangles, surficial and bedrock geology maps and the Natural Resource Conservation service Soils (NRCS) survey for Westchester County (See Section X, Sources and Bibliography). See Figure No. IV.B-1, Site Aerial Photo, for existing conditions.

(1) Geology

(a) City Yard Parcel

According to the August 2012 Environment Site Assessments and July 2012 Preliminary Geotechnical Assessment, the site and vicinity is underlain by between 3 to 13 feet of sandy fill material, followed by an unconsolidated overburden layer that consists of an unsorted mix of pleistocene and recent glacial material including clay, silt, sands, gravel, cobbles, and boulders. According to historic aerial photos and Sanborn maps, Department of Public Works (DPW) drawings and prior geotechnical reports, fill material was used to expand the site into Echo Bay by approximately 50 feet.

Depth to bedrock varied significantly from about 1 foot in the northwest area of the site to about 38.5 feet on the east side of the site. Bedrock level generally slopes downward from northwest to southeast across the site. The bedrock mostly consists of decomposed, as well as intact, granulite and gneiss, which ranges from soft to very hard, and very hard, slightly weathered schist. However, the upper several feet of the bedrock is decomposed and will, therefore, exhibit soil like properties. The decomposed bedrock generally consisted of orange brown sand and gravel with silt, and ranged from about 1 foot to 12 feet in thickness. Below the
decomposed zone, the rock is weathered and was penetrated with augers, and generally consisted of rock fragments. The weathered bedrock thickness ranged from about 1 to 12 feet thick.

(b) Armory Parcel
Like the City Yard parcel, the Armory parcel is sequentially underlain by approximately 3 feet of silty sand fill material, followed by a thin sheet of unconsolidated overburden that consists of an unsorted heterogeneous mix of pleistocene and recent glacial material including clay, silt, sands, gravel, cobbles, and boulders. These glacial deposits are unconformably underlain by weathered rock and amphibolites/schist bedrock of the Ordovician to Cambrian aged Hartland Formation. Historic fill is expected at the southeast corner of the Site, in a small area delimited by Echo Bay, an existing concrete dock, an existing small building and the adjoining City Yard parcel. At that location, according to historic aerial photographs, the property was expanded into Echo Bay between 1966 and 1974. Historic fill is also expected in a small area at the southwest corner of the property, where historic Sanborn maps depict apparent cut-and-fill activities between 1911 and 1931.

(2) Topography
The grade at the City Yard parcel gently slopes southeasterly from approximately 24 feet above mean sea level (ft-amsl) along East Main Street to approximately 8 ft-amsl at the shoreline along Echo Bay. In a small area at the northwest corner of the Site, bedrock is visible and land surface elevation is approximately 34 ft-amsl. The grade in the surrounding area has a gentle southeasterly slope toward Echo Bay, with the Armory parcel being situated at a somewhat higher topographic elevation than the City Yard parcel, of approximately 34 ft-amsl near East Main Street. A rock cut on the northwest boundary of the DPW site contains a retaining wall, which delineates the boundary between the DPW and Armory parcels.

The grade at the Armory parcel slopes uphill from approximately 24 ft-amsl along East Main Street to approximately 34 ft-amsl at the location of the existing onsite Armory setback approximately 100 feet from East Main Street. The grade then remains essentially flat in the northern half of the Site, until it slopes downhill toward the shoreline of Echo Bay to an elevation of approximately 6 ft-amsl edge of the property. Retaining walls are present in the southern region of the site. The Armory buildings sit on a localized high point with respect to adjoining properties.

(3) Soil Conditions
The test borings (see Figure No. IV.B-2, Subsurface Exploration Plan) revealed the following strata, described below in order of increasing depth below ground surface. Not all strata were encountered at each test boring location. Further descriptions of
each stratum are provided on the logs in Appendix 4: *Preliminary Geotechnical Assessment*. Fill, which is sand and silt containing varying amounts of gravel, was found throughout the site and contained trace amounts of brick, coal ash, cinders, wood fragments, cobbles, and boulders. Below the top layer of fill, the following soils are found at different areas on the site, followed by the bedrock base:

**Alluvial Deposits** – Typically loose to medium dense, gray to black to brown medium to fine sand. A petroleum odor was noted at HA4. This stratum was encountered at HA4, HA5, HA6, and B9/9A, and was 3 to 23.5 feet thick.

**Glacial Till** – Typically very dense brown coarse to fine sand, with varying amounts of gravel and silt. Cobbles and boulders should also be anticipated in this stratum. This stratum was encountered at HA5, HA6, and B-7P, and ranged from 2 to 5 feet thick.

**Bedrock** – Bedrock was encountered at each test boring location and confirmed by coring or refusal with the drilling equipment. Depth to bedrock varied significantly from about 1 foot in the northwest area of the site to about 38.5 feet on the east side of the site. Bedrock level generally slopes downward from northwest to southeast across the site. The bedrock typically consisted of decomposed to intact, soft to very hard, granulite to gneiss; and very hard, slightly weathered schist. The upper portion of bedrock was penetrated with the augers and split spoon samples indicating that the upper several feet are decomposed and will largely exhibit soil like properties. The decomposed bedrock generally consisted of orange brown sand and gravel with silt, and ranged from about 1 to 12 feet in thickness. Below the decomposed zone, the rock is weathered and was penetrated with augers, and generally consisted of rock fragments. The weathered bedrock thickness ranged from about 1 to 12 feet thick.

(4) **Surface and Subsurface Conditions**

During the June 2012 geotechnical assessment conducted by Haley & Aldrich, seven test borings were drilled throughout the site (see Figure No. IV.B-2, Subsurface Exploration Plan, for test boring locations) and boring logs are located in Appendix 4: *Preliminary Geotechnical Assessment*. Boring depths ranged from 9 to 24 feet, extending to the depth of the underlying bedrock. The subsurface conditions were concluded to be favorable over the majority of the building complex footprint in terms of being able to support the proposed building design. Site soils are not considered susceptible to liquefaction during an earthquake under the current Building Code and seismically induced settlements of water within the building complex are not anticipated to be significant.

Groundwater levels on the City Yard were observed at 10 to 13 feet below ground level, although, it was noted that water levels observing in the borings shortly after
drilling may have been influenced by the drilling operations and, therefore, may not represent static conditions.

According to the results of prior geotechnical and environmental investigation conducted by Mueser Rutledge in 2007 (Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment Report Appendix J, located in DEIS Appendix 7), the depth to groundwater for the Armory was 6.5 feet below land surface just east of the existing onsite buildings fronting East Main Street and 6.0 feet below land surface in the central region of the Marina parcel. Based on the topography of the area surrounding those two properties, and the presence of Echo Bay, groundwater has conservatively been assumed to flow southeasterly towards Echo Bay. Groundwater flow direction and depth to groundwater may also be subject to tidal influence, subsurface variations in geology and local dewatering projects.

(5) Existing Shoreline Conditions

Conditions along the surrounding shoreline vary along this area and are reflective of its proximity to urban land uses. See Figure No. IV.B-1, Site Aerial Photo, for existing conditions. In some portions, the shoreline is exposed earth, while in others it is sheltered by a variety of shoreline stabilization structures, all of which were found to be in disrepair. These structures include timber, concrete blocks, steel sheet pile and placed stones. The following chart describes the structures found on each parcel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Shoreline Structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Public Works (City Yard)</td>
<td>• Steeply sloped bank of silt-clay lined with large placed stones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ 2 to 4 foot diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Timber retaining wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Concrete pipe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ inaccessible due to plant growth and overflow from salt pit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Stone size is reduced to 1 to 2 feet south of salt pit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Floating debris collection structure at western edge of DPW shoreline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Remainder of site contains concrete armor and mixed stone with large pile of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 to 3 foot diameter stone along a steep slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armory</td>
<td>• Gentle slope lined with small stones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Concrete platform 40 feet from fenceline supported by mixed-stone base (30 feet in length)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the City Yard parcel, the shoreline consists of a steeply sloped bank of silt-clay and it is lined with large stones placed along its bank. About 20 feet inland, barriers constructed to shelter the shoreline from the upland salt storage piles include a timber retaining wall, asphalt platform and a concrete pipe, with miscellaneous concrete slabs and stone and over-pour beneath the platform. Concrete armor exists throughout the lot. Along the Armory parcel, the shoreline has a gentle slope with small to mid-sized stones located throughout and a concrete platform located 40 feet from the fence line, which is supported by a partially eroded mixed stone base and extends 30 feet towards the bay. The remainder of the shoreline along the Armory parcel consists of a stone seawall with intermittent collapse.

The shoreline is mostly sheltered from significant wind and wave impact, in part due to these measures; however from tidal erosion this area is in need of stabilization in order to prevent further loss. The erosion is due in part to deterioration described above that has occurred across most of the shoreline stabilization structures.

b. **Future Conditions Without the Project**
Without the Project, site conditions would remain essentially in their current conditions. If measures are not taken to secure the shoreline, it is probable that tidal erosion would persist. Many of the current coastal stabilization measures have undergone significant deterioration and are no longer as effective.

c. **Potential Impacts**
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. 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 for the DEIS. The Erosion and Sediment Control Plan has been developed in accordance with the New York State Standards and Specifications for Erosion and Sediment Control (August 2005). The plan includes limitations for the duration of soil exposure and criteria and specifications for the placement of the erosion and sediment control devices.

(1) **Erosion and Sedimentation During Construction**
The Project has been designed to minimize and mitigate potential impacts during construction. Erosion and sediment related impacts would be minimized by controlling runoff, by minimizing erosion, and by collecting sedimentation before it leaves the site. Clean runoff would be diverted away from disturbed areas and sediment laden runoff would be directed to sediment traps. Erosion would be minimized, as only those areas under construction would be opened and exposed. Disturbed areas would be stabilized preceding major storm events and/or immediately following construction activities in an area. Suspended sediment in
runoff would be filtered and/or settled out via silt fence, sediment traps and other such measures. Erosion and sediment control for all phases of construction shall be implemented as specified in the project Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and the associated Erosion and Sediment Control Plan Drawings. Potential impacts associated with further shoreline erosion and sediment-laden runoff to the waterway would be avoided by diverting the runoff away from the work area, limiting the exposure of the work area to the extent that can be managed and installing silt fence, fiber rolls, sediment traps, small to medium stones along the shoreline with geotechnical fabric, rolled erosion control product and turbidity curtain. These devices would be installed in accordance with the New York State Standards and Specifications for Erosion and Sediment Control (August 2005). The contractor would be required to inspect and maintain the temporary erosion and sediment control devices throughout the duration of construction including until the site and shoreline achieve permanent stabilization. Inspections during construction would be conducted by a Trained Contractor as defined by the NYSDEC on a daily basis and immediately after a rainfall event.

(2) **Water Quality Impacts Following Construction**

Implementation of the project SWPPP and Erosion and Sediment Control Plan includes permanent structures and measures designed to manage on-site erosion and sedimentation control practices following the completion of construction. These practices would include, but shall not be limited to, erosion control practices (soil stabilization and monitoring), water quality control practices (hydronamic separator, catch basin sumps, vegetated buffers, etc.), and related stormwater flow controlling structures (swales, catch basins, etc.) The SWPPP further identifies the frequency with which inspections of stormwater management measures should occur and the extent of maintenance required. All measures are designed in accordance with NYSDEC standards and are intended to maintain compliance with NYSDEC’s General Permit requirements which require that there be no increase in turbidity that would cause a substantial visible contrast to natural conditions and that there shall be no increase in suspended colloidal or settable solids that would cause deposition or impair waters for their best usage. As a result, significant adverse impacts to water quality following construction are not expected.

d. **Potential Mitigation Measures**

The temporary and permanent mitigation measures mentioned above would meet the latest NYSDEC General Permit requirements for Construction Activity, City of New Rochelle Code, Chapter 127 Coastal Erosion Hazard Areas and the New York State Standards and Specifications for Erosion and Sediment Control (August 2005).

(1) **Typical Temporary Erosion Control Measures**

Temporary erosion and sediment control measures would be utilized and not limited to the examples mentioned above. The contractor would be required to inspect and
maintain the erosion and sediment control devices, temporarily stabilize the shoreline prior to a forecasted substantial storm event, and maintain on site the necessary materials, equipment and labor for emergency repairs. The Applicant would be required to inspect the work activity on a weekly basis for compliance with the NYSDEC General Permit GP-0-10-001 for Construction Activity.

(2) **Typical Permanent Erosion Control Measures**
The Applicant would be required to have a post development maintenance schedule for the permanent structures on a regular basis in accordance with the NYSDEC and City of New Rochelle requirements.

2. **WATER RESOURCES**

a. **Existing Conditions**
The Echo Bay site is located on the Long Island Sound and is at the confluence of two municipal stormwater outfalls, Stephenson Brook and Snuff Mill Creek. The following is a description of the existing conditions and proposed conditions following implementation of the site plan based upon stormwater and other surface water conditions.

(1) **Echo Bay and Associated Tidal Activity**
Echo Bay is a sheltered inlet off of the Long Island Sound. Based on the Shoreline Assessment Report (Appendix 3), prepared by McLaren Engineering Group in August 2012, the majority of the investigated shoreline is mostly sheltered from significant wind and wave impact; however, the observed tidal erosion would necessitate stabilization of the shoreline to prevent further loss. Tidal wetland restoration projects were recommended for the tidal marsh in Davenport Park and the Shoals of Echo Bay by Five Island’s Park in the 1997 Watershed Management Plan for Stephenson Brook, Burling Brook, Pine Brook and Larchmont Harbor, prepared on behalf of five municipalities by the staff of the Westchester County Department of Planning. As of December 2010, several salt marsh and coastal buffer restoration projects were implemented by the Westchester County Department of Planning in the Echo Bay area.

(2) **FEMA 100-Year Floodplain**
According to Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) number 36119C0342F (see Figure No. IV.B-4, *Flood Insurance Rate Map*), the southeast region of the Site, along Echo Bay, is situated in an area with the 1% annual chance of flood, whereas the remaining onsite areas, with the exception of the thin strip along East Main Street, area located within the 0.2% annual chance flood. Likewise, for the Armory site, a strip of land approximately 60 feet wide is situated in an area with the 1% annual chance of flood, followed by an inland strip of land approximately 30 feet wide with a 0.2% annual chance flood.
The proposed development area located in the southeast region of the flood zone includes a portion of the proposed building structure, the pool and associated patio area, a portion of the north access drive, pedestrian walkway, pedestrian bridge, grading with shoreline improvements, drainage improvements, the proposed sanitary trunk sewer realignment and removal of existing parking lot.

Because a portion of the Site is in a 100-year flood zone, the EPA recommended considering adaption of the Project to climate change. According to EPA “Climate change will likely have significant impacts on coastal communities and marine ecosystems. Accelerated erosion, sea level rise, salt water intrusion (where water supplies become more saline), stronger storms, and warmer ocean temperatures are likely to disturb sensitive marine ecosystems and damage private property and public infrastructure throughout the U.S. coastal zone.”1 The Project design includes several recommended adaptions to climate change which are discussed below.

(3) New York State Water Quality Classifications for Surface Waters in the Project Area

The NYSDEC protects tidal wetlands in the State of New York under Chapter 25 of the Environmental Conservation Law at Section 661. Referred to as the Tidal Wetland Act, this regulation established the protection of tidal wetlands of critical importance due to their role in shoreline stabilization, the marine life food web and as the interface between terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems, amongst other priorities. Under the Act, tidal wetlands are classified into six different zones along a saline gradient, from coastal fresh marshes to the littoral zone. The NYSDEC regards vegetated marshes (intertidal marsh, high marsh or salt meadow, coastal fresh marsh) as the highest functioning tidal wetlands. Each zone is mapped on the 1974 Tidal Wetland Map created by the NYSDEC.

Adjacent to the subject site, there are three tidal wetland zones, including coastal shoals, bars and flats, high marsh and a littoral zone. As outlined by Section 661.4(hh)(3), coastal shoals, bars and flats, defined as SM on an inventory map, are covered by water at high tide, are exposed or are covered by water to a maximum depth of approximately one foot at low tide, and are not vegetated by low marsh cordgrass (Spartina alterniflora). High marsh or salt meadow is defined as the uppermost tidal wetland zone, designated HM on an inventory map, are usually dominated by salt meadow grass (Spartina patens); and spike grass (Distichlis spicata). This zone is periodically flooded by spring and storm tides and is often vegetated by low vigor (Spartina alterniflora) and seaside lavender (Limonium carolinianum). Upper limits of this zone often include black grass, (Juncus gerardi); chairmaker's rush (Scirpus sp); marsh elder (Iva frutescens); and groundsel bush (Baccharis halimifolia). Littoral zones are defined as the tidal wetlands zone, designated LZ on

1 http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/impacts-adaptation/coasts.html#adapt
an inventory map, and include all lands under tidal waters that are not included in any other category. The seaward boundary of the littoral zone is coincident with the minus 6-foot contour at mean low water.

In addition to tidal wetlands, the NYSDEC regulates activities occurring within Adjacent Areas. In contrast to freshwater wetlands where the adjacent area is a standard 100-feet upgradient from the wetland boundary, the calculation of adjacent areas to tidal wetlands is a variable formula that is dependent upon the history, land-use and topography of the shoreline. Based on Section 661.4(b)(1) of the Tidal Wetland regulations, it appears the Adjacent Area to the project site would terminate at the seaward edge of the seawalls and revetments that line the majority of the northern shoreline of Echo Bay. If direct wetland disturbance or Adjacent Area disturbance is proposed, a NYSDEC permit is required regardless of the size of those areas.

(4) Compliance with City’s Coastal Erosion Hazard Area Regulations

The City of New Rochelle regulates activities along the shoreline in concert with state and federal entities. Under Chapter 127 of the City of Rochelle Code, activities below the flood zone elevation of 13.0 NGVD would be subject to jurisdiction under the City of New Rochelle Coastal Erosion Hazard Area Law. The Project would include the actions related to the structural seawall improvements, plantings, small boat launch and Echo Bay Walk promenade that would require a coastal erosion permit. During the Site Plan Review process, detailed engineering drawings would be submitted to the City for review and the Applicant would comply with the general standards, restrictions and requirements of the applicable sections of Chapter 127 in order to obtain the required permit.

The Coastal Erosion Hazard Area Law identifies certain activities that are not regulated under Chapter 127, but would be regulated by the US Army Corps of Engineers. Expected activities related to the Project which are not regulated by this chapter include: elevated walkways or stairways constructed solely for pedestrian use and built by an individual property owner for the limited purpose of providing noncommercial access to the beach; docks, built on floats, columns, open timber piles or other similar openwork supports with a top surface area of less than 200 square feet; maintenance of structures when normal and customary and/or in compliance with an approved maintenance program. During the review process, detailed engineering drawings would be submitted to the US Army Corps of Engineers for review in order to obtain the required permit.
(5) **Existing Stormwater System**

The existing stormwater system and proposed stormwater management measures for the Project are discussed in detail in DEIS Section IV.C: *Utilities* (refer to IV.C.3.a Stormwater Management – Existing Conditions).

(6) **Existing Stephenson Brook and Snuff Mill Creek Outfall Structures and Debris Skimmers**

The existing debris skimmer is owned and maintained by the City of New Rochelle. 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 maintenance of the skimmer. The Applicant would allow access of City personnel for the purpose of emptying collected debris and maintaining the skimmer. DEIS Figure III.D-4, *Existing Conditions* (located at the end of Tab III: Description of the Proposed Action) shows the location of the existing Stephenson Brook and Snuff Mill Creek Outfall skimmer as well as the existing debris skimmer.

**b. Future Conditions Without the Project**

Without the Project, site conditions would remain essentially in their current conditions. If measures are not taken to secure the shoreline, it is probable that tidal erosion would persist and improvements to the ecological communities would not occur. Additionally, the stormwater system on the City Yard parcel would remain in its current condition, with no improvements to the treatment of stormwater.

**c. Potential Impacts**

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 and is included in the set of full-sized drawings for the DEIS. The Erosion and Sediment Control Plan has been developed in accordance with the New York State Standards and Specifications for Erosion and Sediment Control (August 2005). The plan includes limitations for the duration of soil exposure and criteria and specifications for the placement of the erosion and sediment control devices.

According to EPA, the “… impacts of climate change are likely to worsen many problems that coastal areas already face. Shoreline erosion, coastal flooding, and water pollution affect man-made infrastructure and coastal ecosystems.”

Although the Project is located in a coastal area, it includes the mitigation measures outlined below, including restoration and permanent stabilization of the shoreline with

---

2 [http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/impacts-adaptation/coasts.html#impacts](http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/impacts-adaptation/coasts.html#impacts)
vegetative cover, and reconstruction of the existing bulkheads and seawalls, so significant adverse impacts are not expected.

(1) Erosion and Sedimentation During Construction
The Project has been designed to minimize and mitigate potential impacts during construction. The proposed Project would likely reduce the potential for tidal erosion through the creation of vegetation tidal wetland areas along the shoreline of the project site. The restoration of tidal wetlands would increase the ecological productivity of this portion of shoreline. Should soil erosion occur, direct impacts to the waterway would result. These impacts would relate to an increase in turbidity in the water column and subsequent decrease in photosynthetic activity in the aquatic environment. The intent of the proposed Project, however, is to rehabilitate the site from an upland and wetland perspective. Installation of appropriate stormwater controls, on a site that currently includes few stormwater management features, and stabilizing the shoreline with vegetative and structural solutions would minimize the potential for erosion impacts from the project site. Potential impacts associated with sediment-laden runoff offsite would be avoided by diverting the runoff away from the work area, limiting the exposure of the work area to the extent that can be managed and installing silt fence, hay bales, inlet and outlet protection, sediment traps and basin, swales, stone check dams, anti-tracking pads, mulching, seeding, fiber rolls, rolled erosion control product and turbidity curtain. These devices would be installed in accordance with the New York State Standards and Specifications for Erosion and Sediment Control (August 2005). The contractor would be required to inspect and maintain the erosion and sediment control device during the duration of construction. During the Site Plan Review process the existing site runoff conditions and required conditions to mitigate erosion would be analyzed within the development area and along the shoreline to develop a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan including specific details and required maintenance for each practice. The contractor would be required to implement and maintain the temporary practices during the duration of construction until the site and shoreline achieves permanent stabilization. Inspections during construction would be conducted by a Trained Contractor as defined by the NYSDEC on a daily basis and immediately after a rainfall event.

(2) Water Quality Impacts Following Construction
With the implantation of the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, significant adverse impacts to water quality following construction are not expected.

d. Potential Mitigation Measures
The temporary and permanent mitigation measures mentioned above would meet the latest NYSDEC General Permit requirements for Construction Activity, City of New Rochelle Code, Chapter 127 Coastal Erosion Hazard Areas and the New York State Standards and Specifications for Erosion and Sediment Control (August
The prepared SWPPP would develop a long term required inspection and maintenance schedule for permanent vegetative ground cover and stormwater management systems. These practices and devices would be designed during the final site plan approval process and obtaining the approval from the NYSDEC General Construction Activity Permit and from the City of New Rochelle Chapter 127 Permit. The applicant would also be required to prepare an executed agreement with the municipality for the operation and maintenance of the post construction practices. With long term inspection and maintenance of vegetative ground cover and stormwater management systems, it is not expected that any significant adverse impacts on adjacent property owners or the waterway would occur, and therefore no additional mitigation measures are required.

(1) **Stormwater Management Policies Based on Current New York State Pollutant Discharge Elimination Regulations**

The NYSDEC General Permit GP-0-10-001 has limitations on the extent of soil disturbance not to exceed five acres at one time without obtaining approval from the City of New Rochelle as regulators of the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4). It is anticipated that the Project would be phased during construction to limit the site disturbance to less than five acres. Temporary erosion and sediment control measures would be utilized. The contractor would be required to inspect and maintain the erosion and sediment control devices, temporarily stabilize the site prior to a forecasted substantial rainfall event and maintain on site the necessary materials, equipment and labor for emergency repairs. The Applicant would be required to inspect the work activity on a weekly basis for compliance with the NYSDEC General Permit GP-0-10-001 for Construction Activity. The Applicant would be required to have a post development inspection and maintenance schedule for the permanent structures such as land grading, rain gardens, permeable pavement, stormwater planters, drainage structures and retention systems be performed on a regular basis in accordance with the NYSDEC and City of New Rochelle requirements. As these mitigation measures are incorporated in the design of the Project, no additional mitigation measures are required.

(2) **Climate Change Adaption Measures**

The EPA identifies a wide variety of measures to prepare for and adapt to the impacts of climate change, including the following:

- Building or repairing dikes, seawalls, and other structures that protect cities from erosion and storms; and
- Upgrading and redesigning infrastructure such as bridges, roads, culverts and stormwater systems.

The Project includes the restoration and permanent stabilization of the shoreline with vegetative cover. The proposed reconstruction of the dilapidated bulkheads...
and seawalls that armor the shoreline provides an opportunity to create tidal wetland planting zones in order to increase the ecological diversity along the shoreline. Additionally, as described more fully in Section IV.C: Utilities, stormwater runoff from the Site is currently neither detained nor treated on-site. The majority of the Project Site, approximately 8.43 acres, drains southward directly to the Long Island Sound. The Project’s proposed stormwater management design would result in a significant reduction in on-site impervious coverage (greater than 25%) and the inclusion of new planting areas and low gradient slopes for increased infiltration. These measures would reduce stormwater runoff volumes and peak flows for the overall 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.

The Project’s Erosion and Sediment Control Plan would also protect the waterbody, and includes limitations for the duration of soil exposure and criteria and specifications for the placement of the erosion and sediment control devices.

3. **ECOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

   **a. Existing Conditions**

   The project parcels were surveyed for ecological resources including flora and fauna, with a focus towards endangered or threatened species as well as state and federally protected wetlands.

   **(1) Threatened, Endangered, Rare and Special Concern Species**

   Although on-site investigation revealed typical shoreline communities, no state or federally listed flora or fauna were observed on the project site. The NYSDEC was contacted and indicated in a letter dated August 1, 2012 (See Appendix 2: Relevant Correspondence and Contacts) that no records of Endangered or Threatened Species protected under Article 11, Title 5 of the Environmental Conservation Law exist within the vicinity of the site.

   General state habitat mapping identify two animal assemblages associated with the Premium River and Premium Millpond located east of the site: Anadromous Fish Concentration Area and Winter Waterfowl Concentration Area. As the project site does not contain any vegetated tidal wetlands and the minimal freshwater discharge that feeds the two small fingers of Echo Bay are culverted, the project site does not provide habitat to any of the aforementioned species. This conclusion is supported by the absence of basic wildlife habitat offerings on the project site. The lack of vegetation along the shoreline limits food sources for avian species. Additionally, the lack of vegetative structure along the shoreline limits the ability for waterfowl to find shelter or escape cover from predators. The physical elements of the site do not provide this type of habitat due to the relatively small area of shoreline and...
immediate juxtaposition to the paved urban environment. In addition to the New York Natural Heritage Program request, the US Fish and Wildlife/New York State Breeding Bird Atlas (2000-2005) and the New York State Reptile Atlas were evaluated. No features of note were documented in relation to the site.

(2) Vegetative Community Types

Vegetative communities found on the Project Site are those typical of littoral zones, mudflats, and high marsh wetlands, although vegetation is generally sparse and wildlife is limited. Figure No. IV.B.3, Tidal Wetland and Upland Communities Map, illustrates each of the vegetative communities. The ecological communities (including limited vegetation) are summarized below. The Ecological Assessment Report, prepared by William Kenny Associates is located in Appendix 5.

(a) Littoral Zone – Tidal Wetland Community

Littoral zones, as per NYSDEC definitions, are permanently submerged portions of the shoreline and occupy water depths of 1 foot or greater, to a maximum of 6 feet, at mean low water. Adjacent to the project site, the littoral zone occupies the central portion of the inlet that wraps around the project site. The eastern finger of the inlet is longer and wider than the small finger to the west.

As described previously, each of these fingers receives freshwater discharge via upgradient culverts and, therefore, the adjacent urban environment negatively impacts the water quality in this area. The contributing urban inputs, such as oil, greases, garbage, amongst others, are very evident in the project area of the upper reaches of Echo Bay. In an effort to mitigate water pollution, a floating and anchored garbage net extends across the channel in the northern portion of the eastern finger and traps larger debris in order to prevent it from entering Echo Bay. Tidal flushing further dampens impacts of pollution on the water quality and increases the potential for the system to rebound.

Given that these areas are completely submerged, the potential for these areas to provide wildlife habitat is limited to aquatic species, such as finfish ducks, geese and other waterfowl. Finfish species that could be found in this area include menhaden, Atlantic cod, winter flounder, mackerel, bluefish, summer flounder, striped bass, American eel, weakfish and scup. However, given the position of the parcel in the upper reaches of the bay, use of the area by finfish is not anticipated to be as common as in more seaward areas. Similar to that of the finfish, waterfowl activity, including Canadian geese, mallards, and overwintering species such as bufflehead and merganser, is somewhat limited due to the lack of adjacent tidal wetland vegetation.
Coastal Shoals, Bars and Mudflats – Tidal Wetland Community

Coastal shoals, bars and mudflats, which extend from the landward position at mean high water to the seaward of 1-foot of water depth at mean low water, were also found within the study area. However, due to the topography and substrate composition of the intertidal, only certain pockets of the intertidal zone were identified as functional mudflats during the evaluation. The remainder of the shoreline adjacent to the site would be considered coastal shoals and bars.

The mudflat areas, defined as low-gradient areas consisting of silty or fine sandy sediments, were qualitatively sampled for the presence of benthic organisms. The sampling revealed minimal benthic organisms but marine worms and soft shell clams were observed. Additionally, green crabs and fiddler crabs were observed on the sediment-water interface and oil or other petroleum products were evident in the benthos. Due to the degraded state of the benthic environment, the ability for this area to be a productive shellfish habitat is limited. However, over time, if inputs are eliminated or reduced, the habitat has the capacity to improve from its current condition.

The eastern shoreline finger, which is described previously as wider and longer than the western one, was inventoried for vegetation and wildlife. In this area, canopy vegetation hangs over the shoreline and provides perching spots for wading birds, such as great blue heron, snowy egrets and black crowned night herons, which were all observed in this area during the assessment. A variety of gulls were also observed. In addition, Passerine species such as bank swallows, American robin, goldfinch, and Eastern bluebird were observed along the shoreline of the property.

High March – Tidal Wetland Community

Scattered individuals and clusters of high-tide bush were observed in areas along the shoreline. Given the limited extent of the vegetation, the area is not considered to be a highly functional high marsh ecosystem. Nonetheless, the small presence of this halophytic vegetation contributes positively to the coastal environment by stabilizing the bank and serving in nutrient uptake capacities.

Pavement and Urban Structure – Upland Community

The majority of the upland portion of the site is occupied by pavement and urban structure. The structures vary from an abandoned historic armory, a dilapidated Quonset hut, an active city maintenance facility, and a vacant concrete plant. Each of these areas displays limited potential for wildlife use. However the structures may provide some breeding area for avian species.
such as chimney swifts and European sparrows, as well as foraging areas for generalist small mammals such as raccoon, Norway rat and striped skunk.

(e) **Successional Shrubland – Upland Community**

A small area of dense successional shrubland exists south of the armory building. This area is thickly vegetated with species such as catalpa, black cherry, multiflora rose, blackberry, crab apple, staghorn sumac, and Norway maple. Thick tangles of poison ivy and bittersweet cloak the shrubs in areas. The presence of this vegetation offers potential wildlife use by avian species, small mammals and invertebrates and exists in sharp contrast to the surrounding dense urban environment.

(f) **Shrub Edge – Upland Community**

The majority of the shoreline consists of a dense shrub edge. These shrubs serve to shade the upper shoreline and provide perching sites for angling waterfowl. The presence of the shrubs is notable given the modification of the majority of the shoreline by rip-rap or other armoring historically as well as the intense upland use of the site. The thick shrub edge has provided a demarcation between the upland and aquatic portions of the site and has likely inhibited access to the shoreline overtime.

(3) **Potential Presence of State and Federal Wetlands Within Project Site**

Two types of NYSDEC classified tidal wetlands occupy the area surrounding the project site including: coastal shoals, bars and mudflats (SM) and a littoral zone (LZ). The entire shoreline of the Echo Bay property is mapped as Tidal Wetland SM by the NYSDEC alongside which lies a Tidal Wetland Littoral Zone. In addition, a thin band of high marsh resource lies along the mean high water line and consists solely of individuals and clusters of high-tide bush. However, no vegetated wetlands exist on the shoreline of the property.

Although the majority of wetland functional assessment systems in the literature have been established for freshwater and inland wetland systems, a functional valuation system for tidal systems was created by the Applicant’s Ecological Consultant using the eight values cited by the NYSDEC in Part 661.1 of Tidal Wetlands Regulations. The functionality of the wetlands was assessed according to the eight values identified by the NYSDEC and the results of these analyses are listed in the following chart:
b. **Future Conditions Without the Project**  
Without the Project, the City Yard and Armory parcels would remain in their current condition and the degraded upland areas would likely continue to impact the coastal environment. Current industrial uses on the City Yard may continue to degrade water quality, contributing to the decrease of coastal vegetation and existing wildlife.

c. **Potential Impacts**  
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 use. This change in use would be accomplished through the relocation of light industrial uses to inland locations and the inclusion of water-enhanced activities along the shoreline such as the Echo Bay Walk esplanade, pedestrian bridge to Five Islands Park and the small boat launch dock.

(1) **Plant and Animal Communities**  
Site evaluations indicate that potential improvements on this project site may positively affect the shoreline through a reduction in intensity and a change in nature of use. The type and nature of wetlands that lie adjacent to the subject parcel are not considered as sensitive as vegetated areas such as tidal freshwater marshes and salt meadows. To this end, proposed upland improvements would likely be compatible with the adjacent tidal resources. Given the overall sensitivity and importance of the coastal environment, implementing an improvement design that allows for the maintenance and increase in tidal wetland values would positively impact the shoreline in this area. The proposed reconstruction of the dilapidated bulkheads and
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**Table 1: Wetland and Watercourse Functional Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tidal Wetland Functional Value</th>
<th>High Marsh</th>
<th>Coastal Shoal, Bars and Mudflats</th>
<th>Littoral Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to Marine Food Productivity</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood, Hurricane, Storm Control</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Habitat</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleansing Ecosystems</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedimentation Control</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Research</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Open Space and Aesthetic Appreciation*

Source: William Kenny Associates Ecological Assessment
seawalls that armor the shoreline provides an opportunity to create tidal wetland planting zones in order to increase the ecological diversity along the shoreline, and providing intertidal plants offers a potential sink for nutrient uptake amongst other biochemical functions. Given the limited existing plant and animal habit on the project site, it is not expected that proposed short-term, construction-related grading and excavation would have significant adverse impacts on the ecological communities. As a result of the shoreline improvements proposed as part of the Project, no adverse impacts on ecological resources are expected.

(2) **State and Federally Protected Species**
According to the NYSDEC and site investigations, no state or federally listed species were found within the area of the project site and as such, no adverse impacts are expected as a result of the Project.

d. **Potential Mitigation Measures**
The Project includes erosion and sediment control measures during construction, shoreline restoration and the creation of tidal wetland planting zones in order to improve existing ecological conditions for plant and animal communities, and no additional mitigation is required.
C. UTILITIES
C. UTILITIES

This section describes the utility infrastructure servicing the Project Site. The existing utilities described herein include water supply for domestic and fire protection, sanitary sewer, electric service and gas supply. The existing conditions portion of this section describes the current usage at the Project Site, facilities, service providers, and system capacity for each of the utilities. The potential impacts portion of this section describes the proposed utility service, providers, capacity and estimated demand for each of the utilities associated with the proposed Project. Further, this section summarizes measures that have been incorporated into the Project, operational or physical features of the Project that avoid any significant adverse impacts related to water supply, sanitary sewer, electric and gas service utilities, and describes potential municipal and private infrastructure improvements. With or without these measures, the Project would have no significant adverse environmental impact.

1. WATER SERVICE

   a. Existing Conditions

      Following is information on the water supplier and existing utility infrastructure distribution system used currently to extend water service to the Project Site.

      (1) Description of Public Water System, Including Infrastructure and Service Within the Project Area

      United Water of New Rochelle is responsible for providing both domestic and fire protection water service to the Project Site. Domestic water service is currently provided through at least two connections to an existing 10-inch water main located in Main Street, with fire protection provided through two on-site hydrants also serviced by the 10-inch water main in Main Street.

      United Water purchases all of its supply from the New York City Water System with 100% of its supply originating from the Catskill and Delaware Aqueduct Systems. The quantity of water available in 2011 was more than adequate to meet the demands of its customers. United Water of New Rochelle provides water service to more than 145,000 people throughout the City of New Rochelle and the neighboring Towns of Eastchester and parts of Greenburgh. There were no reported water quality violations in 2011 and United Water, as part of its Long Term Main Renewal program, replaced 2,771 feet of water mains to help improve water quality, water pressure and fire protection within the system. United Water advised that this program included upgrades to the water main distribution system in nearby downtown New Rochelle which may have improved water flow characteristics to the Site.

---

1 Information obtained from United Water New Rochelle Annual Water Quality Report, issued May 2012.
2 United Water email to Divney Tung Schwalbe dated August 3, 2012.
Figure No. IV.C-1, *Utilities – Water Supply*, shows the approximate location of existing on-site and off-site water mains.

b. **Future Conditions Without the Project**
   Without the Project, the City of New Rochelle Department of Public Works Yard would remain and both water supply connections and water use demands would be similar to the present day conditions. Further, the City would not be able to pursue the plans for economic development of the Echo Bay area and the existing Department of Public Works Yard would continue the operation and maintenance of the existing facilities. No impacts to the existing water supply system, available water pressure or fire protection services are expected as a result of the future conditions without the project.

c. **Potential Impacts**
   Water for domestic, mechanical, fire and miscellaneous uses would be supplied from the existing United Water of New Rochelle water supply system and circulated throughout the Project Site by an expansion and modification of the existing on-site distribution system. Based upon the information presented in the United Water 2012 Annual Water Quality Report water supply is expected to be adequate and United Water would evaluate the condition and size of its existing distribution piping network in the immediate vicinity of the site to determine if any local upgrades to its distribution system are warranted. Final design of the water service connection and any system upgrades would be designed by United Water’s engineering department during the Site Plan Approval process based on load letters submitted by the Applicant.

Figure No. IV.C-1, *Utilities – Water Supply*, presented at the end of this DEIS section shows the preliminary design locations of the proposed on-site water distribution system.

(1) **Estimate of Project Water Usage and Adequacy of Water Supply/Distribution Systems**
   Average daily water use for the proposed Project is conservatively estimated at approximately 54,000 gallons per day (GPD) (or approximately 38 gallons per minute (GPM)). This estimate is based upon the use of low flow fixtures and the application of published New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) Design Standards for Wastewater Treatment Works wastewater design flow unit rates, which are then adjusted upward by 10% to obtain the expected water demand. This represents an estimated increase in average daily water use of approximately 50,000 GPD over the estimated potential average daily use of the site under existing conditions.
Table No. IV.C-1, *Proposed Water Demand and Sanitary Load*, presented at the end of this section summarizes the anticipated water demands of the mixed-uses of the proposed Project.

According to United Water of New Rochelle, there is 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. United Water in September 2012 obtained updated hydrant flow data both on and adjacent to the Project Site for the use within the analysis, however, has yet to conduct its analysis. Final design of the water service connection and any system upgrades will be designed by United Water’s engineering department during the Site Plan Approval process based on load letters submitted by the Applicant. Improvements could range from the relining of select existing pipes to total pipe replacement, and/or the extension of the distribution network to complete new water main loops within the existing water main distribution network of piping.

Fire protection would be provided in strict accordance with the 2010 Fire Code and Property Maintenance Code of New York State, with new fire hydrants spaced approximately 500 feet apart. New building Siamese connections or standpipe locations would be approved by the City of New Rochelle Fire Department and/or local code enforcement official. Required fire flows and fire protection facilities shall be designed in accordance with the Ten State Standards and the requirements of the State Insurance Services Office.

### Potential Mitigation Measures
The following water conservation practices would be implemented as part of the Project to mitigate potential impacts of the development:

1. Fixtures installed within the residential and commercial buildings would be reduced flow, water conservation fixtures in compliance with the 2010 Plumbing Code of New York State or latest edition.
2. Use of drip, landscape irrigation systems.
3. Restriction of irrigation to early morning hours.
4. Individually metered water use.

The use of reduced flow, water conservation fixtures is expected to reduce the water demands of the Project by approximately 20%.

### Sewage Disposal

#### Existing Conditions
Following is information on the existing sanitary sewer utility infrastructure.
collection system used currently to convey sewage from the Project Site to the Westchester County-owned and operated New Rochelle Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) located in close proximity off of LeFevres Lane and directly across Echo Bay.

(1) **Sanitary Sewer Service to the Project Site**
The Project Site lies within the New Rochelle Sewer District. Accordingly, all flow from the property is conveyed to the WWTP via both on-site and off-site municipal sewer mains. There currently are no moratoria on the WWTP that prevent the plant from accepting additional sewage flow.

The Westchester County-owned and operated WWTP was originally designed to accommodate a maximum hydraulic flow rate of 54.0 million gallons per day (MGD) and satisfactorily treat a flow rate of 13.6 MGD. Recently completed upgrades to the plant, in accordance with a 2008 Consent Order with NYSDEC, have increased its ability to treat sanitary flow. The plant is currently permitted by the NYSDEC to treat up to 19.2 MGD. The WWTP is currently processing an average daily sewer flow of approximately 17.0 MGD.3

Sewage collection from the Project Site is conveyed to the WWTP via two City of New Rochelle municipal sewer mains which traverse the Project Site. These include a 42-inch City of New Rochelle Trunk Sewer which conveys the collected sewage to the County-owned WWTP located just across Echo Bay and a 30-inch City of New Rochelle Collector Sewer carrying flow from Main Street and also discharging to the on-site, County-owned and operated inverted siphon. The existing City of New Rochelle Department of Public Works Yard garage has a direct service connection to the existing 30-inch City of New Rochelle Collector Sewer. Sanitary sewer discharges from the existing Armory building are conveyed to an off-site, 8-inch municipally-owned sewer main located in Main Street, which ultimately discharges to the 30-inch City of New Rochelle Collector Sewer which traverses the Project Site.

Figure No. IV.C-2, *Utilities – Existing Sanitary Sewer*, presented at the end of this Section shows the approximate location of existing on-site and off-site sewer mains.

(2) **Existing Westchester County Inverted Siphon System**
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. This system is comprised of a series of four concrete chambers, 20-inch and 24-inch pipes, and associated valves. The system operates like a force main, permitting sewage flow to pass through a series of

---

20-inch and 24-inch side-by-side sewer mains under Echo Bay before rising to the head end of the County-owned and operated treatment works of the WWTP.

b. Future Conditions Without the Project
Without the Project, the City of New Rochelle Department of Public Works Yard would remain and its existing sanitary sewer service connection would remain without modification. There would be no need to either divert a segment of the existing 42-inch City of New Rochelle Trunk Sewer or to abandon the existing 30-inch City of New Rochelle Collector Sewer, which both currently traverse the Project Site. Further, the City would not be able to pursue the plans for economic development of the Echo Bay area and the existing Department of Public Works Yard would continue the operation and maintenance of the existing facilities.

c. Potential Impacts
Diversion of a short, 75 LF segment of an existing 8-inch City-owned sanitary sewer main located in Main Street is required to permit the abandonment of an existing 30-inch City-owned sewer main which traverses the Project Site. This diversion would be accomplished by installing a new, “doghouse” manhole, atop the existing 8” sewer main within the City right-of-way with a new 8” outfall sewer main installed with a direct connection to the existing, on-site 42” municipal truck sewer. The on-site diversion of an approximate 200 linear foot segment of the existing 42-inch City-owned trunk sewer downstream of this direct connection would also be required. Service operations of all City-owned sewers would be maintained throughout construction. 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 proposed Project.

Figure No. IV.C-3, Utilities – Proposed Sanitary Sewer, presented at the end of this DEIS section shows the preliminary design locations of the proposed extension and modification of both the on-site and off-site existing sanitary sewage collection and conveyance system.

(1) Estimate of Project Wastewater Generation and Adequacy of Collection System
Estimated sewer demands for the proposed Project are in the range of 45,000 GPD to 50,000 GPD based on NYSDEC standards. Table No. IV.C-1, Proposed Water Demand and Sanitary Load, presented at the end of this DEIS section summarizes the anticipated sewer demands of the mixed-uses of the proposed Project.

Sewage generated from the Proposed Site 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.

(2) **Infrastructure Improvements Associated with Obtaining Approvals to Provide Sewer Service for the Project Site**

The planned reconstruction of the Westchester County-owned concrete interception chamber on the Project Site would require the Applicant to submit engineering plans to the Westchester County Department of Environmental Facilities for approval. In addition, the diversion and realignment of the existing City of New Rochelle 8-inch collector sewer and 42-inch trunk sewer would also require that construction plans be submitted to the Westchester County Department of Health for their review and approval. All sewer system improvements would be designed in accordance with Westchester County Department of Health standards and portions of both the new and existing collection system would be offered to the City of New Rochelle for dedication to satisfy local Health Department regulations. All new sewer mains offered to the City of New Rochelle would be sized to accommodate peak sewage flows and would also meet the City’s construction standards.

(3) **Impacts Related to the Proposed Relocation of Municipal Sewer Line Within the Project Site**

The on-site relocation of a segment of the existing 42-inch City of New Rochelle Trunk Sewer would not have any off-site impacts on the municipal collection system. The planned diversion of the existing 8-inch City-owned collector sewer within Main Street and abandonment of the existing 30-inch City-owned Collector Sewer which traverses the Project Site would have minimal, temporary off-site impacts limited to within the Main Street right-of-way to facilitate construction. No upstream impacts on the municipal collection system are anticipated.

Connections to the existing municipal system would be accomplished using “dog-house” style manholes which would permit continued operation of the sewer mains throughout construction without any interruption of service, including during the diversion of both the 8-inch and 42-inch municipal sewer mains. Once flow has been diverted from the existing City-owned 30-inch sewer main the line would be abandoned.

The Applicant has conducted a field and video inspection of the 30-inch main to be abandoned to check for any undocumented direct connections to the main. The investigation found the main source of the flow through the 30-inch main is from the existing 8-inch collector sewer main located within Main Street (to be diverted) and the only other active connections to the 30-inch sewer main appear to be from the existing City Department of Public Works Yard facilities.


d. Potential Mitigation Measures
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.

The Westchester County Department of Environmental Facilities has indicated to
the Applicant and representatives of the City of New Rochelle also in attendance at a
meeting held at WCDEF’s offices on July 26, 2012 that “mitigation” may be
required to offset the expected increase in sewage flow to the County WWTP by the
Applicant. Such mitigation would take the form of reduced infiltration and inflow
(I&I) to the WWTP at a 3:1 ratio commensurate with expected increases in sewer
flows. Thus the Applicant would be responsible for constructing improvements to
the existing New Rochelle Sewer District sewage collection and conveyance system
to reduce infiltration/inflow by 3 gallons for every 1 gallon of additional sewage
conveyed to the WWTP as a result of the Project. As a result, no impact is
anticipated to the existing conveyance system or treatment plant, with a net benefit
to other District users upon completion of construction of the Project. The
mechanism for selecting appropriate improvements would be through collaboration
with the City Engineer. This process would be conducted during the Site Plan
Approval process at which time more definitive flow estimates can be determined.
All improvements would require the final approval of the City Engineer and all
improvements are expected to be located entirely within the New Rochelle Sewer
District.

3. Stormwater Management

a. Existing Conditions
Following is information on the existing stormwater drainage conditions within the
Project Site.

(1) Existing Surface Water Drainage Patterns and Drainage Points
Stormwater runoff from the Site is currently neither detained nor treated on-site.
The majority of the Project Site, approximately 8.43 acres, drains southward directly
to the Long Island Sound (Design Point DP-1), with the remaining approximate
one-acre portion of the Site draining toward the municipal stormwater system
located within the Main Street/US Route 1 right-of-way (Design Point DP-2).
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
study area is comprised of impervious surfaces and includes multiple buildings,
asphalt pavement, and gravel surfaces.
Figure No. IV.C-4, **Existing Drainage Conditions**, presented at the end of this DEIS section shows the existing drainage conditions, approximate watershed boundaries, typical flow paths and design points used in the analysis of the Project Site.

(2) **Stormwater Runoff Quantity**
Existing runoff volumes and peak flows were analyzed for the 1-, 2-, 10-, 25-, and 100-year storm events. Rainfall data for Westchester County was provided for each storm event as reported by Northeast Regional Climate Center, Data Ending 2003, with rainfall amounts ranging from 2.8 inches from the 1-year storm to 7.5 inches from the 100-year storm. Between the 1-year and 100-year storms, runoff volumes range from 1.3 acre-feet to 4.5 acre-feet for Discharge Point 1 (DP 1), and from 0.1 acre-feet to 0.5 acre-feet for Discharge Point 2 (DP 2). For the same storm events, peak flows range from 16.1 cubic feet per second (cfs) to 51.1 cfs for DP 1, and from 1.4 cfs to 5.6 cfs for DP 2.

For additional and more detailed information on existing site conditions refer to the Echo Bay Center Stormwater Management Report prepared for the Project and presented in DEIS Appendix 6.

**b. Future Conditions Without the Project**
Without the Project, the City of New Rochelle Department of Public Works Yard would remain and its existing drainage patterns and stormwater collection systems would remain without modification. Further, the City would not be able to pursue the plans for economic development of the Echo Bay area and the operation and maintenance of the existing Department of Public Works Yard would continue. Existing runoff conditions would remain unchanged with stormwater discharging directly to the Long Island Sound without any treatment.

**c. Potential Impacts**
With respect to stormwater management design, the goal of this project is to maintain or improve the pre-construction hydrology and stormwater runoff conditions of the site. Under the proposed Project the existing discharge points remain the same, however, there is small diversion of runoff from the municipal storm drain collection system (Design Point DP-2) directly to Long Island Sound. Thereby, the redeveloped sub-watersheds reduce the contributing area into the municipal stormwater sewer from approximately 1.01 acres to 0.84 acres. All other land within the Project Site drains southward directly to the Long Island Sound (Design Point DP-1) with a portion of the runoff flowing overland and the balance discharged through three new outfalls to Long Island Sound.

Figure No. IV.C-5, **Proposed Drainage Conditions**, presented at the end of this DEIS section shows the preliminary design locations of the proposed on-site stormwater management system.
(1) **Post-Development Stormwater Runoff Quantity**

Through the use of the proposed site planning methods which include the overall reduction in impervious coverage 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 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.

Post-development runoff volumes and peak flows were analyzed for the 1-, 2-, 10-, 25-, and 100-year storm events. Rainfall data for Westchester County was provided for each storm event as reported by Northeast Regional Climate Center, Data Ending 2003, with rainfall amounts ranging from 2.8 inches from the 1-year storm to 7.5 inches from the 100-year storm. Between the 1-year and 100-year storms, runoff volumes range from 1.1 acre-feet to 4.4 acre-feet for Design Point DP-1, and from 0.1 acre-feet to 0.4 acre-feet for Design Point DP-2. For the same storm events, peak flows range from 13.6 cfs to 49.4 cfs for Design Point DP-1, and from 1.3 cfs to 4.8 cfs for Design Point DP-2. Table IV.C-2, *Stormwater Quantity Design Flow Summary*, provides a comparison of anticipated pre- and post-development site drainage conditions.

For additional and more detailed information on post-development proposed site conditions refer to the Echo Bay Center Stormwater Management Report prepared for the Project and presented in DEIS Appendix 6.

d. **Potential Mitigation Measures**

The Stormwater Management Plan for the Project would comply with all regulations and requirements of the NYSDEC SPDES General Permit For Stormwater Discharges From Construction Activity (GP-0-10-001). As such, the proposed stormwater management design has been prepared in compliance with the requirements for a redevelopment project as outlined in Chapter 9 of the NYSDEC’s New York State Stormwater Management Design Manual, dated August 2010. The result of the plan is a significant reduction in on-site impervious coverage (greater than 25%) and the inclusion of new planting areas and low gradient slopes for increased infiltration. These actions are expected to reduce stormwater runoff volumes and peak flows for the overall 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 to remove up to 80% total suspended solids (TSS) from stormwater runoff passing through the structure.
4. **Gas Service**

   a. **Existing Conditions**
   
   Following is information on the supplier and utility infrastructure system used currently to extend gas service to the Project Site.

   (1) **Gas Service Provider and Service Facilities**
   
   Gas service to the Project Site is provided by Consolidated Edison, Inc. Gas service to the existing Armory building is currently tapped from a 4-inch medium pressure gas main located in Main Street. Gas service to the City of New Rochelle Department of Public Works Yard is also provided from Main Street. Though there is a 20-inch high pressure gas distribution main located in Main Street (along the westerly curb), it is not expected that Con Edison would allow the Applicant to directly connect to this service main. Final design of the service connection would be provided by Con Edison’s engineering department during the Site Plan Approval process based on load letters submitted by the Applicant, reviewed by Con Edison and determined reasonable for the proposed facility.

   Figure No. IV.C-6, *Utilities – Electric & Gas Service*, shows the approximate location of both on-site and off-site gas distribution mains from which future service may be extended.

   b. **Future Conditions Without the Project**
   
   Without the Project, the City of New Rochelle Department of Public Works Yard would remain and its existing gas service connections would remain without modification. Further, the City would not be able to pursue the plans for economic development of the Echo Bay area and the existing Department of Public Works Yard would continue to have increased associated operation and maintenance cost due to the aging of the existing facilities.

   c. **Potential Impacts**
   
   The proposed Project would increase 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. It is anticipated that the required new service would be extended to the Project Site from either the existing medium pressure or existing low pressure natural gas mains located within the adjacent public right-of-way. Final configuration of the natural gas service and the requirements for service to the Project Site would be determined by Consolidated Edison’s Engineering Group during the Site Plan Approval process based on building specific load letters submitted by the Applicant to Con Edison.
Figure No. IV.C-6, *Utilities – Electric & Gas Service*, presented at the end of this DEIS section shows the preliminary design locations of the proposed on-site natural gas distribution system.

(1) **Ability of Provider to Service the Project**
Con Edison would provide natural gas service to the Project Site through its existing gas distribution infrastructure network located within the public right-of-ways. New gas service connection points would be required to service the new mixed-use, residential/retail building. The new connection points would be determined by Con Edison upon its review of the projected project demands and final building design and are expected to originate from an extension of existing service mains either in Main Street or nearby Hutchinson Avenue.

d. **Potential Mitigation Measures**
All new buildings would be designed to comply with the 2010 New York State Energy Conservation Code and the 2010 New York State Building Code.

Residential units are expected to be individually metered to encourage conservation of gas consumption and high efficiency consumer appliances and building mechanical systems would incorporate controls and operating strategies which would minimize the consumption of natural gas.

5. **Electric Service**

a. **Existing Conditions**
Following is information on the supplier and utility infrastructure system used currently to extend electric service to the Project Site.

(1) **Electric Service Provider and Service Facilities**
Primary electric service to the Project Site is provided by Consolidated Edison, Inc. through high-voltage, overhead power lines running within the right-of-way along Main Street. The overhead wires are mounted on approximate 30-40 foot tall wooden utility poles spaced approximately 100 feet apart. It is anticipated that a new primary electric service to the Project Site would be provided from an extension of the overhead high voltage system, or from the existing underground high voltage feeder system, within the Main Street public right-of-way, to serve a new pad mounted, oil-filled transformer planned which would be located on the Project Site adjacent to the new residential/retail building’s electric or mechanical room. The Utility Company to Customer interface is anticipated to occur at a new property line box, to be located on the Project Site inside the property line adjacent to the public right-of-way. All individual residential and retail units are expected to be metered individually in accordance with Consolidated Edison’s requirements. The final configuration of the electrical system would be completed in coordination with the
Consolidated Edison Engineering Group during the Site Plan Approval process based on building specific load letters submitted by the Applicant to Con Edison.

Figure No. IV.C-6, *Utilities – Electric & Gas Service*, shows the approximate location of off-site, overhead electric lines from which future service may be extended.

### b. Future Conditions Without the Project

Without the Project, the City of New Rochelle Department of Public Works Yard would remain and its existing electric service connections would remain without modification. Further, the City would not be able to pursue the plans for economic development of the Echo Bay area and the existing Department of Public Works Yard would continue to have increased associated operation and maintenance cost due to the aging of the existing facilities.

### c. Potential Impacts

The proposed Project would increase energy demand for electricity, however, no significant off-site 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 proposed Project.

#### (1) Ability of Provider to Service the Project

Con Edison’s high voltage primary electric service system located immediately adjacent to the Project Site is expected to be adequate to extend electric service to the Proposed Site. The required new electric service is expected to be drawn through a new connection to the existing high-voltage primary electric service system. This connection would require a new primary electric service connection to either the overhead high voltage system or to the existing underground high voltage feeder system, both of which are located within the Main Street right-of-way. The new primary service would be expected to extend to a new pad mounted, oil-filled transformer planned to be located on the Project Site in an area adjacent to the new residential/retail building’s electric or mechanical room. The Utility Company to Customer interface is anticipated to occur at a new property line box, to be located on the Project Site, inside the property and adjacent to the public right-of-way. The final configuration of the electrical system layout and design would be completed in coordination with the Consolidated Edison Engineering Group upon review of final building design plans.

Figure No. IV.C-6, *Utilities – Electric & Gas Service*, presented at the end of this DEIS section shows the preliminary design locations of the proposed on site electrical supply and distribution system.

### d. Mitigation Measures

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. Consumption of electricity would be further reduced through the use of high efficiency Energy Star rated consumer appliances, lighting fixtures and building mechanical systems.

The new pad-mounted electrical transformer to be located on the Project Site would be screened with landscaping.
## ECHO BAY CENTER
New Rochelle, New York

### DEIS Table No. IV.C-1
Estimate of Sanitary Flow and Water Demand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Description</th>
<th>Bldg Area (1) GSF</th>
<th>Sanitary Demand Generators</th>
<th>DEC Water Demand</th>
<th>Sanitary Demand</th>
<th>Water Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residential Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 BR</td>
<td>2 BR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Apartments</td>
<td>18,100</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>*see below</td>
<td>54,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenities</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Subtotal</td>
<td>18,100</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td>56,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23,500</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Bldg (Armory)</td>
<td>32,200</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Subtotal</td>
<td>55,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PROPOSED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average Daily Flow (gpd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peak Flow Rate(5) (gpm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Estimated Flows (6)</td>
<td>4,870</td>
<td>4,870</td>
<td>5,357</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTIMATED INCREASED DEMAND (gpd)</td>
<td>44,474</td>
<td>48,921</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DEC FLOWRATE STANDARDS(2):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Design Flow</th>
<th>Commercial Design Flow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Bedroom/Studio 150 gal/day</td>
<td>Retail/Office 0.1 gal/day/sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Bedroom 300 gal/day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Footnotes:
2. Unit flow values based on NYSDEC Design Standards for Wastewater Treatment Works (1988), pp.10-13
3. 20% subtracted from daily flow for use of water savings plumbing per NYSDEC Design Standards for Wastewater Treatment Works (1988) p.10.
4. Domestic Water Demand = Sanitary Demand x 110%
5. Peaking Factor Assumed to be 3.0 due to mixed use of the development
6. Assumes Armory at 0.1 GPD/SF (per DEC Retail/Office standard) and City DPW Yard at 1650 GPD based on actual water usage obtained from United Water (Years 2010 & 2011).
## ECHO BAY CENTER
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### STORMWATER QUANTITY DESIGN FLOW SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESIGN POINT NO.</th>
<th>WESTCHESTER COUNTY RAINFALL (IN) (1)</th>
<th>1-YEAR</th>
<th></th>
<th>2-YEAR</th>
<th></th>
<th>10-YEAR</th>
<th></th>
<th>25-YEAR</th>
<th></th>
<th>100-YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Existing</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Existing</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Northeast Regional Climate Center, Data Ending 2003
D. VISUAL RESOURCES
D. VISUAL RESOURCES

This section evaluates the potential visual impacts of the proposed Project. Views to the Project Site from a variety of surrounding roadways, neighborhoods and representative vantage points were documented and the existing character of the surrounding neighborhoods is described. The potential visual impacts of the Project are evaluated based upon a series of visual simulations that illustrate the proposed architecture, material, colors, and landscaping for the Project.

The results of the visual analysis demonstrate that the proposed action would not cause any significant adverse visual impacts. The proposed action was designed to be compatible with the surrounding area. Such methods include:

- The augmentation of a significant vegetated buffer around the south perimeter of the 9.4-acre Project Site;
- The design of the building would be compatible and complementary to existing structures in the area;
- The scale of the residential building seasonably visible from off-site would be compatible with the scale of existing residential buildings in the area; and
- The low level and cut-off light fixtures proposed would reduce the amount of lighting visible from off-site locations.

1. EXISTING CONDITIONS

Views to the Project Site from public vantage points are predominantly from public streets, which range from high-volume roadways (US-1 Main Street), to collector roads (Stephenson Blvd), local residential roads (Pratt Street) and, to a lesser degree, residential cul-de-sacs (Decatur Road, Farragut Circle). Most lots adjacent to or across from the site contain commercial or mixed-use commercial with minimal landscaping, sidewalks and no required setbacks, as well as on-site parking along the frontage of some sites. To the northeast of the site there is a mixed-use residential development, Huguenot Hills, which is similar to the proposed project in that it has retail stores on the ground floor with residential units above. The ground floor restaurant and retail of Huguenot Hills is visible from the street with landscaping between the development and an existing commercial strip across Stephenson Boulevard. Views from public parks within close proximity to the Project Site include Fauneil Park and Five Islands Park. Due to existing vegetation, the existing buildings are only marginally visible from Fauneil Park across Main Street and Five Islands Park across Echo Bay.

a. Visual Condition of the Project Site

Multiple views to the Project Site are identified in the DEIS Scoping Document (see Appendix 1) for documentation and discussion. The selected vantage points from which existing photographs have been taken and visual simulations prepared include Lispenard Avenue, Stephenson Boulevard, Pratt Street, Sutton Manor, Five Islands Park, and Echo Bay. Additionally, a vantage point along East Main Street at the
existing entrance drive to the existing Armory property was chosen. Photographs from these locations were documented and are described below. A key map for the views is included as Figure No. IV.D-2, *Visual Analysis Photo Location Map*.

(1) **Area Roads**

Figure No. IV.D-3, *View #1: Existing View to Site – Lispenard Avenue at East Main Street* is a view looking southeast from Lispenard Avenue. A commercial strip is visible in the foreground on the northern side of East Main Street and two auto-related commercial uses are visible on the southern side of East Main Street, adjacent to the Project Site. The first two buildings on the City Yard parcel, approximately 325 feet away, are visible from this vantage point in both summer and winter months. However, from this distance the buildings are only partially visible.

Figure No. IV.D-4, *View #2: Existing View to Site – Stephenson Boulevard at East Main Street*, is a view looking south from Stephenson Boulevard. This vantage point is directly across East Main Street from the existing entrance into the Project Site. From this distance of about 100 feet, the front two buildings, a vacant garage and some on-site parking are visible from this vantage point.

Figure No. IV.D-5, *View #3: Existing View to Site – East Main Street at Pratt Street*, is a view looking south from Pratt Street. Beyond the on-street parked vehicles is a wooden fence visible along East Main Street, behind which stand a number of deciduous trees. From this distance of about 100 feet, the project site is completely screened from view in the summer and, most likely, to a significant degree in the winter as well.

Figure No. IV.D-7A, *View #6: Existing View to Site – East Main Street at Existing Armory Entrance Drive*, is a view looking southeast from East Main Street near the eastern end of Faneuil Park. This vantage point is opposite the existing driveway into the Armory property. From this distance of about 120 feet, the Armory Annex and Armory are visible. An existing 6-foot high chain link fence separates the driveway from the City Yard parcel. Beyond the Armory Annex, approximately 380 feet away, is an existing 1-story garage building, the upper portion of which is visible from this vantage point.

(2) **Five Islands Park**

Figure No. IV.D-6, *View #4: Existing View to Site – Five Islands Park*, is a view looking north to the Project Site. The Project Site is situated approximately 0.3 miles from this vantage point, behind the New Rochelle Wastewater Treatment Plant site which is visible to the east side of this view. The Treatment Plant’s buildings and vegetation screen the view of the eastern side of the Project Site while the western portion, including the Armory, is partially visible through the existing vegetation.
(3) **Sutton Manor**
Figure No. IV.D-7, *View #5: Existing View to Site – Sutton Manor*, is a view looking northeast approximately 0.1 miles across Echo Bay from outside the Sutton Manor Association boat house. A small portion of the buildings on the DPW site can be seen from this view in the summer, as well as the Huguenot Hills development approximately 0.3 miles from this vantage point. In the winter, the viewable area of the Amory is likely to be greater, although not significantly, and City Yard buildings would be more visible. From certain residential properties within this neighborhood, which were inaccessible for photo documentation purposes, the peak of the Armory is also visible year-round.

(4) **Echo Bay**
An aerial photograph, included as Figure No. III.D-3, *Aerial Photograph*, shows the site as viewed from Echo Bay. Aspects of the City Yard that can be viewed from the water include municipal trucks, municipal buildings, salt storage and on-site debris. The Armory parcel is mostly screened by existing vegetation, but trucks, the metal classroom shed, the peak of the deteriorated Amory and on-site debris may be visible from the Bay. Specific views from the shoreline across Echo Bay are discussed above as from the vantage points of Sutton Manor and Five Islands Park.

**b. Existing Visual Character of the Adjoining Area and Surrounding Neighborhood**
The Project Site is located along an urban commercial corridor that contains an array of land uses. An adjacent commercial core of mostly auto-related uses (car dealerships and service businesses) also contains mixed-uses and residential. This corridor is composed mostly of two-story buildings. Beyond the commercial corridor are residential areas composed mostly of single-family homes with some duplex and multi-family houses present to the north and east. The four-story Huguenot Hills development to the northeast represents the highest-density development in the immediate area, with zoning for the site permitting a maximum of five stories.

The character of the East Main Street commercial corridor is mixed. Sidewalks vary in width as do building setbacks with some businesses set back further from East Main Street than others to accommodate parking spaces for its patrons. The architectural style of the commercial buildings varies widely with the use of brick, stucco, and concrete block with some buildings exhibiting decorative parapets and faux-stone veneer. Signage also varies widely as many businesses utilize colorful awnings or internally-illuminated building-mounted signs in addition to stand-alone signage for strip commercial buildings.

It is evident from the number of open tree pits that the East Main Street corridor once contained numerous street trees that have since died and not been replaced. Many trees that remain are in need of care or have been excessively pruned to avoid...
conflict with overhead power lines. The numerous curb cuts and driveways for the various businesses have created an inconsistent landscape treatment. Some commercial strip buildings have installed low shrubs between the parking area and the adjacent sidewalk, with other businesses only featuring the concrete sidewalk or driveways. See Figure No. IV.D-1, Representative Photos of Surrounding Neighborhood Existing Visual Character, for select photos of the East Main Street corridor.

c. Significant Local Visual Resources Potentially Affected by the Project

(1) Echo Bay
The visual character of Echo Bay would be improved as a result of the Project. This improvement would be accomplished through site clean-up, planting of native and shoreline appropriate vegetation along the periphery of the site, and use of an architectural style that is compatible with the surrounding landscape and residential neighborhoods.

(2) Five Islands Park
Existing views to the Project Site are limited due to distance and existing intervening vegetation and buildings. Portions of the Project Site that would be visible from Five Islands Park, similar to that of Echo Bay overall, would be improved as a result of the Project.

2. Future Conditions Without the Project

As planned, most of the corridor would remain in its current state and use for the foreseeable future. One significant change, which is currently underway, is the infrastructure upgrades to the New Rochelle Wastewater Treatment Plant. As a part of a 2008 Consent Order between Westchester County and the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC), five Wastewater Treatment Plants, of which New Rochelle is one, are required to meet certain standards by 2014. The last improvements to this site occurred in 1996.

a. Proposed Improvements at the Westchester County Wastewater Treatment Plant That May Be Visible from the Project Site

The Westchester County Wastewater Treatment Plant, just east of the Project Site, is currently upgrading its infrastructure in response to a 2008 Consent Order with the NYSDEC. Work is currently slated for completion in May 2015.

A dense, mostly deciduous, mature vegetated buffer exists along the north, south, and western sides of the Treatment Plant property which provides dense screening of the Treatment Plant buildings during the late Spring, Summer, and early Fall months. This vegetated buffer can be seen in Figure No. IV.D-7, View #5: Existing
**View to Site – Sutton Manor**, which is a photograph taken from the Sutton Manor neighborhood looking north to the Project Site. To the east of the Project Site is the Treatment Plant property. See also Figure No. III.D-3, *Aerial Photograph*, which shows the vegetated buffer between the Project Site and the Treatment Plant.

During the winter months the western-most buildings (Thickener Building and Control Building) are visible from the Project Site.

The infrastructure improvements at the Westchester County Wastewater Treatment Plant, which include a BNR Facility and Process Control Building, are occurring on the northern side of the Treatment Plant Parcel. These buildings, approximately 250 feet from the Project Site eastern property line, are located no closer than the existing Thickener Building which is approximately 200 feet from the Project Site. Existing mature vegetation along the Treatment Plant property edge would similarly provide seasonal screening of the buildings from the Project Site.

### 3. Potential Impacts

#### a. Altered Views

Three-dimensional models of the proposed Echo Bay Center development have been inserted into the photographic images discussed in Section IV.D-1 to show the impact of the proposed development on views to the Project Site.

Architectural models of the proposed project were created in 3-D using Autodesk Revit and Google SketchUp. Perspective views were then created within the software that simulate the vantage point, eye level, and camera angle at which the existing conditions photographs were taken. Merging the computer-generated perspective view of proposed conditions with the existing conditions photographs yields the visual simulations presented in this document. Photos were taken at several vantage points from the perimeter of the property, which were referenced in the creation of the visual simulations to verify their alignment.

In visual simulations where the proposed buildings would not be visible from the vantage points due to intervening topography, trees, or buildings, the outline of the proposed buildings is represented with a dashed yellow line.

The visual simulations are discussed below.

#### (1) Lispenard Avenue at East Main Street

Figure No. IV.D-8, *View #1: Proposed View to Site – Lispenard Avenue at East Main Street* demonstrates that from this vantage point the proposed mixed-use development, approximately 325 feet away, would be prominently visible. Although the existing City Yard buildings are less perceptible at this distance due to their lower
height, the proposed building would have an architectural style that would be more complementary to the adjacent mixed-use neighborhood.

(2) **Stephenson Street at East Main Street**  
Figure No. IV.D-9, View #2: Proposed View to Site – Stephenson Boulevard at East Main Street, demonstrates that the northeastern portion of the mixed-use development would clearly be visible. Street trees along the sidewalk in front of the ground floor retail would be reestablished.

(3) **East Main Street at Pratt Street**  
Figure No. IV.D-10, View #3: Proposed View to Site – East Main Street at Pratt Street, demonstrates that from this vantage point the proposed mixed-use building would be fully visible. Similar to the views from Lispenard Avenue and Stephenson Street, reestablished street trees would be visible along the sidewalk in front of the ground floor retail. Existing on-street parking would remain.

(4) **Five Islands Park**  
Figure No. IV.D-11, View #4: Proposed View to Site – Five Islands Park, demonstrates that the existing vegetation along the Westchester County Wastewater Treatment Plant property screens the proposed mixed-use building from this vantage point 0.3 miles away. The outline of the proposed building is shown in a dashed-yellow line.

(5) **Sutton Manor**  
Figure No. IV.D-12, View #5: Proposed View to Site – Sutton Manor, demonstrates that the existing intervening deciduous vegetation would provide partial screening of the proposed mixed-use building from this vantage point. Although portions of the building would be more visible during the winter months, the architectural character of the building complements the nearby residential areas unlike the current City Yard buildings which are currently seasonally visible.

(6) **East Main Street at Existing Armory Entrance Drive**  
Figure No. IV.D-13, View #6A: Proposed View to Site – East Main Street at Existing Armory Entrance Drive with Armory Annex, demonstrates the entrance into the project site. A two-lane entrance road separates the proposed mixed-use development from the existing Armory Annex. Approximately 70 feet separate the facades of the two buildings. Due to the grade change between the entrance road and the Armory Annex, a retaining wall would be necessary. Pedestrian access to the waterfront from East Main Street is provided via walkway on the eastern side of the entrance road. The relatively narrow width of the corridor between the two buildings would provide limited landscaping opportunity, with street trees and shrubs located adjacent to the proposed mixed-use building only. Existing structures located beyond the Armory would be removed, but views to the waterfront area would be limited by the buildings in the foreground.
b. **Types and Levels of 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 Echo Bay Walk would utilize lighted bollards to provide pathway lighting and would similarly complement the architecture. The cut-off design of light fixtures, in combination with proposed perimeter vegetation, would not result in a significant visual impact as the lighting distribution would be contained within the Project Site. Illumination from the ground floor retail use would, similar to the existing retail located elsewhere along the urban corridor, provide additional lighting to immediate area along East Main Street.

The proposed mixed-use building would feature a private rooftop open space available to building residents. The floor elevation of this rooftop space is 30 feet below the lowest roof elevation, and therefore is not anticipated to cause a visual impact from any lighting contained within.

c. **Proposed Signage**
Anticipated signage for the proposed mixed-use building would generally be limited to signage for ground floor retail use. Such signage would be of similar character to existing retail signage found along the East Main Street corridor and appropriately scaled to the building architecture.

d. **Physical Relationships Between Proposed Development and Its Component Parts and Surrounding Areas**
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 exterior components of this development, including the landscaping, lighting, and walkways, have been designed to safely and efficiently provide access to the waterfront and achieve an aesthetic that would greatly enhance the East Main Street corridor and surrounding neighborhoods.

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. Lighting would provide safety in evening hours and would be appropriately scaled and designed to have little visual impact from surrounding areas. Several components of the proposed project would serve as public amenities. Overlooking Echo Bay, the southern portion of the site would function as open space for public use and a kayak dock would provide direct access to the water. Along the shoreline, a walkway would be developed along the length of the site that which would connect to a
pedestrian bridge to Five Islands Park and would serve as Phase I for a City-planned greenway.

4. **POTENTIAL MITIGATION MEASURES**

As indicated above, the Project would not result in any significant visual impacts. 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.
E. TRANSPORTATION
E. TRANSPORTATION

This Section evaluates the traffic, parking, mass transit and pedestrian/bicycling Impacts of the proposed Project. The “Build Year” for completion of the Project is Year 2016. Therefore, the existing traffic conditions were used to project future traffic and pedestrian conditions in the Year 2016. Alternative D evaluated in Section V of this DEIS analyzes an alternative to the proposed Project in which the Armory and the Annex building would be retained, and traffic from the potential redevelopment of the Armory by Good Profit was considered in that Alternative.

The City Yard parcel is currently occupied by the City of New Rochelle Department of Public Works (DPW) and thus is currently generating traffic.

Access to the Project Site would be provided for most residents through the existing DPW driveway located along Main Street opposite Stephenson Boulevard. Some residential and visitor parking, as well as public parking for the waterfront esplanade, would be accessed via a driveway (proposed new Armory Place) on Main Street slightly offset from the existing U-turn.

While there is available on-street parking in the vicinity of the Project Site, a portion of which may be used by some retail patrons, there will be ample parking provided on-site for the residents, retail patrons, visitors, and the public.

1. TRAFFIC

a. Existing Conditions
Existing conditions were determined based upon multiple field observations and measurements. These observations included manual traffic counts, parking counts, and general observations of traffic, pedestrian, bicyclists, and parking operating conditions. Discussions were held with City and State officials to discuss the existing conditions.

(1) Area Roadways
The transportation Study Area is the roadway network which would possibly be affected by traffic and parking from the proposed Project. As determined by representatives of the City of New Rochelle, the Study Area consists of the streets surrounding or in the vicinity of the proposed Project, including, but not limited to:

- Main Street
- Echo Avenue
- Stephenson Boulevard
- LeFevres Lane
- Huguenot Street
- River Street
- Radisson Plaza
- Pratt Street
The following are brief descriptions of the key roadways located in the Study Area. Generally, each of the roadways has standard width lanes, with some having additional width to provide for on-street parking. In addition, the pavement is in generally good condition for each of the roadways, with some roadways having relatively current resurfacings. The speed limits are 30 mph.

(a) **Main Street**

Main Street, also known as US Route 1, is generally a north/south roadway (although in this area, it tends to be traveling more northeast/southwest) extending through the City. In the vicinity of the project, Main Street generally consists of two lanes of travel in each direction and has a posted speed limit of 30 mph. West of the site, Main Street is one-way northbound. There are wide sidewalks on both sides of the road. There is some on-street parking permitted along Main Street. Main Street in this area is under the jurisdiction of the City of New Rochelle, but is a former County Road (CR 65) subject to County Referral Jurisdiction. South of Echo Avenue, Main Street is considered a State Touring Route with Local Maintenance Jurisdiction, thus it is under the jurisdiction of the City of New Rochelle.

(b) **Echo Avenue**

Echo Avenue is an east-west roadway that varies between one and two lanes in each direction. Some areas of Echo Avenue have on-street parking. Echo Avenue, east of Main Street, is under the jurisdiction of the City of New Rochelle, but is a former County Road (CR 65) with County Referral Jurisdiction. Between Main Street and Huguenot Street, Echo Avenue is under the jurisdiction of the City of New Rochelle.

(c) **Stephenson Boulevard**

Stephenson Boulevard is a one lane per direction roadway that widens as it gets to Main Street. There is a planted median on Stephenson Boulevard. On-street parking is provided. Stephenson Boulevard is under the jurisdiction of the City of New Rochelle.

(d) **LeFevres Lane**

LeFevres Lane is an east-west roadway consisting of one lane in each direction. LeFevres Lane is under the jurisdiction of the City of New Rochelle.

(e) **Huguenot Street**

Huguenot Street is a portion of Route 1, a portion of which is one-way traveling southbound. The number of lanes on Huguenot Street varies, but in the vicinity of the site, it consists of four lanes. Huguenot Street is considered a State Touring Route with Local Maintenance Jurisdiction, thus it is under the jurisdiction of the City of New Rochelle.

(f) **River Street**

Between Radisson Plaza and Huguenot Street, River Street is a two-way east-west roadway generally consisting of two lanes per direction. West of Radisson Plaza, River Street is a one-way roadway consisting of five
westbound lanes. River Street is under the jurisdiction of the New York State Department of Transportation.

**Radisson Plaza**
Radisson Plaza is a one-way roadway consisting of three northbound lanes, extending from Cedar Street to River Street. Radisson Plaza is under the jurisdiction of the City of New Rochelle.

**Pratt Street**
Pratt Street is a one-way (eastbound) roadway and consists of one travel lane. On-street parking is permitted on Pratt Street. Pratt Street is under the jurisdiction of the City of New Rochelle.

The Study Area is illustrated on Figure No. IV.E-1 in Appendix 8 – Transportation and Parking.

**(2) Traffic Counts for Existing Weekday Peak AM and PM Hours**

**(a) Data Collection**
Manual turning movement traffic counts were collected by John Collins Engineers on Wednesday, May 30, 2012, from 7:00 AM to 9:30 AM and from 4:00 PM to 6:30 PM. Additional manual turning movement traffic counts were performed by TRC Engineers, Inc. in June and July 2012. TRC Engineers, Inc. also performed field observations at various times and days of the week.

The traffic counts were performed at the following locations:

1. Main Street and Echo Avenue
2. Main Street and Stephenson Boulevard
3. Huguenot Street and LeFevres Lane
4. Huguenot Street and Echo Avenue/River Street
5. River Street and Radisson Plaza
6. Main Street and proposed new Armory Place (for future conditions)

Pedestrian observations were also performed at the study intersections during the traffic counts. Data collected during the field observations included traffic volumes, observations of pedestrian and bicyclists, roadway geometrics, traffic signal locations and phasing operations, and traffic flow characteristics. The manual counted traffic volumes were balanced throughout the roadway network, where appropriate.

**(b) Traffic Volumes – Existing Conditions**
It was determined that the traffic impacts of the proposed Project should be evaluated during the peak weekday morning (AM) and evening (PM) roadway hours. A review of the manual turning movement traffic counts at
the study locations, in conjunction with a review of the traffic patterns for the Project, identified the following representative Peak Hours:

- Peak AM Roadway Hour: 7:45 to 8:45 AM
- Peak PM Roadway Hour: 4:30 to 5:30 PM

A limited number of pedestrians and bicyclists were observed.

The 2012 Existing Traffic Volumes for each of the Peak Hours are shown on Figure No. IV.E-2. Where appropriate, the traffic volumes were balanced between intersections.

(c) Description of Intersections
The following is a description of each of the study intersections:

i. Main Street and Echo Avenue
Main Street forms the northbound and southbound legs of this four way intersection with Echo Avenue. The northbound Main Street approach provides a dedicated left-turn lane, two through lanes and a right turn lane. Main Street is one-way at this location. The eastbound Echo Avenue approach provides a left turn lane and a through lane. The westbound Echo Avenue approach consists of a through lane and a shared through/right turn lane. This intersection is controlled by a traffic signal. Crosswalks are provided at the intersection.

ii. Main Street and Stephenson Boulevard/Site Driveway
Main Street forms the northbound and southbound legs of this four way intersection and provides a shared left-turn/through lane and a shared through/right turn lane in each direction. The eastbound Stephenson Boulevard approach provides a left turn/through lane and a right-turn lane. The westbound Project Site driveway approach, which currently serves the DPW, consists of a shared left/through/right turn lane. This intersection is controlled by a traffic signal. Crosswalks are provided at the intersection.

iii. Main Street and LeFevres Lane
Main Street forms the northbound and southbound legs of this four way intersection and provides a shared left-turn/through lane and a shared through/right lane in the southbound direction and a shared left-turn/through lane and a shared through/right turn lane in the northbound direction. The westbound LeFevres Lane approach provides a shared left turn/through/right-turn lane. The eastbound approach is formed from a private driveway and provides a shared left turn/through/right-turn lane. This intersection is controlled by a traffic signal. A crosswalk along Main Street is provided at the intersection.
iv  *Huguenot Street and Echo Avenue/River Street*

Huguenot Street forms the northbound and southbound legs of this four way intersection with Echo Avenue and River Street. The southbound Huguenot Street approach provides a dedicated left-turn lane, two through lanes and a right turn lane. Huguenot Street is one-way at this location. The eastbound River Street approach provides a through lane and a shared through/right lane. The westbound Echo Avenue approach consists of a shared left/through lane and a through lane. This intersection is controlled by a traffic signal. Crosswalks along Huguenot Street are provided at the intersection.

v  *River Street and Radisson Plaza*

River Street forms the eastbound and westbound legs of this four leg intersection with Radisson Plaza. The westbound River Street approach provides two through lanes and a shared through/right turn lane. River Street is one-way at this location. The northbound Radisson Plaza approach provides a left turn lane, a shared left/through lane, and a right-turn lane. The southbound approach is formed by a commercial driveway and consists of a shared left/through/right turn lane. This intersection is controlled by a traffic signal. Crosswalks are provided at the intersection.

vi  *Main Street and Armory Place*

Main Street will form the northbound and Huguenot Street will form the southbound legs of this intersection with Armory Place. A U-turn from Main Street to Huguenot Street currently exists at this location. The northbound Main Street approach provides a U-turn lane and two through lanes. There is some on-street parking at this location.

**(3) Capacity Analyses**

Capacity analysis is a method by which traffic volumes are compared to the calculated roadway and intersection capacities to evaluate traffic conditions. The analysis accounts for potential impacts of pedestrians. The methodology used is described in the Highway Capacity Manual published by the Highway Research Board. Version 8 of the Synchro Software was utilized for the signalized and unsignalized intersections for the capacity analysis. In general, the terminology, “Level of Service” is used to provide a qualitative evaluation based on certain quantitative calculations related to empirical values. Level of Service A represents the best traffic operating condition. The following is a summary of the Level of Service standards.
Table No. IV.E-1 - Level of Service Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>SIGNALIZED</th>
<th>UNSIGNALIZED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Control Delay per Vehicle (seconds)</td>
<td>Average Control Delay per Vehicle (seconds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>10.0 or less</td>
<td>10.0 or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>10.1 to 20.0</td>
<td>10.1 to 15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>20.1 to 35.0</td>
<td>15.1 to 25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>35.1 to 55.0</td>
<td>25.1 to 35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>55.1 to 80.0</td>
<td>35.1 to 50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>80.1 or greater</td>
<td>50.1 or greater</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Highway Capacity Manual; Highway Research Board
Note: Data represents delay in seconds

Capacity analyses were conducted at each of the study locations to determine existing Levels of Service and are summarized on Table No. IV.E-2.

Table No. IV.E-2 - Existing Levels of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Peak AM Hour</th>
<th>Peak PM Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOS (Delay)</td>
<td>LOS (Delay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street &amp; Echo Avenue</td>
<td>C 29.7</td>
<td>C 28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street &amp; Stephenson Boulevard</td>
<td>B 13.7</td>
<td>B 15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street &amp; LeFevres Lane</td>
<td>B 11.9</td>
<td>B 12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huguenot Street &amp; Echo Avenue/River Street</td>
<td>B 18.2</td>
<td>B 17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Street &amp; Radisson Plaza</td>
<td>B 13.7</td>
<td>C 29.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After discussions with the City, the signal timings utilized to determine existing conditions were based upon actual field measurements. The factors utilized in the capacity analyses, including the Peak Hour Factors, were confirmed with the City’s Traffic Consultant.
All intersections generally operate at an acceptable overall Level of Service. Tables indicating Level of Service by movement/approach are contained in Appendix 8. The capacity analysis worksheets are contained in Appendix 8.

(4) **Accident Report Summary**

TRC Engineers, Inc. met with representatives of the City of New Rochelle Police Department regarding the accident history in this area. Accident data was obtained from the City of New Rochelle Police Department for the period from January 2010 through a portion of August 2012 along Main Street in the vicinity of the Project Site as well as at the study locations. The data was reviewed and the following table summarizes the accidents at each intersection for each year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Street/Echo Avenue</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street/Stephenson Boulevard</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street/LeFevres Lane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huguenot Street/Echo Ave./River Street</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Street/Radisson Plaza</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street and Huguenot Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street and Pratt Street</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As illustrated in the table above, the intersections of Main Street with Echo Avenue and Huguenot Street with Echo Avenue/River Street have the highest number of accidents and are described further below. There has been a reduction in the number of accidents in the first portion of 2012 as compared with 2011, especially at the intersection of Huguenot Street and Echo Avenue/River Street. As described later in this Section, the traffic signal timing at the intersection of Main Street with Echo Avenue is proposed to be modified, without or with the proposed Project, and this could possibly reduce the number of accidents that occur at this location.

The majority of the accidents that occurred were considered “non-reportable”, which are accidents with minor property damage and no significant injuries. There were no fatal accidents reported. There was an accident that involved a pedestrian at the intersection of Huguenot Street and River Street/Echo Avenue and three at the
intersection of Main Street and Echo Avenue. At the intersection of River Street and Radisson Plaza, there was an accident involving a pedestrian and there was another accident involving a pedestrian and a vehicle exiting the Toyota driveway, while a pedestrian on Huguenot Street was hit near Pratt Street. There was an accident involving a bicycle at the intersection of Huguenot Street and River Street/Echo Avenue and a non-intersection accident involving a bicycle on the sidewalk along Main Street. A detailed summary of the accidents, including the types of accidents, is contained in Table No. IV.E-8 in Appendix 8. The majority of the intersections at the intersection of Huguenot Street and Echo Avenue/River Street were rear end accidents, followed by left and right turn accidents. At the intersection of Main Street and Echo Avenue, the majority of the accidents were rear end, left turns and sideswipes.

In addition to the accidents listed above, there were some non-intersection accidents, including along Main Street/Huguenot Street between Echo Avenue/River Street and Stephenson Boulevard. There were a limited number of these at any location and there were no patterns. Many were non-reportable or had no information. Some of the accidents included hitting a pothole in the road, hitting a parked car or a car entering/exiting a parking space, or an accident occurring in or exiting one of the nearby parking lots.

As described later in this Section, the proposed Project will not have a significant impact on the traffic operating conditions of the adjacent roadway network and thus, it is not projected to be a significant contributor to accidents. A traffic signal is proposed at the main driveway to the Project Site. As this traffic signal will be between two adjacent traffic signals, speeds will be generally limited in that area and the new traffic signal is not expected to significantly increase the number of accidents in the area.

b. Future Conditions Without the Project
The future without the Project, or the “No-Build” condition, analyzes future traffic operating conditions without the development of the Project. Future conditions were projected for the 2016 Build Year. The Existing Traffic Volumes were conservatively increased by a compounded 2% annual background growth rate for four years (total of 8.2% increase) as described below based upon discussions with representatives of the City of New Rochelle.

(1) Traffic Volume for the 2016 Build Year
Based upon discussions with the City of New Rochelle Planning and Traffic Engineering Departments, there are no future developments proposed or under construction in the vicinity of the Project Site that would have a significant impact on traffic conditions in the area.
The City of New Rochelle Traffic Department recommended the utilization of a 1% or less per year background growth rate. However, to be conservative, the growth rate utilized for this analysis was increased to 2% per year to account for background growth and any other potential developments. Thus, the 2012 Existing Traffic Volumes were projected to the 2016 Build Year by applying a conservative 2% per year (8.2% total) growth rate to the area wide Existing Traffic Volumes to form the 2016 No Build Traffic Volumes as shown on Figure No. IV.E-3.

(2) **Capacity Analysis for the Anticipated “No-Build” Traffic Conditions**

Capacity analyses were conducted for the No-Build condition utilizing the 2016 No Build Traffic Volumes, which are summarized in Table Nos. IV.E-4 and IV.E-5. The traffic signal timings utilized in the No-Build capacity analyses were obtained from field observations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing LOS (Delay)</th>
<th>No-Build LOS (Delay)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Street &amp; Echo Avenue</td>
<td>C 29.7</td>
<td>D 36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street &amp; Stephenson Boulevard</td>
<td>B 13.7</td>
<td>B 14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street &amp; LeFevres Lane</td>
<td>B 11.9</td>
<td>B 12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huguenot Street &amp; Echo Avenue/River Street</td>
<td>B 18.2</td>
<td>B 18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Street &amp; Radisson Plaza</td>
<td>B 13.7</td>
<td>B 14.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table No. IV.E-5

Peak PM Hour Existing and No-Build Levels of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing LOS (Delay)</th>
<th>No-Build LOS (Delay)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Street &amp; Echo Avenue</td>
<td>C 28.0</td>
<td>C 31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street &amp; Stephenson Boulevard</td>
<td>B 15.6</td>
<td>B 16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street &amp; LeFevres Lane</td>
<td>B 12.0</td>
<td>B 12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huguenot Street &amp; Echo Avenue/River Street</td>
<td>B 17.5</td>
<td>B 18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Street &amp; Radisson Plaza</td>
<td>C 29.7</td>
<td>D 37.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Copies of the analyses and Levels of Service by approach are contained in Appendix 8. All intersections would generally operate at an overall acceptable Level of Service. Some delays will be experienced by vehicles turning left from eastbound Echo Avenue to northbound Main Street and thus, additional green time is recommended for this advanced phase.

**c. Potential Impacts**

The proposed Project would consist of the development of 285 residential apartment units and 25,000 square feet of retail space together with related parking and infrastructure, in addition to public waterfront access that includes public parking, a pedestrian walkway and kayak dock.

**(1) Project-Generated Peak-Hour Traffic and Distribution (Arrival/Departure)**

The ability of any roadway network to accommodate anticipated traffic volumes is measured by comparing the Peak Hour Traffic Volumes to roadway capacities. Therefore, it is essential to determine the future traffic volumes with the proposed Project and compare them with the No-Build Traffic Volumes for the Peak Hours.

Traffic volumes to be generated by the proposed Project were determined based upon information from the Institute of Transportation Engineers’ (ITE) publication, “Trip Generation”, Eighth Edition. Table No. IV.E-6 in Appendix 8 summarizes the trips to be generated by the Project during the Peak Hours. ITE Land Use 820, Shopping Center was conservatively utilized for the retail portion while ITE Land...
Use 220, Apartment, was utilized for the residential portion. Some internal trips (trips between the retail and residential portions) and pass-by trips (based upon traffic traveling past the Project Site on Main Street) were accounted for during the Peak PM Hour, based upon the ITE methodology. No internal trips or pass-by trips were utilized during the Peak AM Roadway Hour to be conservative. Approximately one-quarter of the apartments will be two-bedroom while the remaining three-quarters will be one-bedroom or studios, which would further reduce the actual trip generation.

The future volumes projected to enter the site driveways were based upon the number of parking spaces provided for the various uses. To be conservative, no credits for the existing transit services were taken, although some residents are expected to use the various transit facilities, including walking to the Intermodal Facility. The residential trips to be generated by the Project were distributed to the roadway network based upon “Journey to Work” data for the City of New Rochelle, the existing roadway network and the existing traffic patterns. The retail trip distributions were adjusted based upon discussions with the City’s Traffic Consultant to account for more retail traffic destined from the north. The Arrival and Departure distributions are illustrated on Figures No. IV.E.74 thru IV.E.77.

The Project traffic volumes illustrated on Figure No. IV.E-8 were added to the 2016 No-Build Traffic Volumes to form the 2016 Build Traffic Volumes illustrated on Figure No. IV.E-9.

Potential traffic to be generated by the redevelopment of the Armory building by Good Profit is described in Section V – Alternatives.

(2) **Capacity Analysis for the Anticipated “Build” Traffic Conditions**

Capacity analyses were conducted for the future with the Project (the “Build” condition) utilizing the 2016 Build Traffic Volumes and are summarized in comparison to the 2016 No-Build Levels of Service in Table Nos. IV.E-8 and E-9. Copies of the analyses as well as Level of Service Tables by approach are contained in Appendix 8. While certain movements may experience some delays at the signalized intersections during the Peak Hours, 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 would be provided to the eastbound Echo Avenue advance phase.
At the intersection of Main Street and Armory Place, some modifications would be provided to the existing U-turn. 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.

Table No. IV.E-8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>No-Build</th>
<th>Build</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOS (Delay)</td>
<td>LOS (Delay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street &amp; Echo Avenue(1)</td>
<td>D 36.1</td>
<td>C 29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street &amp; Stephenson Boulevard/Site Driveway</td>
<td>B 14.4</td>
<td>B 11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street &amp; LeFevres Lane</td>
<td>B 12.2</td>
<td>B 12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huguenot Street &amp; Echo Avenue/River Street</td>
<td>B 18.8</td>
<td>C 20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Street &amp; Radisson Plaza</td>
<td>B 14.5</td>
<td>B 14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street &amp; Armory Place(2)</td>
<td>a(3) 1.4</td>
<td>A 9.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table No. IV.E-9  
Peak PM Hour No-Build and Build Levels of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>No-Build</th>
<th>Build</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOS (Delay)</td>
<td>LOS (Delay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street &amp; Echo Avenue(1)</td>
<td>C 31.8</td>
<td>C 29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street &amp; Stephenson Boulevard/Site Driveway</td>
<td>B 16.7</td>
<td>B 16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street &amp; LeFevres Lane</td>
<td>B 12.4</td>
<td>B 12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huguenot Street &amp; Echo Avenue/River Street</td>
<td>B 18.3</td>
<td>B 18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Street &amp; Radisson Plaza</td>
<td>D 37.9</td>
<td>D 37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street &amp; Armory Place(2)</td>
<td>a(3) 1.5</td>
<td>A 9.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes slight shift of green time to eastbound Echo Avenue in the Build condition.
(2) Includes intersection modifications under Build condition.
(3) For existing U-turn

Additional analysis with the redevelopment of the Armory Building by Good Profit is described in Section V – Alternatives. If it goes forward, the Good Profit development is currently proposed to share the access via Armory Place, as well as having a drop off lane in the front of the site and an access from Huntington Place.

d. Potential Mitigation Measures
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. The intersection will operate at good levels of service and sufficient storage length would be provided as illustrated in the queue analyses in Appendix 8.

(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.

2. **Parking**

   a. **Existing Conditions**

   (1) **Existing Parking Conditions and Utilization for the Area Roadways Within One-Quarter Mile of the Project Site**
   On the majority of the streets in the vicinity of the Project Site, including along portions of Main Street, on-street parking is provided. The majority of the parking spaces are not metered. There are some metered spaces along Main Street in front of the some of the stores. Some areas have parking limited to one hour, while others have a two-hour limit. There are signs stating, “No Parking from 4:00 AM to 7:00 AM”, including in front of the Project Site.

   Observations of these areas indicate that on-street parking spaces are available. As described below, more than sufficient parking will be provided on-site, thus there would be limited demand for on-street parking.

   b. **Future Conditions Without the Project**
   Without the proposed Project, the City Yard and Armory parcels would likely remain in their current conditions. Parking for the City Yard parcel will remain on-site, with some parking along East Main Street in front of the Project Site. Parking for the Armory parcel is limited to a small lot behind the building and parking along East Main Street.
c. **Potential Impacts**

Primary access to the residential portion of the Project would be through a driveway at the location of the existing DPW driveway. A driveway (new Armory Place) to serve the retail uses and some of the residential units as well as visitors and provide public waterfront access would be located opposite the existing U-turn. Some traffic destined to the Armory would also use this access. Alternative D evaluated in Section V of this DEIS analyzes an alternative to the proposed Project which includes the proposed redevelopment of the Armory and Annex building by Good Profit.

(1) **Parking Analysis for Existing and Anticipated Conditions**

Approximately 430 parking spaces would be provided on site as part of the proposed Project. This would provide slightly more than approximately 1.5 parking spaces per residential unit for overnight parking. Parking would be shared between the residences and the retail uses. A detailed Shared Parking Analysis is contained in Appendix 8. Shared parking principles account for peak retail parking demand occurring at the times when the residential parking demand is lowest, and retail parking being available for residential use during overnight hours. Based upon the Shared Parking Analysis calculations, more than sufficient parking for all Project uses would be provided on site. There would also be an additional 45 parking spaces provided on the Armory parcel for visitors and public access to the waterfront esplanade and the Armory. In addition, although not included in this analysis in order to be conservative, on-street parking is available along Main Street. The following table summarizes the future parking spaces after the construction of the proposed Project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table No. IV.E-10 Parking Spaces Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Spaces</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street Level (Upper Garage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Level (Lower Garage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Spaces Provided</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Visitor/Public Parking/Armory Parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Divney Tung Schwalbe

As illustrated above, there are approximately 430 parking spaces to be provided on site in the parking 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. The shared parking analysis accounts for the retail parking being utilized at the times when the residential parking demands are lower, and when the residential parking peaks overnight, there is limited retail parking. To be conservative, based upon discussions with the City’s Traffic Consultant, the Shared Parking Analysis rates were adjusted to account for 100% of the 1.5 spaces per residential unit being occupied overnight. Even with this conservative projection, sufficient parking will be provided.

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

Additional discussion regarding parking associated with the redevelopment of the Armory Building by Good Profit is included in Section V – Alternatives.

(2) Effect of the Proposed Development on Parking Within One-Quarter Mile of the Project Site
The proposed Project includes a total of 430 parking spaces for both the residential and retail portions of the Project, located conveniently within the mixed use building with efficient access to the residential units and retail businesses. The proposed parking ratios are consistent with the requirements of the City Zoning Ordinance and based upon the Shared Parking Analysis (see Appendix 8), sufficient parking would be provided on site. Due to adequate parking on-site, it is not expected that parking within ¼ mile of the Project Site would be impacted by the proposed Project.

d. Potential Mitigation Measures
The proposed Project has been designed to avoid impacts related to parking and no significant adverse impacts are expected. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

3. Mass Transit

a. Existing Conditions
(1) Existing Mass Transit Systems in the Area
Public bus service is currently provided to the area by the Westchester Bee Line Bus Lines. Various lines travel along Main Street, with Line 60 stopping in front of the site in the vicinity of the Site Driveway. Line 60 travels throughout the day between the Bronx and White Plains including through Pelham Manor, Larchmont and Mamaroneck. Other lines travel within a few blocks of the Project Site. In addition, the Intermodal Transportation Center is located along North Avenue less than three-quarters of a mile from the Project Site. The Intermodal Transportation Center services other bus routes as well as Metro North and Amtrak trains. See Figure No.
IV.E-14, Mass Transit Locations Near Project Site. No existing ferry operations were identified in the area.

**b. Future Conditions Without the Project**
Without the proposed Project, the City Yard and Armory parcels would likely remain in their current conditions, with no change in the location of the Bee Line stop that exists in the vicinity of the Project Site driveway.

**c. Potential Impacts**

(1) **Impacts Associated With the Use of Public Transportation Systems and System Expansions or Improvements**
There are no expected changes in mass transit services. The proposed Project would not have a significant impact on public transportation.

**d. Potential Mitigation Measures**
There are no significant adverse mass transit impacts associated with the proposed Project, and therefore no mitigation measures are required.

4. **Pedestrians and Bicycling**

**a. Existing Conditions**

(1) **Existing Pedestrian Environment**
Limited pedestrians were observed along Main Street and the surrounding area during the various field observations.

Sidewalks are provided in this area and sufficient space is available for the pedestrians to walk. Crosswalks are provided at various signalized intersections.

Discussions with representatives of the City of New Rochelle indicate that there are no major issues with pedestrians in this area. The sidewalks and crosswalks can support the pedestrian activity.

(2) **Existing Bicycling Opportunities and Facilities**
Main Street and Stephenson Boulevard both are designated Bike Routes by the City. There were limited bicyclists observed in the study area. Discussions with representatives of the City indicate that there have not been issues with bicyclists in the area. There are no peak periods for bicyclists in the area, since the amount of activity is sporadic. The City is promoting bicycling and has previously recommended that bicycle racks be provided.
b. **Future Conditions Without the Project**
Without the proposed Project, the City Yard and Armory parcels would likely remain in their current conditions, with limited pedestrian activity along the front of both parcels.

c. **Potential Impacts**
The proposed on-site circulation and operation was reviewed and it was determined that the circulation system would work safely and efficiently.

With the future waterfront esplanade and public access to the waterfront, some members of the public are expected to ride bicycles or walk in this area. New sidewalks/pedestrian paths on-site would be provided in conjunction with the Project. Proper sidewalks, crosswalks and pedestrian circulation paths would be provided and maintained, providing safe pedestrian access throughout the Project Site.

Pedestrian access to the retail uses would be available from two entrances: one on Main Street and one from the parking area within the building structure. The entrance within the building would be expected to serve as the primary entrance for patrons due to the parking availability in that location. Safe and efficient conditions will be provided for pedestrians and vehicles within the Project Site.

d. **Potential Mitigation Measures**
The proposed Project has been designed with sidewalks, crosswalks and pedestrian circulation paths, providing safe pedestrian access throughout the site to avoid impacts related to pedestrians and bicycling, and no significant adverse impacts are expected. As a result, no additional mitigation measures are required.
F. NOISE
F.  NOISE

1.  EXISTING CONDITIONS
The noise analysis qualitatively addresses noise from project-generated traffic increases and construction operations. Traffic noise was evaluated for the weekday AM and PM peak traffic periods.

a.  Existing Noise Environment and Noise Generators
Ambient sources of noise in the Project Site area include a large volume of mixed vehicular traffic from local roadways (primarily US Route 1 which runs along its northern boundary), the Metro North rail line (approximately ½ mile away to the northwest), and nearby buildings' HVAC systems, which normally are not audible at ground level.

Existing noise on the Project Site is limited primarily to the on-site operations within the Department of Public Works (DPW) City Yard site since the Armory building is currently vacant. DPW operations include storage for DPW trucks and other vehicles, street and highway sweeping vehicle storage, sanitation and recyclable collection, sand/salt storage, vehicle servicing and repairs, as well as office areas, training areas and record storage. DPW staff members report to the facility at the beginning of their shift, obtain necessary vehicles and equipment, leave the facility and travel to worksites elsewhere in the City, and return to the City Yard to return vehicles and equipment at the end of the shift. Noise associated with current DPW operations includes typical truck and heavy vehicle noise.

Existing noise in the vicinity of the Project Site also includes sources related to the numerous commercial and industrial businesses within close proximity of the Project Site. Neighboring businesses include auto body shops, auto dealerships, McDonalds restaurant, landscape and building materials yard, and a variety of general restaurant and retail establishments. Some of the neighboring businesses such as the Landscape Depot use heavy equipment to move materials and the Honda and Chevy dealerships receive large tractor trailer deliveries of automobiles. As a result of the associated traffic volumes and truck activity passing by on Main Street or accessing neighboring businesses, there is a moderate level of background noise in the area which is consistent with normal business operations for a “main street” commercial corridor with some light industrial uses.

The New Rochelle Noise Control Ordinance (City Code Chapter 213) defines a noise sensitive zone as “an area adjacent to a site, including but not limited to any authorized school, church, senior citizen center, day-care center or hospital, which requires specific noise limitations.”

No noise sensitive zones are adjacent to the Project Site. As shown in the traffic study, six intersections would be affected by

---

1 City of New Rochelle Code, Chapter 213, §213-3
Project traffic. The traffic study indicates that, 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. See Table IV.F-1, Traffic Intersections and Noise Sensitive Zone Locations. Based on an evaluation of future traffic volumes at the six intersections impacted by the Project, no impacts from vehicular noise or stationary sources are anticipated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Adjacent Sensitive Zones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LeFevres Lane/East Main Street</td>
<td>Salesian High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephenson Boulevard/East Main Street</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratt Street/Huguenot Street</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echo Avenue/Main Street</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echo Avenue/Huguenot Street</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echo Avenue/Radisson Plaza</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Future Conditions Without the Project**

Without the Project, the sources of noise would be substantially similar to the existing condition. Background levels would remain the same, but traffic noise could show a slight increase due to growth in traffic volume.

a. **Additional Noise Generation Following Completion of Proposed Improvements to Westchester County Wastewater Treatment Plant**

According to an information flyer distributed to nearby residents by County Legislator Jim Maisano (see Appendix 2, Relevant Correspondence), the construction at the Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) is ongoing with construction hours typically between 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM. However, the flyer indicates that contractors at the WWTP site have agreed to delay noisy activities until 8:00 AM. The noise from the construction has been consistently below New Rochelle limits.

According to the flyer, the WWTP is being upgraded to add facilities to remove nitrogen using Biological Aerated Filters and ultraviolet light disinfection along with a new intermediate pumping station. The work started on 07/08/11 and is expected to be complete by 05/18/15.

The Applicant is unaware of any noise that will be generated by the modifications to the WWTP.
3. **Potential Impacts**

Noise is measured in A-weighted decibels (dB(A))\(^2\). According to the decibel scale, an increase of 3 dB(A) results from a doubling, or 100% increase, of the noise source and is the lowest perceptible threshold of change. NYSDEC provides guidelines in “Assessing and Mitigating Noise Impacts” (February 2, 2001). The document does not identify a specific threshold for determining impacts, however, the following human reactions to increases in noise level are listed in the document:

- Under 5 dB(A) Unnoticed to tolerable
- 5 – 10 dB(A) Intrusive
- 10 – 15 dB(A) Very noticeable
- 15 – 20 dB(A) Objectionable
- Over 20 dB(A) Very objectionable to intolerable

**a. Potential Noise Generation from Construction Equipment and Traffic**

The Project has three phases for construction, which would extend over a 24- month period. It is expected that demolition would begin in 2014 and the Build Year would be 2016.

The construction of the Project would create short-term noise disturbances, but would also result in the permanent elimination of noise from the on-site DPW operations that currently exist. Abutting properties to the northeast may experience noise impacts during demolition of the existing structures occurring in the first phase of construction. Neighbors across the street to the north may experience noise due to blasting. Whenever possible, processing equipment would be located away from neighbors and adjacent buildings. Construction noise levels would not exceed L\(_{10}\) of 75 dB(A) when measured at a distance of 400 feet from the construction site; at all other times noise levels shall not exceed an L\(_{10}\) of 80 dB(A) when measured at a distance of 400 feet from the construction site, as required under the City Noise Ordinance.

Noise levels may temporarily increase due to construction-related traffic and on-site use of construction equipment. All equipment would be properly maintained and muffled in compliance with applicable U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) noise emission standards.

**b. Potential Noise Generation from Completed Project**

Vehicular volumes obtained as part of the traffic study prepared for this DEIS by TRC Engineers are the basis for qualitatively assessing which affected roadways may experience an increase in noise due to an increase in traffic. As noted above, an

\(^2\) City of New Rochelle Code, Chapter 213, §213-3
increase of 3 dBA results from a doubling, or 100% increase, of the noise source and is the lowest perceptible threshold of change.

Table No. IV.F-2, *Increase in Vehicles at Intersections During Peak Hours*, identifies projected traffic volume increase. The highest traffic volume is expected to result in the worst case noise condition. For both the AM and PM peak hours, the intersection of Main Street & Armory Place and Pratt Street is expected to have the greatest increase in vehicles passing through it. The change in total traffic volume from the 2016 No Build to the 2016 Build Conditions during the AM peak hour (7:45 – 8:45) is 152 vehicles. The change in total traffic volume during the PM peak hour (4:30 – 5:30) is 203 vehicles. However, the increase of 152 vehicles from 2,051 (+7%) and 203 vehicles from 2,287 (+9%) is significantly less than double the traffic volume through that intersection. Traffic from the Project would not result in a doubling of traffic volumes at any of the six impacted intersections, which would be required to experience a noise level increase of 3 dBA during the peak periods.

**Table No. IV.F-2: Increase in Vehicles at Intersections During Peak Hours**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Peak AM Hour (7:45 – 8:45)</th>
<th>Peak PM Hour (4:30 – 5:30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Build</td>
<td>Build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River St/Radisson Plaza</td>
<td>2,006</td>
<td>2,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huguenot St &amp; Echo Ave/River St</td>
<td>2,221</td>
<td>2,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main St &amp; Echo Ave</td>
<td>2,493</td>
<td>2,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main St &amp; Stephenson Blvd</td>
<td>1,897</td>
<td>2,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main St &amp; LeFevres Ln</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>1,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main St &amp; Armory Pl/ Pratt St</td>
<td>2,051</td>
<td>2,203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TRC Engineering, September 2012

For the impacted intersections, the increased volume of project-generated traffic would be too low to cause a noticeable increase in noise levels. Since no noise level increases would exceed 3 dBA, no significant noise impacts would be expected from the proposed Project.

Noise associated with the completed mixed-use building, which would include residential apartments, retail stores and structured parking is not expected to be out of character with the surrounding commercial and residential uses along Main Street. It is possible that one or more commercial tenants in the Project may apply for a permit allowing a sidewalk café. Any sidewalk café in the Project would comply
with §267 of the City Code, and would close by 10:00 PM Sunday through Thursday and 11:00 PM Friday and Saturday. Likewise, the proposed public waterfront esplanade along Echo Bay would comply with §224 of the City Code and would be closed at dark until 6:00 AM.

4. **Potential Mitigation Measures**

Although noise would be generated from construction equipment, all equipment would be rubber-tired and properly maintained and muffled in compliance with the EPA’s noise emission standards, and such noise impacts would be temporary and short-term. 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. Therefore, no additional mitigation measures are required.
G. AIR QUALITY
G. AIR QUALITY

1. EXISTING CONDITIONS

a. Large Stationary Sources of Air Pollution in Project Vicinity

According to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “Stationary sources [of pollutants in the ambient air] are non-moving sources, fixed-site producers of pollution such as power plants, chemical plants, oil refineries, manufacturing facilities, and other industrial facilities. … Air pollution from stationary sources is produced by two primary activities. These activities are stationary combustion of fuel such as coal and oil at power generating facilities, and the pollutant losses from industrial processes. Industrial processes include refineries, chemical manufacturing facilities, and smelters. … Large, stationary sources of emissions that have specific locations and release pollutants in quantities above an emission threshold are known as point sources.”

Existing stationary sources of pollutant emissions are associated with combustion of fuel oil and natural gas for HVAC units for existing buildings. The Project Site is set on approximately 9.4 acres of land and contains approximately six buildings that serve as DPW offices, garages, storage and the City Armory. None of these buildings are considered large stationary sources of air pollution.

CO from parking lots can also be considered a stationary source of emissions. The City Yard contains an undetermined number of parking spaces for employee vehicles, City trucks and other City vehicles. Very little parking is associated with the City Armory as it is not currently being utilized. None of the parking areas are considered large stationary sources of air pollution.

In the vicinity of the Project Site, the New Rochelle Wastewater Treatment Plant may have been considered a large stationary source of air pollution. However, given the current improvements underway as a result of the 2008 Consent Order with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation and that agency’s enforcement of regulations, the WWTP is not considered a large stationary source of air pollution.

b. Existing Odors Associated with Westchester County Wastewater Treatment Plant

The Westchester County Department of Environmental Facilities (WC DEF) was contacted on August 1, 2012 with a FOIL Request for all recorded public air quality and/or noise complaints received by the County in the last three years regarding the operation of the New Rochelle Wastewater Treatment Plant. See Appendix 2, Relevant Correspondence and Contacts. The WC DEF responded on October 2, 2012.

1 http://www.epa.gov/airquality
with an email listing the following number of odor and noise complaints by year received by the New Rochelle Wastewater Treatment Plant from 2008 to present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Odor</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Noise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No additional information was provided by the WC DEF related to the specific complaint, date of complaint or information related to seasonal variation. No more than 3 odor complaints per year have been received since 2008. Information prior to 2008 was not provided by WC DEF.

2. **Future Conditions Without the Project**

Without the Project, the sources of air quality would be substantially similar to the existing condition. Background levels would remain the same, but air quality could show a slight increase due to growth in traffic volume.

**a. Change to Odors Associated with Westchester County Wastewater Treatment Plant Following Completion of Proposed Improvements**

According to an information flyer distributed to nearby residents by County Legislator Jim Maisano (see Appendix 2, Relevant Correspondence), the current work at the New Rochelle WWTP was initiated by a 2008 Consent Order with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation in relation to enforcement of the federal Clean Water Act. These tasks are separated into two categories: Non-Biological Nutrient Removal and Biological Nutrient Removal (BNR).

According to the flyer, the WWTP is being upgraded to add facilities to remove nitrogen using Biological Aerated Filters and ultraviolet light disinfection along with a new intermediate pumping station. The work started on 07/08/11 and is expected to be complete by 05/18/15.

The Non-BNR work includes upgrades to the plant to increase the flow and rehabilitate the rest of the facility. This contract work began on 06/01/10 and includes “upgrade work to the headworks and influent pumping station, as well as new grit chambers. The primary settling tanks are being completely reconditioned and the headwords, influent pumping station, grit chamber and primary settling tanks will be covered and have odor control. New aeration tanks run on pure oxygen and are covered. All sludge handling facilities are odor-controlled. The completion date for the Non-BNR portion of the work is estimated as 11/1/13.”
The BNR work is to add facilities to remove nitrogen using Biological Aerated Filters for nitrification and denitrification. The construction contract will also add ultraviolet light disinfection in order to meet the new chlorine residual requirement and a new Intermediate pumping station to get the secondary effluent from the original facilities to the new BNR facilities.

3. **Potential Impacts**

   a. **Construction-Related Air Quality Issues**

   Air quality emissions of concern that are associated with short-term construction activities may include fugitive dust from moving equipment and excavation activities, as well as exhaust emissions from diesel-fueled construction equipment. Fugitive dust emissions would be minimized because trucks would be limited to an on-site speed of 5 mph, a water truck would wet the roads, and water would also be used to wet working surfaces to prevent windborne fugitive dust. Stockpiles of soil and gravel piles would be covered.

   The proposed Project has been designed and would be managed to avoid potential impacts to air and water quality during demolition and construction. Excavation typically causes dust, especially during periods of dry weather. However, these particles are temporary in nature and would be minimized by using best construction practices and mitigation measures discussed below. As a result of these mitigation measures disturbances in the form of dust and debris to the abutting sites and the community would be minimal.

   b. **Construction Emissions**

   Construction activities may affect surrounding areas during the developmental period of a proposed action, including air quality. Potential construction air quality impacts are assessed based on duration, equipment usage, and affected area.

   Where duration of construction is expected to be short-term, potential air quality impacts generally do not require a detailed, quantitative assessment. In the case of the Project, the duration of construction is anticipated to be fewer than two years. Given this, and because the proposed Project would not result in significant mobile source impacts, the vehicle trip generation from construction would be less than from the completed Project, and no significant PM10/PM2.5 air quality impacts from stationary sources are anticipated from the Project, a qualitative evaluation of the construction emissions was conducted and key elements are summarized below.

   Westchester County currently meets the NAAQS for all pollutants except ozone and PM2.5. Westchester County is designated as a moderate non-attainment area for ozone1 as well as a nonattainment area for PM2.5. Prior to 2002, the County also was a nonattainment area for CO. It is now designated as a CO maintenance area and is subject to the same requirements as a CO nonattainment area. A CO
maintenance area must maintain the NAAQS for 20 years by following two sequential 10-year plans.

Construction emissions were evaluated for the period when construction machinery would be in use. According to the construction schedule (see DEIS Section IV. L: Construction Impacts), there would be three phases of construction over a 24-month period. The primary concern for construction air quality is emissions of particulate matter due to exhaust emissions or fugitive dust on-site. Key elements of the preliminary evaluation for construction impacts to air quality include:

- Carbon monoxide emissions from employee vehicles;
- Disruption to normal traffic patterns caused by road closings;
- Increased truck traffic on local roads;
- Fugitive PM10 and PM2.5 emissions from on-site vehicular movement and other activities; and
- PM10, PM2.5, NOx, and SO2 emissions from equipment exhaust.

c. **Soil Vapor**

As described in DEIS Section IV. K Hazardous Materials, several RECs are present on each parcel. Soil, and to a more limited extent, groundwater at the Project Site are impacted and would require remediation. Based on the soil and groundwater impacts, soil vapor impacts are possible and if present would require mitigation in accordance with an approved Remedial Action Work Plan (see Section IV.K: Hazardous Materials of this DEIS).

4. **Potential Mitigation Measures**

Based on the assessment, construction activities are not likely to cause significant adverse air quality impacts. The short duration of the construction period, in conjunction with the implementation of best management practices to mitigate construction emissions exposure off-site, would minimize negative effects from construction emissions.

a. **Proper Engineering and Construction Techniques to Reduce Short-Term Impacts and Construction Emissions**

Standard mitigation measures would be incorporated into the construction management plans to minimize potential impacts in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations. Equipment would comply with applicable EPA regulations. To minimize fugitive dust emissions, vehicles on-site would be limited to a speed of 5 mph, and water would be used to wet working surfaces. Storage piles would be covered. Exposed areas would be stabilized after disturbance to minimize dust. Tracking pads would be established at construction exits to prevent dirt from being tracked onto roadways. Dust associated with demolition activities would be controlled with misting systems. Construction areas would be surrounded by perimeter fencing that would help contain fugitive dust emissions. Emission
reduction and related construction measures would be included in the specifications of the construction contracts.

To minimize the potential for air quality impacts, a diesel particulate matter (DPM) emissions reduction program, including best management practices comprised of the following components, would be implemented during the construction period:

(1) **Diesel Equipment Reduction**
Construction on site would minimize the use of diesel engines and maximize the use of electric engines where practical.

(2) **Clean Fuel**
Ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel (ULSD) would be used exclusively for diesel engines throughout the Project Site. This would enable the use of tailpipe reduction technologies (see below) and would directly reduce DPM and sulfur oxides (SOx) emissions.

(3) **Best Available Tailpipe Reduction Technologies**
Non-road diesel engines with a power rating of 50 hp or greater and controlled truck fleets (i.e., truck fleets under long-term contract, such as concrete mixing and pumping trucks) would utilize the best available tailpipe reduction technology for reducing DPM emissions, such as diesel particle filters (DPFs).

(4) **Utilization of Tier 2 or Newer Equipment**
In addition to the tailpipe controls commitments, the construction program would encourage the use of Tier 2 or later construction equipment for non-road diesel engines greater than 50 hp.

(5) **Location of Equipment**
Emissions sources such as concrete trucks and pumps would be located away from residential properties to the extent practicable.

(6) **Fugitive Dust**
The fugitive dust control plans described above would be required as part of contract specifications.

(7) **Idle Times**
Restrictions would be placed on on-site vehicle idle times for all vehicles not using the engine to operate a loading, unloading, or processing device (e.g., concrete mixing trucks) in compliance with applicable laws.
H. SOCIOECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACTS
H. SOCIOECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACTS

The following section provides a comprehensive discussion and analysis of pertinent socioeconomic data for New Rochelle and the project area, as well as a detailed analysis of the fiscal impacts associated with the Project. This section also analyzes secondary economic impacts of the proposed development in terms of direct and indirect effects from construction, post-construction on-site operations and household spending. This section is based on a Socioeconomic and Fiscal Impacts Analysis, prepared by Milone & MacBroom, Inc. and dated October 2012, which is located in Appendix 9.

1. Socioeconomic

a. Existing Demographic Conditions

The demographic conditions described below are from the US Census Bureau and ESRI, a national data provider. The US Census Bureau provides demographic information for 2000 and 2010. Population and income projections were obtained utilizing ESRI Business Analyst Online and were gathered for four geographies: the City of New Rochelle, Census Tract 59.02, Block Group 1 of Census Tract 59.02, and a one-mile radius around the Project Site. See Figure No. IV.H1, Census Tract Map. The City, Census Tract 59.02 and Block Group 1 were all selected so that projected data for these geographies could be compared to 2010 Census and American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates data for the same geographies. The one mile radius was selected to ensure that a broad enough spectrum of the neighborhoods surrounding the Project Site was analyzed. Estimated data for 2011 and projected data for 2016, the assumed “build year” when the project would be fully occupied, were gathered to demonstrate the full spectrum of demographic changes projected to occur in the study areas during the next five years.

(1) Demographic Characteristics of City and Neighborhoods in the Immediate Vicinity of the Project

According to the 2010 Census, Westchester County’s current population is 949,113, which represents an increase of 25,654 people or 2.8% since the 2000 Census. Population growth in the City of New Rochelle outpaced the County during this time period, increasing by 6.8% to 77,062 people. Census Tract 59.02, within which the proposed Project is located, declined in population by 3.1% between 2000 and 2010. The 2010 Census block group that the Project Site is located within, Block Group 1, is a combination of the 2000 Census Block Groups 3 and 4. The combined population for these two 2000 Census block groups was compared to the 2010 Census population of Block Group 1 to ensure an accurate comparison. Similar to its parent Census tract, Census Block Group 1 declined by 4.7% from 2,593 people to 2,471 people. Table No. IV.H-1 (Appendix 9, Table 1) summarizes these population statistics.
Table No. IV.H-1: Population Trends
(Appendix 9, Table 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Westchester County</th>
<th>New Rochelle</th>
<th>Census Tract 59.02</th>
<th>Block Group 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 Population</td>
<td>949,113</td>
<td>77,062</td>
<td>5,340</td>
<td>2,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 Population</td>
<td>923,459</td>
<td>72,182</td>
<td>5,509</td>
<td>2,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>25,654</td>
<td>4,880</td>
<td>-169</td>
<td>-122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
<td>-4.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2000 and 2010 Census data; U.S. Census Bureau.

Over the past fifty years, Westchester County has grown in population by over 140,000 people, or approximately 17.3%. In contrast, the City of New Rochelle has only increased by 250 people, or 0.3%, during the same time period. Unlike the County, which has experienced slow but steady population growth during this time period, New Rochelle experienced a period of population contraction from 1960 to 1990 which saw the City lose 12.4% of its population. Since 1990, however, the City’s population has rebounded to its former 1960 level.

Census Tract 59.02 has a noticeably older population than either the County or New Rochelle as a whole, with a median age of 43.7 years. As shown in Table No. IV.H-2 (Appendix 9, Table 2), the census tract has a higher percentage of its population in the age 55 and older cohorts than the two larger geographies. New Rochelle’s age distribution is very similar to that of Westchester County, with one exception. The percentage of individuals age 15 to 24 is somewhat higher in New Rochelle than in the County at large, most likely a reflection of college students attending Iona College, Monroe College and the College of New Rochelle. These populations are also likely contributing to the lower median age seen in the City.

Between 2000 and 2010, Westchester County’s school age population increased by 2.5%, although this population remained a stable 18.0% of the total County population. New Rochelle experienced a slightly higher rate of growth with a 2.7% increase in its school age population. However, as a result of the increase in New Rochelle’s total population, the school age population declined from 17.3% of the total in 2000 to 16.6% in 2010. Finally, Census Tract 59.02 experienced a decline of 19.0% in its school age population, along with a corresponding decrease in the share of total population. See Table No. IV.H-3 (Appendix 9, Table 3).
## Table No. IV.H-2: Population by Age (2010)
(Appendix 9, Table 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percentage of County Population</th>
<th>City of New Rochelle</th>
<th>Percentage of City Population</th>
<th>Census Tract 59.02</th>
<th>Percentage of Tract Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>57,199</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>4,696</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>63,212</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>4,754</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>65,680</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>4,949</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>63,316</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>5,855</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>53,580</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5,371</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>108,013</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>9,695</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>132,984</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>10,070</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>149,032</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>10,974</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>61,788</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>4,906</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>53,187</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>4,081</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>68,766</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>5,509</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>47,929</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4,111</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>22,727</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2,091</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>949,113</td>
<td></td>
<td>77,062</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Median Age | 40.0 | 38.4 | 43.7 |

Source: 2010 Census data; U.S. Census Bureau.

## Table No. IV.H-3: School Age Population (2010)
(Appendix 9, Table 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010 Age Cohort</th>
<th>Westchester County</th>
<th>City of New Rochelle</th>
<th>Census Tract 59.02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>65,212</td>
<td>4,754</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>65,680</td>
<td>4,949</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-17</td>
<td>41,909</td>
<td>2,111</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total School-Age Population</td>
<td>170,801</td>
<td>12,814</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total Population</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2000 Age Cohort</th>
<th>Westchester County</th>
<th>City of New Rochelle</th>
<th>Census Tract 59.02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>67,993</td>
<td>4,988</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>63,737</td>
<td>4,806</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-17</td>
<td>34,805</td>
<td>2,678</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total School-Age Population</td>
<td>166,555</td>
<td>12,472</td>
<td>815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total Population</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Change, 2000-2010 | 4,246 | 342 | -133 |
| % Change, 2000-2010 | 2.5% | 2.7% | -19.0% |

Source: 2000 and 2010 Census data; U.S. Census Bureau.
(2) **Household Characteristics**

As shown in Table No. IV.H-4 (Appendix 9, Table 4), both Westchester County and the City of New Rochelle have similar household distribution by type, only varying by a few percentage points per household category. In contrast, Census Tract 59.02 has a substantially greater percentage of non-family households than either the County or the City, as well as a higher percentage of single person households. In addition, a far smaller percentage of families with their own children under age 18 reside in Tract 59.02 than in the City or the County. While average household size is about equal for the County and the City, Tract 59.02 is much lower at 2.23 persons per household.

**Table No. IV.H-4: Household Characteristics (2010)**

(Appendix 9, Table 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Westchester County</th>
<th>City of New Rochelle</th>
<th>Census Tract 59.02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>347,232</td>
<td>27,953</td>
<td>2,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Households</td>
<td>236,419</td>
<td>18,179</td>
<td>1,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/Own Children&lt;18</td>
<td>113,566</td>
<td>8,621</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Family Households</td>
<td>110,813</td>
<td>9,774</td>
<td>1,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Alone</td>
<td>94,614</td>
<td>8,368</td>
<td>868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 65 and Older</td>
<td>39,602</td>
<td>3,507</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households w/Individuals Under 18</td>
<td>122,639</td>
<td>9,495</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households w/Individuals Age 65+</td>
<td>99,527</td>
<td>8,164</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Size</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Family Households</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% w/Children&lt;18</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Non-Family Households</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Living Alone</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Age 65 and Older</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Households w/Individuals Under 18</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Households w/Individuals Age 65+</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2010 Census data; U.S. Census Bureau.

Similarly, the distribution of household sizes in Tract 59.02 is much more heavily weighted toward smaller households than in the City or the County (see Table No. IV.H-5). Nearly 68% of the households in Tract 59.02 are comprised of one or two persons. Only 17.3% of the households in Tract 59.02 have four or more persons, compared to 27.7% for the County and 28.5% for the City. Table No. 6 in the Socioeconomic and Fiscal Impacts Analysis report (Appendix 9) shows additional information related to educational attainment for each of the three geographies.
Table No. IV.H-5: Household Size (2010)
(Appendix 9, Table 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Size</th>
<th>Westchester County</th>
<th>City of New Rochelle</th>
<th>Census Tract 59.02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Households</td>
<td>Percentage of Households</td>
<td>Number of Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Person</td>
<td>94,614</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>8,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Persons</td>
<td>99,048</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>7,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Persons</td>
<td>57,428</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>4,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Persons</td>
<td>54,396</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>4,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Persons</td>
<td>25,721</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>2,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Persons</td>
<td>9,484</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 or More Persons</td>
<td>6,541</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>347,232</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>27,953</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2010 Census data; U.S. Census Bureau.

3) Housing Costs and Conditions

2010 Census figures indicate that 93.6% of Westchester County’s 370,821 housing units are occupied (see Table No. IV.H-6). The City of New Rochelle accounts for approximately 8.0% of the County’s total housing stock. Both New Rochelle and Census Tract 59.02 have lower vacancy rates than the County as a whole, most likely due to the fact that these two geographies do not have many seasonal homes as do some other communities in Westchester County. Over 61% of the housing stock in Westchester County is owner-occupied, compared to 51% and 48% for New Rochelle and Tract 59.02, respectively.

Table No. IV.H-6: Housing Occupancy (2010)
(Appendix 9, Table 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Occupancy: 2010</th>
<th>Westchester County</th>
<th>City of New Rochelle</th>
<th>Census Tract 59.02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units</td>
<td>370,821</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>29,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Housing Units</td>
<td>347,232</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>27,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Housing Units</td>
<td>23,589</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>1,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Housing Units</td>
<td>347,232</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>27,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-Occupied Units</td>
<td>213,888</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>14,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-Occupied Units</td>
<td>133,344</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>13,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Housing Units</td>
<td>23,589</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Rent</td>
<td>7,813</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Sale Only</td>
<td>12,59</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented or Sold, not occupied</td>
<td>3,757</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Seasonal, Recreational, or Occasional Use</td>
<td>3,355</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Migrant Workers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Vacant</td>
<td>7,402</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2010 Census data; U.S. Census Bureau.
According to 2010 American Community Survey data, all three geographies have diverse housing stocks in terms of the number of units in each housing structure. Over 45% of Westchester County’s housing stock is single-family detached homes; this figure drops to 37.0% for New Rochelle and 27.4% for Tract 59.02. All three geographies have a significant percentage of their housing stock in structures with 20 or more units; in the case of Tract 59.02, it exceeds 50%. Westchester County and the City of New Rochelle both had a plurality of their housing units constructed before 1940, followed by equally substantial housing growth between 1940 and 1970. In contrast, Census Tract 59.02 experienced its greatest housing growth between 1950 and 1959, followed by additional housing growth in the 1960s. Only 13.7% of the housing units in Tract 59.02 were built in 1970 or later, as compared to 23.9% in the City and 27.5% in the County. Table Nos. 8, 9, 10 and 11 in the Socioeconomic and Fiscal Impacts Analysis report (Appendix 9) show additional information related to types of units, age of structure, building permits, property values and distribution of renter-occupied units for each of the three geographies.

b. **Future Socioeconomic Conditions Without the Project**

Without the Project, the City of New Rochelle and the neighborhoods surrounding the Project Site will continue to change and evolve. This subsection analyzes the projected changes to the City of New Rochelle and sub-geographies over the next five years to develop a snapshot of how the community and the area around the Project Site may appear in the assumed “build year” of 2016. Using ESRI to obtain population and income projections for a future build year is standard industry methodology.

(1) **Population and Income Projections**

Population and income projections were obtained utilizing ESRI Business Analyst Online and were gathered for five geographies: Westchester County, the City of New Rochelle, Census Tract 59.02, Block Group 1 of Census Tract 59.02, and a one-mile radius around the Project Site. The City, Census Tract 59.02 and Block Group 1 were all selected so that projected data for these geographies could be compared to 2010 Census and American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates data for the same geographies. The one miles radius was selected to ensure that a broad enough spectrum of the neighborhoods surrounding the Project Site was analyzed. Estimated data for 2011 and projected data for 2016, the assumed build year when the project would be fully occupied, were gathered to demonstrate the full spectrum of demographic changes projected to occur in the study areas during the next five years.

As the data in Table No. IV.H-7 indicates, population growth in New Rochelle is expected to be minimal through 2016. For Census Tract 59.02 and its component Block Group 1, a more dramatic population decrease of 9.4% is projected through 2016. However, for all geographies examined, both median household and per capita incomes are projected to rise significantly over the time period.
Table No. IV.H-7: Demographic Projections
(Appendix 9, Table 12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 12 Demographic Projections, 2011-2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westchester County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median HH Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 0-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 65+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ESRI Business Analyst Online; compiled by MMI.

Without the addition of the proposed Project, the demographic characteristics of the City of New Rochelle are expected generally to change only slightly, with several exceptions. The population of the City looks to continue its trend of aging, with an increase in the number of persons age 65 and older. In addition, income levels are projected to continue rising. However, with projected background population growth of only 622 people by 2016, demographic conditions in the City will likely remain very similar to current conditions, albeit with a somewhat wealthier population.

For the immediate areas around the Project Site, however, demographic characteristics are likely to change during the next few years. By 2016, both Census Tract 59.02 and Block Group 1 are projected to lose 9.4% of their respective populations, and over 10% of their resident family households. In addition, the over 12% projected decreases in residents age 0 to 19 in both Census Tract 59.02 and Block Group 1 will help hasten the aging of the underlying local population. Despite these changes, Census Tract 59.02 and Block Group 1 will experience similar levels of growth in median household income and per capita income as the City as a whole. These increases will help generate additional disposable income dollars that can be spent at local businesses.

c. Potential Socioeconomic Impacts

The prime components of increased municipal costs as a result of residential development are general government costs related to servicing new population and education costs related to new resident students entering the public school system. In order to accurately project the potential costs associated with a residential development, it is necessary to calculate the estimated increase in total population and public school students that may result from the proposed residential development.
In order to project total population resulting from the residential component of the proposed Project, “population per unit” multipliers have been examined. The multipliers are from the Rutgers University Center for Urban Policy Research publication entitled “Residential Demographic Multipliers – Estimates of the Occupants of New Housing,” prepared in June 2006. The multipliers are broken down into an expansive array of subcategories, including differentiation by housing type, housing size and housing price.

**Anticipated Population Generation**

Applying the Rutgers multiplier for one-bedroom rental units of 1.67 persons per unit to the 208 studio and one-bedroom housing units of the Project results in a projected population of 347 people. Applying the Rutgers multiplier for two-bedroom rental units of 2.31 persons per unit to the 77 two-bedroom housing units results in a projected population of 177 people. The projected number of new residents from the Project is, therefore, approximately 524 people.

The number of public school students expected to be generated by the Project was also calculated using the Rutgers multipliers (see Table No. IV.H-8). Utilizing the Rutgers multiplier of 0.07 for one-bedroom rental units, and the multiplier of 0.16 for the two-bedroom rental units results in a projected total population of 22 public school students. For purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that studio apartments would not generate public school students. Therefore, no multiplier has been applied to these units.

Table No. IV.H-8: Total Population and Public School Students

(1) **Table 14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Type</th>
<th># of Units</th>
<th>Rent Level</th>
<th>Population Multiplier</th>
<th>Public School Student Multiplier</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Public School Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>$1,525</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio - BMR</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$1,189</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1BR</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>$1,750</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1BR - BMR</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$1,267</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2BR</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>$2,350</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2BR - BMR</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$1,518</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>285</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>524</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Rutgers University, Center for Urban Policy Research, "Residential Demographic Multipliers," June 2006; compiled by MMI.

“BMR” is an acronym for “below market rent”; these units constitute the affordable housing units that are part of the Project.
Impact on City’s Demographic Profile

The addition of 524 new residents would likely have an impact on the surrounding neighborhoods. Without the Project, 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 slightly from the existing condition. Table No. IV.H-9 shows the population projections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table No. IV.H-9: Population Projections With Project Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Appendix 9, Table 15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of New Rochelle</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2016 Projected</th>
<th>2016 w/Echo Bay</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>77,062</td>
<td>77,684</td>
<td>78,208</td>
<td>0.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>27,908</td>
<td>28,109</td>
<td>28,394</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Tract 59.02</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2016 Projected</th>
<th>2016 w/Echo Bay</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>5,139</td>
<td>4,658</td>
<td>5,182</td>
<td>11.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>2,299</td>
<td>2,091</td>
<td>2,376</td>
<td>13.63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block Group 1</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2016 Projected</th>
<th>2016 w/Echo Bay</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>2,354</td>
<td>2,132</td>
<td>2,656</td>
<td>24.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>32.31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Mile Radius</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2016 Projected</th>
<th>2016 w/Echo Bay</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>28,457</td>
<td>28,286</td>
<td>28,810</td>
<td>1.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>11,108</td>
<td>11,025</td>
<td>11,310</td>
<td>2.59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ESRI Business Analyst Online; compiled by MMI.

The total population of the Project is only 0.7% of the current population of New Rochelle, but also represents 22.3% of the current population of Block Group 1 in Census Tract 59.02. However, the population of Block Group 1 is projected to decrease by 222 people by 2016. Therefore, the addition of new residents from the Project would only increase the current population by approximately 300 people.

The addition of the 524 new residents likely would have only minor impacts on the demographic profile of the immediate area. Younger renter households may lower the median age of the area slightly, while the generation of 22 public school children would have a negligible impact on age profile of the area.

The proposed Project would also add 285 housing units to the local housing stock, an increase of 10.5% in the number of housing units in Census Tract 59.02. The addition of these units would likely change the characteristics of the housing stock in the immediate area, predominantly by increasing the percentage of units built after 2005 and increasing the median gross rent for rental units. However, an increase in median rent in the area would be partially counterbalanced by the inclusion of 29 below market rate rental units as part of the development. A detailed discussion of the change in median rent in the area and its relationship to growth inducement and environmental justice can be found in Section VIII, Growth Inducing Impacts, with the technical analysis in Appendix 9.
(3) **Financial Impacts Associated with Potential Condemnations**

The Project does not require the acquisition or condemnation of any privately-owned parcels. The City of New Rochelle owns the two parcels that make up the Project Site: the City Yard and Armory parcels. The majority of the Project development would occur on the City Yard parcel, including the mixed-use commercial and residential building, associated parking, and the waterfront open space amenities. The Project also includes the development of Armory Place and public parking for the waterfront open space, along with the pedestrian esplanade and kayak launch dock.

The Echo Bay Redevelopment Project Restated Memorandum of Understanding between the City and the Applicant (MOU) 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.

At the present time, the Nelstad site generates approximately $70,483 in property taxes, with $58,279 being collected by the City and school district and $12,204 by the County. The Mancuso Marina property is owned by the City and does not currently generate property taxes. If the Nelstad parcel is not redeveloped, these taxes would continue to be collected for the foreseeable future. With no new development on the parcel, it is assumed that any municipal costs associated with the parcel would remain negligible.

(4) **Employment Opportunities**

Three primary types of economic impacts resulting from the proposed Project are discussed in detail in the Socioeconomic and Fiscal Impacts Analysis report in Appendix 9: construction period direct benefits, secondary or indirect benefits, and on-site permanent employment of workers at the Project.

(a) **Short Term Construction Jobs**

The proposed development would introduce economic activity into the New York metropolitan region, with an effect on the economy of New Rochelle and surrounding communities. This increased activity would first take place during the construction phase of the Project. To build the Project, approximately 127 construction workers would be needed annually for a period of 24 months.
(b) **Indirect Benefits of the Construction Phase**

Secondary, or indirect, benefits of the construction phase are comprised of the spinoff economic activity that results from the spending of wages and purchase of goods and services associated with the Project. Much of the initial investment made to develop the Project would remain in the local economy. The primary reason for this is that many of the contractors and laborers constructing the Project would come from and spend their wages in the region. This spending tends to circulate repeatedly throughout the economy, making the eventual economic impact a multiple of the initial expenditure.

To quantify the secondary economic impacts of the proposed Project, this analysis uses an input/output RIMS II model of the local economy. The final demand multipliers indicate that each dollar spent on construction increases the total output of the New York metropolitan regional economy by $1.8716, including the initial dollar spent. In addition, for each dollar spent on construction, an additional $1.0078 in value is added to the output of all industries in the region. Earnings multipliers suggest that the spending of this same dollar increases the total earnings in the region by 60.4 cents. Employment multipliers indicate that every 1 million dollars spent on construction creates over 13.3 jobs in the larger regional economy.

Applying the multipliers to the estimated Project construction costs of $73,956,000, it is projected that the proposed Project would increase the total regional output of goods and services by approximately $138,416,050. Factoring out the initial expenditure of an estimated $73,956,000 results in a net increase to the regional economy of approximately $64,460,050 at full build-out. Additionally, the development would add approximately $74.5 million in value to the output of all other industries in the region.

The $73.96 million investment in on-site construction of the Project would also lead to increased earnings and jobs in the regional economy. It is estimated that this construction would also lead to increased earnings in the New York metropolitan area of approximately $44.7 million. In terms of employment, an estimated 984 secondary jobs would be created in the regional economy as a result of the investment associated with the Project’s construction.

(c) **Long Term Employment**

On-site employment of new workers at the retail and residential components of the Project would have an impact on the local and regional economy. Utilizing an industry standard of approximately two (2) employees per 1,000 square feet of retail space, the proposed 25,000 square feet of retail space to be developed as part of the Project would result in approximately 50 retail
In addition, 9 residential property management jobs would be created. According to the State of New York Department of Labor, the average retail sales employee earns $28,370 annually.\(^1\) Multiplying this figure by the projected 50 new retail employees results in an additional $1,418,500 in salary circulated into the local and regional economy. The 9 new residential management jobs created would also add an additional $400,000 in salary to this total.

As it enters the local economy through the purchase of goods and services, this additional amount of salary dollars would have a direct effect on the earnings of other households in the regional economy. The addition of the 59 new retail and residential property jobs would also induce additional employment in other industries in the region. Applying the RIMS II direct effect multipliers for the retail industry category of $1.6707 in additional earnings per dollar of retail earnings (including the initial dollar of retail earnings) and 1.4390 additional jobs per retail job (including the initial retail job created) created provides an estimate of the regional economic impact of the proposed retail space. Utilizing these direct effect multipliers, it is projected that the $1,418,500 in new retail earnings would generate an additional $951,388 in earnings and the 50 new retail jobs would induce the creation of an additional 22 jobs in the regional economy. Applying the RIMS II direct effect multipliers for the rental and leasing services industry category of 2.2697 in additional earnings per dollar of earnings (including the initial dollar of retail earnings) and 2.7634 additional jobs per rental and leasing service job (including the initial job created) created provides an estimate of the regional economic impact of the new residential management jobs. Utilizing these direct effect multipliers, it is projected that the $400,000 in new residential management earnings would generate an additional $507,880 in earnings and the 9 new residential management jobs would induce the creation of an additional 16 jobs in the regional economy.

**d. Potential Mitigation Measures**

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

---

\(^1\) [http://labor.ny.gov/stats/lswage2.asp#41-0000](http://labor.ny.gov/stats/lswage2.asp#41-0000)
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.

2. **Fiscal Impacts**

The following section discusses the potential fiscal impacts of the proposed Project on the City of New Rochelle in terms of projected tax revenues, one-time municipal revenues (such as building permit fees), and increased general government and education costs. This section also analyzes the existing economic conditions of the area, including household and family income levels, poverty statistics, employment, and commuting patterns. Finally, this section presents the net fiscal impact of the proposed Project in a net present value format for a future period of thirty (30) years with the proposed payment-in-lieu-of-taxes (PILOT) scenario.

a. **Existing Fiscal Conditions**

(1) **Existing Economic Conditions in the Project Area**

The median household income in Westchester County of $79,619 is 53.3% and 43.2% greater than the national and New York State median household incomes, respectively. With a median household income of $65,317, New Rochelle’s income is only 82% of the corresponding County median. The distribution of household incomes in both the County and New Rochelle follow a similar pattern although New Rochelle has a higher percentage of lower income households and the County has higher percentages of wealthier households. Similarly, the County’s per capita income is 17.2% higher than the City’s per capita income. See Table No. IV.H-10.

Family income patterns in both Westchester County and New Rochelle are similar to household income patterns (See Appendix 9, Table 17A). On a percentage basis, however, the income gap between New Rochelle and the County as a whole is smaller for median family income than for median household income. New Rochelle’s median family income of $87,086 is roughly 86% of the County median; however, both New Rochelle and Westchester County have median family incomes that are well above the national and New York State medians of $62,982 and $67,405, respectively.
Table No. IV.H-10: Household and Per Capita Income: 2010
(Appendix 9, Table 17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Westchester County</th>
<th>City of New Rochelle</th>
<th>Census Tract 59.02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Households</td>
<td>Percentage of Households</td>
<td>Number of Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$10,000</td>
<td>13,892</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>1,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000-$14,999</td>
<td>12,054</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>1,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000-$24,999</td>
<td>24,567</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>2,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$34,999</td>
<td>25,085</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>2,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000-$49,999</td>
<td>34,964</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>2,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$74,999</td>
<td>51,765</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>4,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000-$99,999</td>
<td>41,221</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>3,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-$149,999</td>
<td>55,141</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>3,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000-$199,999</td>
<td>30,354</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>1,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000+</td>
<td>54,752</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>3,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median HH Income</td>
<td>$79,619</td>
<td></td>
<td>$65,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income</td>
<td>$47,814</td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2010 ACS 5-Year Estimates; U.S. Census Bureau.

Because Westchester County is a “High Cost” area, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has given the County permission to use its calculation of “area median income” (AMI), rather than HUD’s own calculation which includes averaging on a national basis. In 2012, the Westchester AMI is $107,900 for a family of four and $86,350 for a family of two. Eighty percent of the AMI is $86,300 and $69,050 respectively. Westchester County uses the AMI to set eligibility requirements for its funding programs for both affordable rental and ownership housing. As the data in Table No. IV.H-10 (Appendix 9, Table 17) shows, a substantial percentage of New Rochelle’s households earn less than 80% of the AMI for a family of four. Nearly 44% of New Rochelle’s households earn less than $75,000, while 50.1% of the households in Census Tract 59.02 earn less than $75,000.

Data generated by the U.S. Census Bureau as part of the American Community Survey program provides the basis for analyzing employment data for the City of New Rochelle and Census Tract 59.02. In addition, this data is also provided for Westchester County as a point of comparison.
Table No. IV.H-11: Employment Status: 2010
(Appendix 9, Table 19)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status: 2010</th>
<th>Westchester County</th>
<th>City of New Rochelle</th>
<th>Census Tract 59.02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 16 Years &amp; Over</td>
<td>738,220</td>
<td>60,758</td>
<td>4,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons in Labor Force</td>
<td>483,490</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>37,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian Labor Force</td>
<td>483,289</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>37,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>451,799</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>35,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>31,490</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>2,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons not in Labor Force</td>
<td>254,730</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>23,075</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2010 ACS 5-Year estimates; U.S. Census Bureau.

It should be noted that this data indicates that in 2010 the City of New Rochelle had an unemployment rate of 4.4% and Westchester County overall had an unemployment rate of 4.3%. While the City and the County have fared better than other areas in terms of employment in recent years, more up to date data from the State of New York indicates that unemployment rates are significantly higher. According to the State’s Department of Labor and its Local Area Unemployment Statistics program, as of May 2012 New Rochelle had an unemployment rate of 7.6% while the County had an unemployment rate of 7.2%. These compare to an overall State unemployment rate of 8.6%. Monthly data from the State program also indicates that the unemployment rate peaked in New Rochelle and Westchester County in January and February of 2010. At that time, New Rochelle had an unemployment rate of 9.9%, while the County’s rate stood at 8.0%.

Unemployment data is not available from the State at the Census Tract level. However, based upon the comparison between State data and Census data for New Rochelle and Westchester County, it can be inferred that the actual unemployment rate in Census Tract 59.02 is somewhat higher than then 5.2% reported in the 2010 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates data.

(2) Taxing Jurisdictions and Current Tax Revenues Generated by the Project Site
The Project Site Action falls within several taxing jurisdictions. These include the following:

- City of New Rochelle
- County of Westchester
- New Rochelle School District
- New Rochelle Library District
- Westchester County Refuse District
- Westchester County Sewer District
The current tax rates and the City’s equalization rate are highlighted in Table No. IV.H-12 below:

Table No. IV.H-12: Tax Rates for Pertinent Jurisdictions
(Appendix 9, Table 24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Rates for Pertinent Jurisdictions</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equalization Rate</td>
<td>0.0296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Real Property Tax Rate</td>
<td>185.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Real Property Tax Rate</td>
<td>123.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District Tax Rate</td>
<td>681.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Tax Rate</td>
<td>15.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Refuse Tax Rate</td>
<td>12.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Sewer Tax Rate</td>
<td>41.477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The Project Site is comprised of two parcels, both of which are currently tax exempt and provide no taxes to the City or County. It should be noted that under the Proposed Action, the Armory parcel would continue to be under City ownership and, therefore, would remain tax-exempt.

b. Future Conditions Without the Project
Without the Project, the Project Site would continue to generate no tax revenue for both the City of New Rochelle and Westchester County. Assuming a “no-build” scenario with no additional development on the Project Site, no taxes would continue to be collected for the foreseeable future. With no new development on the site, it is assumed that any municipal costs associated with the Project Site would remain negligible.

c. Potential Impacts
(1) Anticipated Tax Revenues Generated by the Project
   (a) Real Property Tax Revenue
      Based upon Applicant data, it has been estimated that the residential component of the proposed Project would have a market value of

---

2 The City of New Rochelle will continue to own the Armory parcel, but per the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), will 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.
$39,023,000. The retail component is estimated to have a market value of $3,639,800. Finally, the Applicant’s socioeconomic consult has estimated that the underlying land would carry a value of approximately $5,000,000. Therefore, the total estimated market value of the Project is $47,662,800.3 The current State equalization rate for property is 0.0296, which results in an assessed value of $1,410,819. Applying the current tax rates for each taxing jurisdiction results in estimated annual real property tax revenues of $1,495,654. The total tax revenue to the City of New Rochelle (City, school district and library combined) would be $1,246,128.

Table No. IV.H-13: Project – Real Property Tax Revenue (Appendix 9, Table 25)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Component</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
<th>Equalization Rate</th>
<th>Assessed Value</th>
<th>City Real Property</th>
<th>County Real Property</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>County Refuse</th>
<th>County Sewer</th>
<th>TOTAL TAXES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Structure</td>
<td>$39,023,000</td>
<td>0.0296</td>
<td>$1,135,081</td>
<td>$214,304</td>
<td>$742,498</td>
<td>$375,764</td>
<td>$18,375</td>
<td>$13,888</td>
<td>$124,538</td>
<td>$22,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Land</td>
<td>$4,250,000</td>
<td>0.0296</td>
<td>$125,800</td>
<td>$23,340</td>
<td>$15,519</td>
<td>$86,774</td>
<td>$2,001</td>
<td>$1,512</td>
<td>$33,365</td>
<td>$16,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Structure</td>
<td>$3,639,800</td>
<td>0.0296</td>
<td>$107,738</td>
<td>$19,989</td>
<td>$13,291</td>
<td>$73,459</td>
<td>$1,714</td>
<td>$1,295</td>
<td>$4,469</td>
<td>$14,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Land</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>0.0296</td>
<td>$22,200</td>
<td>$4,119</td>
<td>$2,739</td>
<td>$15,137</td>
<td>$353</td>
<td>$267</td>
<td>$58,517</td>
<td>$23,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$47,662,800</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,410,819</strong></td>
<td><strong>$261,752</strong></td>
<td><strong>$861,933</strong></td>
<td><strong>$42,448</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,962</strong></td>
<td><strong>$38,517</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,495,654</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Sales Tax Revenue
As the proposed Project is built, housing units would become occupied and ultimately host approximately 285 new households. Based on the target market and projected rents for this Project, these housing units are likely to be leased by households with an average income of $85,000. It is assumed that a portion of this total income would be available for discretionary purchases that would inject money into the regional economy.

Deducting expenditures on basic necessities such as shelter, taxes, transportation, food, and clothing from total income yields an estimated percentage of household income that would be available for discretionary purchases. The U.S. Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics annually publishes Consumer Expenditure Surveys, which present information on how various categories of items capture certain shares of household spending. This survey was reviewed for consumers reporting income of $70,000 and over to estimate the percentage of all spending that

---

3 The tax revenue generation estimates above are intended to provide an accurate depiction of the fiscal impact of the project to the City of New Rochelle. As a result, the “Market Value” above has been adjusted to reflect local assessing standards as it relates to mixed-income and mixed-use properties within New Rochelle, which takes into account property level rent, expenses, and debt service in addition to a cost-based approach. Comparable properties within the City were used as a benchmark guide in estimating the fiscal value of the Project to the City.
goes towards discretionary, or unnecessary, items. From this data it is conservatively estimated that 34.0% of total household income for this income category is available for discretionary purchases. Table No. IV.H-14 (Appendix 9, Table 26) summarizes the pertinent data and shows the derivation of discretionary spending as a percentage of household income.

Table No. IV.H-14: Discretionary Spending as Percentage of Household Income
(Appendix 9, Table 26)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage of All Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Expenditures</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessities Subtotal</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Spending on Discretionary Items</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed Ratio of Estimated Annual Expenditures to Income</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary Spending as Percentage of Household Income</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


It is also assumed that a certain percentage of household spending would be for tax-exempt retail items. For the purposes of this analysis, food, clothing and healthcare items are assumed to be non-taxable. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Expenditure Surveys data referenced in Table No. IV.H-14 above, these items total 20.2% of household expenditures. Thus a factor of 79.8% was used to estimate the percentage of sales per square foot that were actually taxable. The estimated total household discretionary spending and anticipated sales tax revenue to the City from the Project is shown in Table No. IV.H-15.
Table No. IV.H-15: Estimated Sales Tax Revenue
(Appendix 9, Table 27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 27 Estimated Sales Tax Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECHO BAY - RETAIL COMPONENT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Space (s.f.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales per sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Taxable Sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxable sales (per sq. ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Taxable Annual Sales</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Rochelle Sales Tax Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sales Tax Generated</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **ECHO BAY RESIDENTS**                | **Lower Bound** | **Upper Bound** |
| Estimated Annual Household Spending   | $8,236,500      | $8,236,500      |
| % Taxable Sales                       | 79.8%           | 79.8%           |
| Assumed Percentage Spent in New Rochelle | 15%          | 25%            |
| **Total Taxable Annual Sales**        | **$985,909**    | **$1,643,182**  |
| New Rochelle Sales Tax Rate           | 2.50%           | 2.50%           |
| **Sales Tax Generated**               | **$24,648**     | **$41,080**     |
| **TOTAL SALES TAX GENERATED**         | **$199,210**    | **$290,455**    |
| **AVERAGE**                           | **$244,832**    |                |

Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, CES 2010, Table 46. Compiled by MMI.

The City of New Rochelle also collects a tax of 1.5% on all utility sales to residential customers. Based upon existing tax data from the City and data from HUD, it was estimated that the average monthly utility bill subject to tax would be $200 per unit at the Project, or $2,400 per year. Multiplying this figure by 285 units results in a total of $684,000 in taxable value. With a 1.5% tax rate, the City would collect approximately $10,260 annually in utility tax revenue.

**Proposed Development – Estimated School Utility Sales Tax Revenue**

The New Rochelle school district collects a sales tax of 3.0% on all utility sales to residential customers. Based upon existing tax data from the City and data from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), it was estimated that the average monthly utility bill subject to sales tax would be $200 per unit at Echo Bay, or $2,400 per year. Multiplying this figure by 285 units results in a total of $684,000 in taxable value. With a 3.0% sales tax rate, the school district would collect approximately $20,520 annually in utility sales tax revenue.
(c) **Other Tax Revenues – Municipal Permit Fees**

In addition to annual revenue streams, the proposed Project would generate substantial one-time fee revenues from building permit fees and administrative permit fees. Administrative permit fees are the fees required for applications to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Building permit fees in New Rochelle are calculated based upon the value of the construction work for which a permit is being requested. A fee of $105 is charged for the first $1,000 of value, and a fee of $12 is charged for every additional $1,000 of value. The estimated construction cost for the residential, retail and parking components of the project, plus other hard construction costs, are estimated at $73.96 million, which results in a building permit fee of $887,565. Other additional building fees include electrical, sprinkler and demolition permits.

A variety of planning, zoning and other administrative permits would be required under the proposed conceptual site plan. Most of these fees are small in comparison to the building permit fees; the largest of the administrative fees would most likely be the site plan filing fee at roughly $111,000. An additional fee for a flood zone certificate, a fee for review by the City’s Professional Architectural Review Committee (PARC) and sign preparation fees would also be required.

The table below summarizes estimated municipal fees based upon information available at this time. The total amount of these fees is approximately $1,018,160.
Table No. IV.H-16: Estimated Municipal Fees

(Appendix 9, Table 28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee Category</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Fee Category</th>
<th>Fee</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit</td>
<td>$73,956,000</td>
<td>$105 first $1,000, $12 each additional $1,000</td>
<td>$887,565</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprinkler System Installation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone Certificate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$36.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>$36.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition Permit</td>
<td>66,000 s.f.</td>
<td>$120 first 2,000 s.f., $0.16 each additional s.f.</td>
<td>$10,360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Construction Permit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$95</td>
<td></td>
<td>$95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendments to Plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$95 first review</td>
<td></td>
<td>$95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Permit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td></td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Plan Filing Fee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$600 plus $150 each $100,000 over $250,000</td>
<td>$111,159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Fee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$26</td>
<td></td>
<td>$104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,018,160</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of New Rochelle; compiled by MMI.

**Additional Revenues**

In addition to the estimated fees and miscellaneous revenues generated by the proposed development and included in Table No. IV.H-16 above, 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.

In addition, in December 2012, New Rochelle was awarded a $1.5 million grant toward 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 Regional Economic Development Funding 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.
This $1.5 million dollar grant is a reimbursement program, whereby the developer will spend money improving the site and waterfront and the State gives the funds to the developer. In turn, the developer will turn over this funding to the City. It is expected that this funding will be realized during 2015.

(2) Construction Costs and Ongoing Public Services Costs of the Project

(a) Construction Costs

The construction and operational phases of the proposed Project would generate direct and indirect economic activity in the region. The planned 285 dwelling unit residential community and 25,000 square feet commercial mixed-use space would be built out over a roughly 20-month period. Economic impacts would evolve from the construction and on-going operation of the community, and the economic activity generated by the resident population would also impact the regional New York metropolitan economy.

The Applicant estimates the total projected development expenditures at $89,213,000. Of this total, $73,956,000 is for hard construction costs. For this project, it is estimated that labor costs would constitute approximately 40% of the total on-site construction costs associated with the development. Therefore, labor costs are projected at $29,582,400. The Applicant is responsible for all costs to construct the Project, including public improvements and amenities.

(b) Municipal Costs

Costs associated with residential development occur in two areas: increases in general government expenditures and increases in public education expenditures. To determine the estimated costs associated with the residential component of the Project, an “average per capita cost” methodology was utilized. A detailed description of the methodology for determining the average per capita cost of general government services in New Rochelle is included in the Socioeconomic and Fiscal Impacts Analysis report in Appendix 9. The City of New Rochelle’s Total 2012-2013 Municipal Budget summary is below:
Using the City's general fund budget for 2012-2013 and the 2010 U.S. Census population figure for New Rochelle (77,062 residents), the per capita cost of general municipal services to City residents is $738. This number was then applied to the population projections to provide a range of estimated general government costs. A similar analysis was conducted to calculate the costs associated with the retail component of the Project for a total of $47,357.

Education costs were estimated in a different manner. Through extensive research of actual costs incurred for adding new public school students, City staff has determined that the marginal cost per new student is $17,500. This figure was applied to the previously calculated estimate of public school children resulting from the proposed residential development plan to estimate associated education costs.

---

4 The Applicant’s planning consultant met with the City’s Department of Development and the Superintendent and Deputy Superintendent of the City School District of New Rochelle on August 22, 2012. The Superintendent and Deputy Superintendent provided a marginal cost figure per new student equal to $17,500, though did not provide detailed methodology as to how the number was determined.
The following table summarizes the projected municipal costs of the Project. The total projected costs for the City of New Rochelle would be approximately $819,069 in the base year for general government and education services.

Table No. IV.H-17: Estimated Government and Education Costs
(Appendix 9, Table 30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Component</th>
<th># of Units</th>
<th># of Residents</th>
<th># of PS Students</th>
<th>Education Cost</th>
<th>TOTAL COSTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$87,084</td>
<td>$87,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1BR</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$169,002</td>
<td>$344,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2BR</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$340,626</td>
<td>$340,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>25,000 s.f.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$47,357</td>
<td>$47,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>524</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$819,069</strong></td>
<td><strong>$819,069</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) Other Adverse and Beneficial Fiscal Impacts from the Project on the City of New Rochelle and the Region
The Project would generate significant revenue streams for the City of New Rochelle. Comparing these revenues to the general municipal government costs and education costs likely to be generated by the Project indicates a net fiscal surplus of approximately $841,182.

Table No. IV.H-18: Net Fiscal Impact of the Project
(Appendix 9, Table 31)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Echo Bay Development - Net Fiscal Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Property Tax Revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District Property Tax Revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library District Property Tax Revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Refuse Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Parks and Rec Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Utilities Sales Tax Revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District Utilities Sales Tax Revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal General Sales Tax Revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Municipal Revenues</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Municipal Costs                       | $434,069 |
| Education Costs                       | $385,000 |
| **Total Municipal Costs**             | **$819,069** |

| Minus Current Tax Revenues            | $0 |
| **NET FISCAL IMPACT**                 | **$841,182** |
d. Potential Mitigation Measures
The proposed Project would generate both fiscal benefits and costs for the City of New Rochelle. Utilizing a pure time-neutral net fiscal impact methodology, it was determined that the proposed 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 $841,182 per year. In addition, the Project would result in approximately $1.02 million in one-time fees and charges, and $6.5 million in debt service assistance, public amenity fees and Regional Economic Development funding. As the fiscal impact of the proposed Project is positive in both a time-neutral net calculation and when considered cumulatively over a 30 year time horizon (see the Socioeconomic and Fiscal Impacts Analysis report in Appendix 9 for a detailed discussion of cumulative impacts over a 30 year time horizon), no mitigation measures are required.

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. A 30-year time horizon was used for the analysis to project how the fiscal impact of the Project would change over a substantial portion of the Project's effective lifetime. The assumed Build Year is 2016, and the PILOT period was assumed to be 20 years. PILOT revenues were calculated for each year, from which projected general government costs and education costs were subtracted.

(1) Potential Funding and Financing Opportunities – PILOT Scenario
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. As the chart shows, 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.
### Table No. IV.H-19: Annual Net Fiscal Impacts, PILOT Scenario

(Appendix 9, Table 32)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,018,160</td>
<td>$721,719</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,739,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,739,879</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,739,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$576,707</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$38,402</td>
<td>$2,708,219</td>
<td>$186,864</td>
<td>$400,765</td>
<td>$408,025</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,030,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$592,180</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$37,093</td>
<td>$2,776,027</td>
<td>$191,536</td>
<td>$467,616</td>
<td>$414,754</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,182,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$606,953</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$32,764</td>
<td>$2,838,909</td>
<td>$196,324</td>
<td>$474,630</td>
<td>$420,976</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,191,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$622,127</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$29,192</td>
<td>$2,898,034</td>
<td>$201,233</td>
<td>$488,976</td>
<td>$433,700</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,219,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$635,622</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,094</td>
<td>$2,952,762</td>
<td>$206,623</td>
<td>$496,310</td>
<td>$440,805</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,244,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$609,963</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$24,186</td>
<td>$2,911,706</td>
<td>$211,420</td>
<td>$503,755</td>
<td>$447,954</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,315,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$866,742</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$32,921</td>
<td>$3,111,213</td>
<td>$214,123</td>
<td>$511,316</td>
<td>$454,754</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,477,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$876,001</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$34,542</td>
<td>$3,145,424</td>
<td>$219,202</td>
<td>$518,981</td>
<td>$461,976</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,571,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>$878,001</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$35,123</td>
<td>$3,151,827</td>
<td>$224,101</td>
<td>$526,765</td>
<td>$469,218</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,630,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>$876,957</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$36,345</td>
<td>$3,166,635</td>
<td>$233,068</td>
<td>$532,665</td>
<td>$475,898</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,678,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>$879,375</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$37,531</td>
<td>$3,184,411</td>
<td>$243,562</td>
<td>$539,935</td>
<td>$482,871</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,729,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>$881,825</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$38,855</td>
<td>$3,204,035</td>
<td>$254,035</td>
<td>$546,986</td>
<td>$490,871</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,779,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>$885,092</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$39,141</td>
<td>$3,220,635</td>
<td>$265,590</td>
<td>$553,433</td>
<td>$499,871</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,829,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>$889,009</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$40,186</td>
<td>$3,237,401</td>
<td>$277,609</td>
<td>$561,142</td>
<td>$509,142</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,879,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>$893,491</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$41,216</td>
<td>$3,254,336</td>
<td>$289,309</td>
<td>$569,810</td>
<td>$518,429</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,929,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>$901,026</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$42,196</td>
<td>$3,271,496</td>
<td>$299,145</td>
<td>$578,380</td>
<td>$527,715</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,978,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2032</td>
<td>$909,551</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$43,034</td>
<td>$3,289,531</td>
<td>$309,590</td>
<td>$587,935</td>
<td>$537,078</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,027,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>$923,551</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$43,204</td>
<td>$3,298,731</td>
<td>$319,949</td>
<td>$598,708</td>
<td>$547,507</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,076,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2034</td>
<td>$925,955</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$44,034</td>
<td>$3,316,199</td>
<td>$329,612</td>
<td>$609,303</td>
<td>$558,075</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,125,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>$928,025</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$44,834</td>
<td>$3,333,905</td>
<td>$339,591</td>
<td>$620,336</td>
<td>$569,875</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,174,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td>$930,809</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$45,533</td>
<td>$3,351,701</td>
<td>$349,875</td>
<td>$632,665</td>
<td>$582,075</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,223,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2037</td>
<td>$933,809</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$46,233</td>
<td>$3,369,501</td>
<td>$359,475</td>
<td>$645,656</td>
<td>$595,875</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,272,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2038</td>
<td>$936,809</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$46,933</td>
<td>$3,387,253</td>
<td>$369,806</td>
<td>$659,708</td>
<td>$610,375</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,321,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2039</td>
<td>$939,809</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$47,633</td>
<td>$3,405,609</td>
<td>$379,855</td>
<td>$674,912</td>
<td>$625,908</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,371,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>$943,809</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$48,333</td>
<td>$3,424,884</td>
<td>$389,975</td>
<td>$691,470</td>
<td>$642,708</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,422,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2041</td>
<td>$2,250,086</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$49,133</td>
<td>$3,444,106</td>
<td>$399,836</td>
<td>$708,816</td>
<td>$660,978</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,472,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2042</td>
<td>$2,313,808</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,092</td>
<td>$3,465,340</td>
<td>$409,875</td>
<td>$728,025</td>
<td>$680,536</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,523,808</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following chart illustrates the net present value for the PILOT scenario, utilizing a discount rate of 7%. When looking at this scenario, it is clear that the PILOT scenario would provide value to the City both through the course of the PILOT period and in the years after the expiration of the abatement.

The following tables illustrate the annual PILOT revenues and administrative fees by beneficiary in the PILOT scenario, as well as the annual sales tax and miscellaneous fee revenues by beneficiary in the PILOT scenario:
Table No. IV.H-20: Annual PILOT Revenues and Administrative Fees by Beneficiary, PILOT Scenario (Appendix 9, Table 33)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Property Tax Revenue</th>
<th>Administrative Fees &amp; Misc. Revenue</th>
<th>Library Real Property</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>County Real Property</th>
<th>Refuse Fees, Parks &amp; Rec Fees &amp; Utility Sales Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,739,879</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,739,879</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$121,349</td>
<td>$38,402</td>
<td>$10,405</td>
<td>$45,933</td>
<td>$80,688</td>
<td>$186,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$124,382</td>
<td>$10,665</td>
<td>$457,102</td>
<td>$82,706</td>
<td>$191,536</td>
<td>$201,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$127,492</td>
<td>$10,931</td>
<td>$468,330</td>
<td>$84,773</td>
<td>$196,324</td>
<td>$206,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$130,679</td>
<td>$11,205</td>
<td>$480,243</td>
<td>$86,893</td>
<td>$201,233</td>
<td>$211,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$133,946</td>
<td>$11,485</td>
<td>$492,249</td>
<td>$89,065</td>
<td>$206,263</td>
<td>$216,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$137,295</td>
<td>$11,772</td>
<td>$504,555</td>
<td>$91,292</td>
<td>$211,420</td>
<td>$221,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$140,727</td>
<td>$12,066</td>
<td>$517,169</td>
<td>$93,574</td>
<td>$216,706</td>
<td>$226,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$144,245</td>
<td>$12,368</td>
<td>$530,099</td>
<td>$95,913</td>
<td>$221,123</td>
<td>$231,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>$147,852</td>
<td>$12,677</td>
<td>$543,351</td>
<td>$98,311</td>
<td>$226,676</td>
<td>$237,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>$151,548</td>
<td>$12,994</td>
<td>$556,935</td>
<td>$100,769</td>
<td>$233,368</td>
<td>$243,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>$155,336</td>
<td>$13,319</td>
<td>$570,838</td>
<td>$103,288</td>
<td>$239,292</td>
<td>$248,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>$159,220</td>
<td>$13,652</td>
<td>$585,130</td>
<td>$105,870</td>
<td>$245,182</td>
<td>$251,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>$163,200</td>
<td>$13,993</td>
<td>$599,738</td>
<td>$108,517</td>
<td>$251,312</td>
<td>$257,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>$167,280</td>
<td>$14,343</td>
<td>$614,752</td>
<td>$111,230</td>
<td>$257,395</td>
<td>$264,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>$171,462</td>
<td>$14,702</td>
<td>$630,121</td>
<td>$114,011</td>
<td>$264,035</td>
<td>$271,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>$175,749</td>
<td>$15,069</td>
<td>$645,874</td>
<td>$116,861</td>
<td>$270,635</td>
<td>$278,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2032</td>
<td>$180,143</td>
<td>$15,446</td>
<td>$662,020</td>
<td>$119,782</td>
<td>$277,401</td>
<td>$284,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>$184,646</td>
<td>$15,892</td>
<td>$678,571</td>
<td>$122,777</td>
<td>$284,336</td>
<td>$291,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2034</td>
<td>$189,262</td>
<td>$16,228</td>
<td>$695,535</td>
<td>$125,846</td>
<td>$291,445</td>
<td>$298,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>$193,994</td>
<td>$16,634</td>
<td>$712,924</td>
<td>$128,993</td>
<td>$298,731</td>
<td>$306,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td>$198,904</td>
<td>$17,094</td>
<td>$731,374</td>
<td>$132,217</td>
<td>$306,199</td>
<td>$306,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2037</td>
<td>$203,924</td>
<td>$17,537</td>
<td>$750,937</td>
<td>$135,523</td>
<td>$313,854</td>
<td>$313,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2038</td>
<td>$208,964</td>
<td>$17,984</td>
<td>$771,501</td>
<td>$138,911</td>
<td>$321,701</td>
<td>$321,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2039</td>
<td>$214,024</td>
<td>$18,432</td>
<td>$793,073</td>
<td>$142,384</td>
<td>$329,743</td>
<td>$337,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>$219,104</td>
<td>$18,892</td>
<td>$814,757</td>
<td>$145,943</td>
<td>$337,987</td>
<td>$354,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2041</td>
<td>$224,214</td>
<td>$19,362</td>
<td>$837,553</td>
<td>$149,592</td>
<td>$354,987</td>
<td>$372,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2042</td>
<td>$229,344</td>
<td>$19,834</td>
<td>$860,471</td>
<td>$153,332</td>
<td>$372,987</td>
<td>$391,987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table No. IV.H-21: Annual Sales Tax and Miscellaneous Fee Revenues by Beneficiary (Appendix 9, Table 34)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>County Refuse</th>
<th>County Sewer</th>
<th>City Sales Taxes - Direct</th>
<th>City Sales Taxes - Indirect*</th>
<th>MCTD Sales Taxes</th>
<th>County Sales Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$7,864</td>
<td>$27,128</td>
<td>$235,974</td>
<td>$36,275</td>
<td>$40,537</td>
<td>$162,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$8,060</td>
<td>$27,807</td>
<td>$239,823</td>
<td>$37,182</td>
<td>$41,551</td>
<td>$166,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$8,262</td>
<td>$28,502</td>
<td>$243,819</td>
<td>$38,112</td>
<td>$42,590</td>
<td>$170,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$8,468</td>
<td>$29,214</td>
<td>$246,804</td>
<td>$39,065</td>
<td>$43,664</td>
<td>$174,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$8,680</td>
<td>$29,945</td>
<td>$249,823</td>
<td>$40,041</td>
<td>$44,746</td>
<td>$178,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$8,897</td>
<td>$30,693</td>
<td>$254,946</td>
<td>$41,042</td>
<td>$45,864</td>
<td>$183,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$9,120</td>
<td>$31,461</td>
<td>$259,819</td>
<td>$42,068</td>
<td>$47,011</td>
<td>$188,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$9,348</td>
<td>$32,247</td>
<td>$264,720</td>
<td>$43,120</td>
<td>$48,186</td>
<td>$192,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>$9,581</td>
<td>$33,033</td>
<td>$269,749</td>
<td>$44,207</td>
<td>$49,391</td>
<td>$197,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>$9,821</td>
<td>$33,880</td>
<td>$274,514</td>
<td>$45,303</td>
<td>$50,626</td>
<td>$202,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>$10,066</td>
<td>$34,727</td>
<td>$279,456</td>
<td>$46,435</td>
<td>$51,891</td>
<td>$207,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>$10,318</td>
<td>$35,595</td>
<td>$284,428</td>
<td>$47,596</td>
<td>$53,189</td>
<td>$212,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>$10,576</td>
<td>$36,485</td>
<td>$289,453</td>
<td>$48,786</td>
<td>$54,518</td>
<td>$218,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>$10,840</td>
<td>$37,397</td>
<td>$294,497</td>
<td>$50,006</td>
<td>$55,881</td>
<td>$223,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>$11,111</td>
<td>$38,332</td>
<td>$299,559</td>
<td>$51,256</td>
<td>$57,278</td>
<td>$229,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>$11,389</td>
<td>$39,290</td>
<td>$304,644</td>
<td>$52,537</td>
<td>$58,710</td>
<td>$234,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2032</td>
<td>$11,674</td>
<td>$40,272</td>
<td>$309,774</td>
<td>$53,851</td>
<td>$60,178</td>
<td>$240,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>$11,966</td>
<td>$41,279</td>
<td>$315,007</td>
<td>$55,197</td>
<td>$61,682</td>
<td>$246,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2034</td>
<td>$12,265</td>
<td>$42,311</td>
<td>$319,149</td>
<td>$56,577</td>
<td>$63,224</td>
<td>$252,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>$12,571</td>
<td>$43,369</td>
<td>$324,401</td>
<td>$57,992</td>
<td>$64,805</td>
<td>$259,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td>$12,886</td>
<td>$44,453</td>
<td>$329,633</td>
<td>$59,441</td>
<td>$66,425</td>
<td>$265,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2037</td>
<td>$13,208</td>
<td>$45,564</td>
<td>$334,905</td>
<td>$60,927</td>
<td>$68,086</td>
<td>$272,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2038</td>
<td>$13,538</td>
<td>$46,703</td>
<td>$340,203</td>
<td>$62,451</td>
<td>$69,788</td>
<td>$279,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2039</td>
<td>$13,876</td>
<td>$47,871</td>
<td>$345,427</td>
<td>$64,012</td>
<td>$71,333</td>
<td>$286,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>$14,223</td>
<td>$49,068</td>
<td>$350,815</td>
<td>$65,612</td>
<td>$73,291</td>
<td>$293,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2041</td>
<td>$14,579</td>
<td>$50,294</td>
<td>$356,331</td>
<td>$67,272</td>
<td>$75,154</td>
<td>$300,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2042</td>
<td>$14,943</td>
<td>$51,552</td>
<td>$361,949</td>
<td>$68,934</td>
<td>$77,033</td>
<td>$308,131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Additional sales tax revenue to be generated by residents of the Echo Bay Center development at off-site New Rochelle retail establishments.
Finally, Table No. IV.H-22 presents a comparison of the City tax revenue streams under both the PILOT and non-PILOT (taxation) scenarios.

Table No. IV.H-22: Annual City Revenue, PILOT vs. non-PILOT Scenarios (Appendix 9, Table 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>-$892,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$669,963</td>
<td>$1,595,150</td>
<td>-$925,187</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>-$1,109,756</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>$2,253,903</td>
<td>$2,253,903</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>
I. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES
I. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

The identification and evaluation of community facilities and services was prepared primarily with data received from the City of New Rochelle, including annual reports and approved budgets for town-funded services, as well as responses to information requests sent to service providers. Letters explaining the Project, outlining the required analyses as defined by the Scoping Document adopted by the City Council, and requesting the specified data were sent to service providers. The New Rochelle City School District was consulted for information related to the public school analyses. See Appendix 2, Relevant Correspondence and Contacts, for copies of the letters and provider responses.

1. POLICE/FIRE/EMERGENCY SERVICES

a. Existing Conditions

(1) Description of Department Facilities and Personnel
   (a) Police
   The New Rochelle Police Department is headquartered at 475 North Avenue and currently employs 217 staff members, 158 of whom are sworn officers. The Police Services Division, which comprises the sworn officers, includes the Patrol Unit, a community collaborative unit referred to as PACT (Police and Community Acting Together), a Special Operations Unit, a Traffic Unit, and the Community Resource Coordinator. The Department dispatches three patrol tours per day, each split across assigned patrol areas, and these officers serve as first responders on calls. The police respond to an average of 55,000 calls annually, about 8% of which are medical emergencies, 0.45% of which are violent crimes, and 3% of which are thefts.

   Based on communication with the Police Department\(^1\), the Project Site is located within Reporting Area 106, which includes the frontage of East Main Street from the city line (near Cooper Drive) to Main/Huguenot Streets/Echo Avenue, along with the area south of East Main Street generally bounded by Le Fevres Lane, Echo Avenue, the Cod Edison site, and Echo Bay. Within the time frame of 01/01/11 to 06/30/12 (18 months), Reporting Area 106 received 1,008 calls. Of those calls, a total of 14 were made to the Project Site: 13 calls to the City Yard parcel and one call to the Armory parcel. Of the 13 calls to the City Yard parcel, 2 were accidents, 4 were related to vehicle maintenance, 1 was a threat, 1 was a vehicle stop, 1 was related to animals, 2 were other, and 2 were non-events. The call to the Armory parcel was categorized as a non-event.

---

(b) **Fire/Emergency Services**

The New Rochelle Fire Department has a total of 134 combined firefighters and officers throughout five stations across the City. This department performs an array of services including fire code enforcement, Emergency Medical Services, Hazardous Material Emergency Services, Rescue, Permitting and fire suppression. The Headquarters for the Fire Department at 90 Beaufort Place houses the Fire Commissioner’s Office in addition to the offices for Code Enforcement, Support Service, Fire Prevention, Training, Safety, Emergency Medical Services and Emergency Management. In 2011, the Fire Department responded to nearly 8000 calls, with about 55% of those calls for fire or other related emergencies. The Department responds to all calls in 6 minutes or less 98% of the time. There are five engine companies and three ladder companies manned and ready 24/7, under the direction of a Deputy Chief. Additional equipment includes: a Spartan Heavy Rescue, two spare pumpers and one spare ladder truck, Mask Service Unit and Mass Casualty Unit. Due to age, three engines are currently beyond service life and one tower ladder is at the end of its service life.

The Project Site is served by Fire Station 1, which is located approximately 0.4 miles away at 45 Harrison Street and is the largest fire house in New Rochelle, with 50 firefighters who serve across four shifts, five major vehicles, numerous support vehicles and a Fire Department maintenance shop. Station 1 received 2,800 calls in 2011, about 35% of the total calls for the year. Specific calls for the Project Site are unavailable, with one parcel vacant and not generating any calls. Existing access to the Project Site was confirmed by the Chief of the Fire Department currently to be adequate.

Each fire station has an assigned “EMS-Engine” and these resources are supplemented by a public contract with TransCare Ambulance Service. This contract provides for two ambulances in service 24/7, which are stationed at Fire Station 1 and Station 3, along with a third ambulance in service from 7:00 AM to midnight staged on Quaker Ridge Road. Approximately 45% of emergency calls received in 2011 by the Fire Department were for medical emergencies.

### b. Future Conditions Without the Project

Without the Project, the Fire Department indicated that future demand for fire and emergency services should be fairly stable, with current volume only experiencing slight increases. The Police Department did not provide specific information related to future conditions, but based upon telecommunications with the Department, it is expected that police services would also be stable with current volume.
c. Potential Impacts

(1) Ability of Service Providers to Handle Additional Calls for Service

(a) Police

The Project would increase the number of residents, employees and visitors at the Site. This could create the potential for an increased demand in services from the Police Department. However, the residential portion of the Project includes a 24-hour concierge and/or security guard in the main lobby. The New Rochelle Police Department indicated in a telecommunication\(^2\) that the addition of approximately 23,500 square feet of retail uses along the East Main Street commercial corridor and 285 new residential apartments would likely not be significant. Impacts on police services from the Project are expected to be minimal.

(b) Fire/Emergency Services

The New Rochelle Fire Department estimates\(^3\) it would respond to approximately 100 calls a year for the Project for all types of emergencies with dwelling units, retail space and the parking garage. Station 1 is currently expected to respond to approximately 3,000 calls this year prior to the development coming to fruition. It is estimated that the addition of new commercial and residential uses on the Project Site would include 100 new calls for service, which is just over 1\% of the total calls in the City and just over 3\% of the total calls for Station 1. The Fire Department also notes that the Project is located within the coastal Hurricane evacuation zone and would require evacuation and emergency shelter.

Although the Project would only increase the calls at Station 1 by just over 3\%, the Fire Department indicates that the cumulative impact of overall development in the Station 1 area would increase the need for increased Department resources. The Fire Department notes that Station 1 must be bolstered or would have a low availability rate. Station 2, the next closest firehouse at 170 Webster Avenue, would respond when needed but its response time would be longer.

The building would meet all construction code requirements for safety and would be sprinklered.

\(^2\) Telecommunication on August 23, 2012 with Capt. Kevin Kealy, Staff Services.
\(^3\) Letter communication from Chief Louis DiMeglio, dated August 14, 2012.
(2) **Public Safety Considerations Related to Commercial and Residential Land Uses and Pedestrian Walkway in Close Proximity of Westchester County Wastewater Treatment Plant**

The County’s Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) is located across an inlet to the southeast of the project site between the City Yard parcel and the Five Islands Park. The WWTP parcel is 13.8 acres and is currently undergoing improvements to the facility consistent with a 2008 Consent Order with the NYSDEC in relation to enforcement of the Federal Clean Water Act. The WWTP has long been part of the neighborhood and single-family residential neighborhoods, Salesian High School campus and Five Islands Park all currently exist in this area. The Project includes commercial and residential land uses and a proposed pedestrian bridge to provide connection between the Echo Bay waterfront esplanade and Five Islands Park via the WWTP parcel and LeFevres Lane. The Project would be in close proximity to the WWTP, with views of the facility to the southeast. Currently, a line of mature trees buffer the southwest edge of the WWTP parcel to limit seasonal views of the facility. The site plans for the WWTP improvements illustrate a pathway along the northern edge of the parcel delineated by a decorative fence. Given the many commercial and residential developments within proximity of the WWTP, and the existing pedestrian access to Five Islands Park via LeFevres Lane, it is not expected that the Project would be incompatible with the facility or have any concerns related to public safety.

d. **Mitigation Measures**

The impact on police 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.

2. **Solid Waste (Department of Public Works – Solid Waste Bureau)**

a. **Existing Conditions**

The New Rochelle Department of Public Works (DPW) employs 115 staff members across ten departments including: engineering, streets and highways, sewers and drains, forestry, refuse collection, traffic services, properties and grounds, police/court facility, city hall, and the central garage. The adopted budget for 2012 is $19.8M of which approximately 30% is allocated towards waste collection and disposal, 20% is allocated towards streets and highways, and 7% is allocated towards sewers and drains⁴.

⁴ Source: City website, [www.newrochelleny.com](http://www.newrochelleny.com)
(1) **Existing Solid Waste and Recycling Collection**  
The Bureau of Sanitation is responsible for solid waste and recycling in the City of New Rochelle. Forty-four individuals are employed by the City of New Rochelle for duties that relate to refuse collection for private residences, some commercial establishments and apartment buildings. The majority of commercial refuse is collected by private carting firms.

### b. Future Conditions Without the Project

Without the Project, solid waste and recycling impacts to the existing Armory parcel and City Yard parcel would be limited to those associated with continued use of the City Yard parcel by the Department of Public Works for work activity, and any future development of the Armory building as part of the City’s RFP process.

### c. Potential Impacts

#### (1) Projected Solid Waste Generation and Proposed Waste Collection

The Project is expected to generate approximately 30 tons of solid waste per month.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Component</th>
<th>Generation Rate(^5)</th>
<th>Number(^6)</th>
<th>Solid Waste (tons) Per Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>0.00175 tons/day/ resident</td>
<td>524 residents</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail/Restaurant/Residential Management</td>
<td>0.001 tons/day/ employee</td>
<td>68 employees</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>--</strong></td>
<td><strong>--</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A private carting company would be contracted by the Applicant to collect and dispose of all solid waste generated by the Project for both the residential and commercial components, and would transfer the waste to an approved disposal and/or recycling facility. Solid waste generated by the project would be separated and processed according to applicable current regulations.

#### d. Potential Mitigation Measures

The solid waste collection and disposal for the Project would be handled by a private carting company and no impacts to the City’s Bureau of Sanitation is expected. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

---

\(^6\) See Socioeconomic and Fiscal Impacts Analysis, prepared by Milone & MacBroom, Appendix 9.
3. **Schools**

   **a. Existing Conditions**

   According to information provided on the New Rochelle School District website ([http://www.nred.org/home.aspx](http://www.nred.org/home.aspx)), the New Rochelle City School District serves the Project Site and consists of one preschool, six elementary schools, two middle schools, and one high school. As of the 2011-12 school year, there were approximately 10,992 total students and total 1,298 staff members in the district. Projected district enrollment for the 2012-13 school year is 11,069, and over the last ten years enrollment has increased by an average of 77 students.

   The 2012-13 proposed budget is $234,175,000, with the total expenditures per student at approximately $21,156. Program costs account for approximately $178,961,000 of the total budget. The remainder of the budget includes administrative ($23,858,000) and capital expenditures ($31,356,000) expenditures. The program expenditure per student is approximately $16,168. Real property taxes account for 79.3% ($185,767,000) of the budget and State Aid accounts for 12.7% ($29,780,000) of the budget.

   Recent capital improvements have included a new wing constructed in 2004 at the New Rochelle High School, as well as playgrounds constructed at Trinity, Davis and Jefferson Elementary schools in 2008 and a few emergency projects at New Rochelle High School in the same year.

   **(1) School District Capacities and Enrollment**

   The neighborhood elementary school for the Project is Trinity Elementary School. Approximately 830 students are projected for the 2012-13 year. The middle school for the Project is Isaac E. Young Middle School. The high school for all New Rochelle residents is New Rochelle High School, which provides 9-12 instruction. Projected enrollments for the middle school and high school were not provided by the District.

   In a meeting with School District representatives on August 22, 2012, general overall capacities were provided: Trinity Elementary, 800 students; Isaac E. Young,
1,100-1,200 students; and New Rochelle High School, 3,500-3,600 students. Additionally, total District enrollment for the 2012-13 was estimated to be 10,800 students, which is approximately 269 students less than the 11,069 projected in the 2012-13 Proposed Budget. The School District representatives indicated that Trinity Elementary is at its maximum capacity in its existing condition.

The enrollment history at Trinity Elementary over the past eight years is shown below:

Table No. IV.I-2: Trinity Elementary Enrollment History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>856</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. **Future Conditions Without the Project**
Without the Project, the City of New Rochelle and the neighborhoods surrounding the proposed development site would continue to change and evolve. Estimated data for 2011 and projected data for 2016, the assumed year when the project would be fully on-line, were gathered to demonstrate the full spectrum of demographic changes projected to occur at this variety of geographic levels during the next five years. See *Socioeconomic and Fiscal Impacts Analysis*, Appendix 9. Based upon the demographic analysis prepared for the area surrounding the Project (Census Tract 59.02 and Block Group 1), demographic characteristics may change during the next few years. By 2016, both Census Tract 59.02 and Block Group 1 are projected to lose -9.4% of their respective populations, and over 10% of their resident family households. In addition, over 12% projected decreases in residents age 0 to 19 would help hasten the aging of the underlying local population.

The demographic projections for residents age 0-19 in Census Tract 59.02 show a reduction of 121 children (997 in 2011 and 876 in 2016) and in Block Group 1 a reduction in 65 children (529 in 2011 and 464 in 2016). These projections show a trend that the population cohort that includes school age children (5-17) in the Project Site area is declining over the next few years.
c. **Potential Impacts**

(1) **Estimate of School-Age Children To Be Generated from the Project**

The Project includes a total of 285 dwelling units in a rental apartment building. Of the 285 units, 71 would be studio apartments, 137 would be one-bedroom apartments and 77 would be two-bedroom apartments. There would be no three-bedroom apartments in the project. Using industry standard demographic multipliers for public school children (private school children are not included in the calculation), approximately 22 public school students would be generated by the Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedroom Count</th>
<th>No. of Units</th>
<th>School Children Multiplier</th>
<th>No. of School Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Bedroom</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Bedroom</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>285</strong></td>
<td><strong>--</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, an increase in 22 total public school students would be minimal to a school district with 11,069 students (projected in the 2012-13 Proposed Budget). With a District enrollment of 11,069, 22 additional students would increase overall enrollment by 0.2%. Based on consultation with the School District representatives, it was estimated that 2/3 of the estimated students would likely be in elementary school and 1/3 of the students in the middle and high schools. Therefore, approximately 15 students would attend Trinity Elementary’s six grades (K-5), with approximately 2.5 students spread across each grade level. Approximately seven students would attend grades 6-12, with approximately one new student per grade level.

(2) **School Enrollments and Expenditures**

As noted above, the demographic projections for residents age 0-19 in Census Tract 59.02 and Block Group 1 show a reduction of 121 children and 65 children, respectively. These 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. Even at Trinity Elementary School, the addition of 15 new elementary students to the current projected 830 students for the 2012-13 school year would yield a total of 845 students. As shown above in Table No. IV.I-2, *Trinity Elementary Enrollment*

---

11 Rutgers University, Center for Urban Policy Research, "Residential Demographic Multipliers," June 2006; compiled by MMI.
12 For the purpose of school children analysis, it is assumed that studio apartments would generate no public school students.
History, 845 students is lower than the peak of 881 in 2003-04 and lower than the more recent enrollments of 856 students in 2009-11.

Based on the average cost per student described above ($21,156), the cost to educate the estimated 22 project-generated public school children would be approximately $465,400. However, in consultation with the School District, a marginal cost figure per new student equal to $17,500 was provided to the Applicant’s consultant, resulting in estimated 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 to the City School District (See Table 31, Net Fiscal Impact, in Socioeconomic and Fiscal Impacts Analysis located in Appendix 9 and DEIS Section IV-H for anticipated tax generation by district), the cost associated with educating the children in the Project would be paid by the proposed development. Therefore, no adverse impacts are expected from the Project.

In the Socioeconomic and Fiscal Impacts Analysis (See Appendix 9 for technical report and DEIS Section IV.H for summary), the Applicant also analyzed the fiscal impacts under a payment in lieu of taxes (PILOT) scenario. The scenario assumes a payment amount 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. In 2014, it is assumed that all of the permit fees for the development 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 (see Table 32, Annual Net Fiscal Impact-PILOT Scenario, in Appendix 9).

d. **Potential Mitigation Measures**

The Project would generate a minimal number of new public school students and result in no significant adverse impacts to the School District. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

4. **Open Space**

a. **Existing Conditions**

New Rochelle has approximately 1,248 acres (18.8% of total land use) that are substantially natural state, 1,073 of which includes open space or recreation. The Department of Parks and Recreation manages the 12 larger parks and 9 smaller neighborhood parks that comprise the system in addition to the management of
rental facilities available as well as programs, among which include an after-school program, athletics, dance, and a full-day camp. Parks that are in close proximity to the proposed site are Five Islands Park, Stephenson Park, Hudson Park, Davenport Park, Aiello Park, and Liberty Park. The 2012 adopted budget for Parks and Recreation is approximately $3.3M and the Department currently employees approximately 14 staff members.

(1) On-Site and Nearby Open Space Resources

(a) On Site Open Space

The Project Site includes the City Yard and Armory parcels, neither of which currently provides public open space.

(b) Nearby Open Space

Within close proximity of the Project Site, there are a number of parks and other open space features, including indoor and outdoor rental facilities, listed below:

**Municipal Marina** – offers 350 boat slips, 150 moorings, and kayak storage. Services include launching and hauling; winter boat storage; and mobile and stationary marine pump-out services. The NRM offers dockage to New York City, which is a 20-minute train commute, and its fuel dock operates extended hours Memorial Day to Labor Day, delivering Valvtec Marine Grade products. Transient boaters are allowed. It is the only clean green and ADA-accessible facility in the Sound Shore Area and offers both daily and weekly rates.

**Five Islands Park** – located off LeFevres Lane, the park covers 15 acres. It has a large grassy area, sunbather’s beach, picnic areas, pavilion, large children’s play area with equipment, outdoor amphitheater, shuffleboard, horseshoe courts, and areas for nature walks. A pedestrian bridge links Big and Little Harrison Islands to the main Oakwood Island. This park has barbecue pits, picnic tables, benches, an open air pavilion and a dock for fishing on the half-acre Big Harrison Island. Other amenities include a playground, public restrooms, and a walking track.

**Five Islands Harrison Island Pavilion**

This covered outdoor pavilion is located across two pedestrian bridges with a view overlooking Long Island Sound. It has six to eight 8-foot tables with benches and four stationary grills of outdoor cooking. It is also within walking distance of children’s play area and restrooms. Harrison Island Pavilion accommodates 40 people or less.
Five Islands Indoor Pavilion
This is an indoor facility overlooking the Long Island Sound and accommodates 80 people or less in accordance with Fire Department regulations. It is located near the bathrooms and the children's play area.

Five Islands Main Outdoor Pavilion
This is a covered outdoor picnic pavilion. Six to eight sturdy 8-foot tables with benches accommodate 80 people or less. Grill areas #7 and #8 are included in the pavilion area. Four stationary grills are available for use.

Stephenson Park – located on Stephenson Boulevard and Lyons Place. It contains playground equipment, a basketball court, a walking path, flower garden and benches.

Hudson Park – located in the South End on Hudson Park Road. It features a grassy recreation area with a cameo playground, a music bandshell, seating areas, bathing, beaches and parking. Parking fees are in effect from Memorial Day Weekend thru Labor Day.

Hudson Beach – located in Hudson Park and is open from Memorial Day weekend through Labor Day. The beach is opened weekends only in June and every day from Monday, June 25th thru Monday, September 3rd from 10:00 AM to 6:00 PM.

Davenport Park – located on Davenport Avenue. This is a 20-acre passive recreation area overlooking the Long Island Sound. Compatible activities include sunbathing, walking, sitting or reading a book. The site contains a Shakespeare Garden. Across from Davenport Park, is a bird sanctuary with more than 50 species of birds.

Aiello Park – located adjacent to Trinity Elementary school and is bordered by Church Street to the West.

Liberty Park – a small park located in Residence Park Neighborhood, just south of Sutton Manor, between Pelham Road and Hudson Park Road.

b. Future Conditions Without the Project
Without the Project, impacts to the existing Armory parcel and City Yard parcel would be limited to those associated with continued use of the City Yard parcel by the Department of Public Works for work activity, and any future development of the Armory building as part of the City’s RFP process. Echo Bay Center includes the cleanup and restoration of the Echo Bay shoreline and the creation of a public
waterfront esplanade with the pedestrian-oriented Echo Bay Walk providing physical public access to the waterfront. None of these open space amenities would be provided without the Project.

c. **Potential Impacts**

(1) **New Private and Publicly Accessible Open Spaces**

The Project includes the creation of the Echo Bay Walk esplanade and adjoining landscaped areas. These areas would represent new public open space that currently does not exist on 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 walkway. The pedestrian walkway winds its way around the Project Site and connects to a pathway in the center of the Site with access to the public waterfront parking area, the Armory building and back out to East Main Street via Armory Place. The pathway is shown ending at the west boundary of the Armory parcel to provide future pedestrian connections to the west. Private open space uses for the mixed use building would be the resident pool and terrace and private resident balconies.

Public amenities along the esplanade include: pedestrian bridge connection to the WWTP parcel for a future pedestrian path connection to Five Islands Park, public seating areas, walkway connections to public parking area to be constructed on the Armory parcel, and a small non-motorized boat launch dock. Proposed plantings would provide a park-like setting to the visitors of the open space area and Echo Bay Walk. Proposed plantings are generally located on the northern side of the Echo Bay Walk so as to provide unobscured views of the Bay. Groupings of shade and ornamental trees are proposed along a gentle berm between the proposed building and the Echo Bay Walk, 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.

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 Echo Bay Center with Five Islands Park may be possible and would require coordination between the City and Westchester County.

It is expected that the public open space and esplanade, along with associated lighting, parking and other amenities would be built by the Applicant as part of the Project, then dedicated to the City as public land and maintained by the City in the future.
The Project Site is currently owned by the City of New Rochelle, but does not have any public open space or waterfront access. The Project includes a significant amount of public open space and waterfront access that would provide city residents and visitors both physical and visual access to this portion of Echo Bay from East Main Street for the first time in decades. As a result, the Project is not expected to have an adverse impact on open space resources, and no additional mitigation measures are required.
J. HISTORIC AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES
J. HISTORIC AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

This section of the DEIS describes the history of the Project Site and the character of the surrounding area in order to assess whether the proposed Project would have any significant impact on historic and/or archaeological resources. This section also provides a summary of the Phase 1A Literature Review prepared in July 2012. The Phase 1A report, along with all photos and maps associated with the archaeological resources analyses, is located in Appendix 10 of this DEIS. The Phase 1A report identifies a small vegetated portion (approximately 1.5 acres) of the Armory site in the southwest corner of the property as having historic potential. The Phase 1A report recommended a Phase 1B Archaeological Field Reconnaissance Survey for this area, which was completed in October 2012. The Phase 1B End of Field Letter is located at the end of Appendix 10.

The Armory parcel is located at 260-70 East Main Street and is owned by the City of New Rochelle, which acquired it in 1997 from New York State. The parcel houses the main Armory drill hall, administrative block (also known as the “Annex”) and several outbuildings. The New Rochelle Armory is one of many armories built in New York State between the 1880s and the 1940s to serve the state’s militia. The construction of armories typically followed a pattern, with armories built in the later years of the 19th century and the early years of the 20th century including two-part buildings consisting of administrative blocks and attached drill sheds. The cornerstone of the New Rochelle Armory indicates that the building was begun in 1931, but it appears that the construction was not completed until 1933, when the Armory became the permanent home of the 31st Fleet Division of the New York Naval Militia. Unlike many armories built in New York State, where the Annex is incorporated into the main building, at the New Rochelle Armory the Annex is a structure attached to the left side of the entrance tower. The Annex is an unadorned two-story structure with rectangular windows on both floors.

In May 2012, the City prepared a Request for Proposals (RFP) for the reuse of the Armory facility and invited interested groups to submit creative visions and 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 were reviewed by the City Council. At its September 19, 2012 meeting, the City Council selected “Good Profit,” the sponsor of a proposed local food marketplace with restaurants. In November, 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. Upon the expiration of the six-month time period, Good Profit is required to submit a detailed site plan, analysis of public costs and benefits and a detailed financing program to the City. The development program and site plan for the Armory has not been finalized at this time. It is noted that the Good Profit proposal would require its own separate environmental analysis under the State Environmental Quality Review Act. A copy of the July 20, 2012 Good Profit proposal is located in Appendix 13 for reference.
1. **Existing Conditions**

   **a. Historic and Archaeological Resources**
   As part of the initial research for the Phase 1A literature review, CITY/SCAPE: Cultural Resource Consultants performed visual inspections of the Project Site and consulted archaeological site maps and files housed at the Peebles Island Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP) office. In addition, historical maps housed at the Westchester County Archives and online resources located in the David Rumsey Historic Map Collection, the New York Public Library Digital Collection and the University of New Hampshire Digital Collection Initiative were also consulted. The Phase 1A report, along with all photos and maps associated with its analysis, is located in Appendix 10 of this DEIS.

   **b. Environmental Information**
   The two parcels comprising the project site have been altered to a great degree over their history. The Echo Bay Center development area was once the location of the confluence of a stream that flowed through Crystal Lake and the Long Island Sound, but, since that time, the lake and the stream have both been filled. The soil contained within the project area is categorized as Urban Land and, as such, is not considered to have prehistoric archaeological potential. In terms of foliage, although the development area is located within the Appalachian Oak zone, the site is characterized by buildings, asphalt parking areas, concrete, gravel, mown lawns and a small number of deciduous and evergreen plantings. With respect to elevation, the site ranges from about 32 feet above mean sea level to 8 feet above mean sea level and the southern portion of the property contains steep slopes that descend from 26 feet above mean sea level to 9 feet above mean sea level.

   **c. Methodology**

   **(1) National Register of Historic Places**
   No buildings on the project site are currently listed on the National Register of Historic Places. During the site assessment, the Historic and Archaeological consultant evaluated the buildings on the project site in order to determine whether any of the buildings on or in the vicinity of the Echo Bay Center development area meet the criteria for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The visual inspection of the project site and vicinity indicates that none of the buildings on the project site meet the established criteria for listing on the National Register.

   The OPRHP website was consulted to determine if any properties on or adjacent to the project area are listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Acting on behalf of CITY/SCAPE, Croshier Archeological Research also completed on-site file

---

1 [http://www.nps.gov/nr/regulations.htm](http://www.nps.gov/nr/regulations.htm)
research at OPRHP to identify historic and prehistoric archaeological sites located in the vicinity of the project area. The Boston Post Road Memorial Monument (A119.42.00929), which stands in Faneuil Park across Main Street opposite the New Rochelle Armory, is considered eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Additionally, the Davenport Park Prehistoric Site (A119.42.00318) located on the south side of Davenport Neck (approximately 0.75 miles from the Project Site) is considered eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

Other New Rochelle buildings or structures determined to be National Register eligible include: Trinity Church (A119.42.00766), located at 311 Huguenot Street, and the Trinity/Huguenot Memorial (A119/42/00765), located in the cemetery of Trinity Church. The investigation did not identify any structures on or in the vicinity of the Echo Bay Center site that are listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Of the historic sites described above, the Project Site is only visible from the Boston Post Road Memorial Monument.

(2) **Pre-Historic Potential of Echo Bay Center Site**

There are seven sites within a mile of the project site that have prehistoric significance. According to the evaluation by the Historic and Archaeological consultant, none of the seven sites would be impacted by the proposed project. Prehistorically, the project area was located at the confluence of a stream that flowed through Crystal Lake (now filled) and Long Island Sound. If the project site had remained undisturbed, the location at a confluence of a stream and Long Island Sound would have increased the sensitivity of the project site, and it could have a high potential to contain a prehistoric site or sites. However, the potential for the Echo Bay Center project site to contain prehistoric cultural material has been greatly diminished by the construction over the past century of numerous buildings, parking areas and infrastructure throughout the Armory and City Yard parcels. Given the level of disturbance that has taken place on the site, the prehistoric potential of the Echo Bay site is considered to be low.

(3) **Historic Potential of Echo Bay Center Site**

There are three historic structures that were identified within a mile radius of the site including: the Boston Post Road Monument, the Trinity/Huguenot Memorial and the Trinity Church. However, the Boston Post Road Monument is the only historic structure that potentially would be impacted, and the impacts would be solely visual in nature. Due to distance and the intervening buildings, neither Trinity Church nor the Trinity/Huguenot Monument would be impacted by the Echo Bay Center.

Within the Echo Bay Center project site, the alterations to the land surface that have resulted from its significant development history over the last century represent profound disturbance and therefore, greatly diminish its historic potential.
d. **Assessment of Sensitivity ("Stage 1A" Study) - Site Parcels and Buildings**

(1) **Armory Building and Site**

The Armory parcel houses the main Armory drill hall, Annex and several outbuildings. The New Rochelle Armory and Annex where constructed in 1933 based upon the building cornerstone, and the site currently contains three associated structures including a structure that contains former military classroom space, a garage, and a structure, to the south, of unknown use. The Armory and its associated structures occupy land originally owned by L.D. Huntington. As of 1914, the eastern portion of the Huntington subdivision was acquired by Louisa A. Davids in conjunction with a parcel from John Stevenson, which encompassed the current Department of Public Works site. In the late 1800s, there were three buildings located on the southern portion of the site, but the only remaining signs of this prior use are two granite gateposts by the entrance to the Armory access drive and, potentially, the terrace that is supported by a stone wall.

The Armory is one of many armories built in New York State between the 1880s and 1940s to serve the state’s militia, and one of the few Naval Armories built in the United States. The Armory drill hall and Annex are situated on a terrace that overlooks East Main Street (Boston Post Road). The terrace is supported by a stone wall that, like the granite gateposts that mark the driveway, is likely associated with the Louisa A. David’s house. Two flights of concrete steps lead from the street to the main entrance to the New Rochelle Armory, a square tower with a level roof topped by a flag pole. The tower is minimally decorated with its Gothic antecedents. Unlike many armories built in New York State, where the Annex is incorporated into the main building, the New Rochelle Armory Annex is located in a structure attached to the left side of the entrance tower. The Annex is an unadorned two-story structure with rectangular windows on both floors, the lower windows being protected by metal grilles; the grilles provide protection for the building, but are also one of the characteristics of this architectural type. The drill shed is located to the right of the entrance tower block.

The original facilities in the main drill hall building included a rifle range, a radio room, and a barrel-vaulted drill deck that doubled as a gymnasium. Between 1942 and 1951, the metal clad classroom was added as a separate structure, on the north side of the drill shed. The garage was constructed after 1951. However, the overall conditions throughout the main building are poor, particularly the Annex classrooms, officer’s rooms and lounges, and include deteriorated walls and collapsed ceilings. The other buildings on the site lack any type of architectural distinction and the southern portion of the site is overgrown with weeds and wildflowers. All
structures are considered by the consultant to be unremarkable at present, and the main buildings are in need of considerable rehabilitation.

(2) **Department of Public Works Buildings and Site**
By 1931, the Department of Public Works (DPW) was located on its current site. Since that time, the site has accommodated a variety of light industrial land uses. Prior to this occupation, two dwelling and several outbuildings were located throughout the David’s property, which comprises the current Armory and DPW sites. By 1951, both houses had been demolished and the Municipal Garage constructed. Today there are additional buildings on the southern portion of the DPW parcel, one of which would be in the location of the Louisa A. David’s dwelling. The western portion of the site, some of which is used for parking and vehicle storage, is fenced. Historic maps indicated that there were no structures located on eastern portion of the DPW parcel prior to the yellow brick buildings seen on the Sanborn maps. There were two dwellings and several outbuildings located on the David’s property but, given the level of disturbance that has taken place on the DPW parcel, it is considered unlikely that evidence of these structures or shaft features associated with them would remain. The buildings under use by the DPW are not considered to be architecturally significant.

2. **Future Conditions Without the Project**

   Without the Project, impacts to the existing Armory parcel and City Yard parcel would be limited to those associated with continued use of the City Yard parcel by the Department of Public Works for work activity, and any future development of the Armory buildings as part of the City’s RFP process.

3. **Potential Impacts**

   The proposed Project consists of the development of a mixed-use residential and retail building and associated parking on the current City Yard parcel. In addition, the Project includes the waterfront public improvements on the City Yard parcel and a portion of the Armory parcel, along with the creation of Armory Place drive and public parking to access the public waterfront improvements and esplanade. The Project retains all of the buildings on the Armory parcel with the exception of the metal shed and a small storage structure behind the annex building. The Project includes the creation of Armory Place, a new driveway from East Main Street to provide both visual and physical access to the Echo Bay waterfront and public parking for the waterfront amenities. In order to provide efficient access that can be shared by both the proposed Project’s mixed-use commercial/residential building and the existing Armory and Annex buildings (with its associated potential future redevelopment), as well as provide public parking for the waterfront, the removal of the metal shed and storage structure behind the Annex building would be required. These two buildings are currently vacant with no historic or archaeological significance.
a. **Potential Removal of the Armory Annex Building**

The Applicant has met with representatives of Good Profit to explore ways in which the Good Profit site plan can be coordinated with the Applicant’s site plan. However, the Good Profit development program is not yet certain, and the site plan for that parcel has not yet been finalized. Good Profit has indicated its desire to retain the Armory Annex building. Neither the retention nor the removal of the Annex building would impact the Applicant’s proposed Project. However, removal of the Annex building would permit a wider boulevard driveway and a greater viewshed to Echo Bay from Main Street. The removal of the Annex is an Alternative to the Project evaluated in Section V of this DEIS.

In order to accommodate a wider entrance drive and viewshed at Armory Place, Alternative B includes the removal of the Armory Annex building and the shed located behind the Annex on the Armory parcel. The main Armory building would not be altered as part of Alternative B. 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 Applicant’s historic and archaeological consultant has indicated is not expected that the removal of the Annex block would have significant adverse impacts on historic resources.

Both the Phase 1A Literature Review and Sensitivity Analysis and Phase 1B Archaeological Field Reconnaissance Survey have been forwarded to OPRHP for review. Since the Amory buildings are owned by the City and not listed on the National Register of Historic Places, there is no special approval process for removal of the deteriorated portions of the Armory that include the annex and metal storage shed.

b. **Potential Impacts on Any Other Historic and/or Archaeological Resources**

(1) **Pre-Historic Sites**

The portion of the Echo Bay Center project site where the Armory is sited is located on land that was formerly the confluence of a stream flowing from the north through Crystal Lake (now filled) into the Sound. The confluence of streams has been found to be extremely sensitive for prehistoric cultural resources. If the Echo Bay Center project site had been an undisturbed site, the potential of the property to contain prehistoric cultural resources would be considered high. However, virtually none of the land associated with the Echo Bay Center site remains undisturbed, and, for this reason, it is considered unlikely that intact soil strata exist on the property. For those reasons, the prehistoric potential of the property is ranked as low, and as such it is not expected that the Project would have any significant adverse impacts on Pre-Historic resources.
(2) Historic Sites

Based upon review of historic maps, it appears several Map Documented Structures were located on the property. The earliest map indicates that an ice house was located on the west side of the stream that formerly flowed out of Crystal Lake. Evidence of this structure will have been impacted by the construction of the New Rochelle Armory, and it is not expected that any intact resources associated with the ice house remain on the Echo Bay Center site.

In addition to the ice house, there were two dwellings and numerous outbuildings located on the western portion of the site. Although development has taken place on this portion of the property, it is considered possible that evidence of the houses and shaft features associated with them might be located in the southern portion of the Echo Bay Center site (southwest portion of the Armory parcel). Approximately 1.58 acres on the southwest portion of the Armory property is considered to have the potential to contain evidence of these two houses and outbuildings that were once constructed on the site. Therefore, the Historic and Archaeological consultant recommends a Phase 1B Archeological Field Reconnaissance survey for that portion of the Armory parcel in order to determine if these resources exist. The Phase 1B Archeological Field Reconnaissance survey was concluded on October 10, 2012. Modern trash, including metal, glass, and cement was recovered throughout the area tested in the Phase 1B survey. The condition of the site was determined to be profoundly disturbed. See “End of Field Letter – Phase 1B Archaeological Field Reconnaissance Survey” at the end of this section.

4. Potential Mitigation Measures

The proposed Project has been designed to retain the main barrel-vaulted Armory building, entrance tower, annex building and outbuilding along the water’s edge with the proposed Echo Bay Center mixed-use building on the Project Site. The main Armory buildings would remain, and could be re-used in a manner consistent with the City’s approved redevelopment proposal. In order to accommodate Armory Place and provide efficient vehicular access from Main Street, the proposed Project would include the removal of the metal shed and small storage structure located behind the Annex on the Armory parcel. These two buildings are currently vacant with no historic or archaeological significance. As discussed above, the removal of the these two building is not expected to have significant adverse impacts on archaeological or historic resources on the Project Site, and would have the positive benefits of permitting a shared access drive between the Armory and the proposed mixed-use building and visual access to the waterfront. Therefore, no additional mitigation measures are required.

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.

A small portion of the Echo Bay waterfront esplanade is proposed for the southwest corner of the Armory site, where limited site disturbance has occurred. A Phase 1B Archeological Field Reconnaissance survey for that portion of the Armory parcel has been completed and an End of Field Letter prepared (located at the end of Appendix 10). The condition of the site was determined to be profoundly disturbed. Based on the historic and archaeological consultant’s findings, no additional archaeological work is warranted and the proposed Project would have no impacts on archaeological resources.
K. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS
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K. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS (ENVIRONMENTAL SITE CONDITIONS)

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Phase I) was performed by Roux Associates, Inc. on the City Yard and Armory parcels in July 2012. The Phase I was performed in accordance with the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process, published November, 2005. The activities performed during the Phase I included:

- A reconnaissance of the Site;
- A search of federal, state and local environmental and regulatory databases;
- A search for Environmental Liens and Activity Use Limitations;
- A review of previously completed environmental reports;
- Review of Environmental Data Resources, Inc. (EDR) Radius Map Report (06/22/12);
- A search of the historical City Directories conducted by EDR;
- An inquiry to a person knowledgeable of the property and the local health department.

Appendix 7 includes the Phase 1 Environmental Reports for the City Yard and Armory parcels. The following is a summary of Recognized Environmental Conditions (REC) identified on the Project Site.

1. Existing Conditions

The City Yard parcel was occupied by a boat yard in 1911, and has operated as a Department of Public Works facility from 1917 through the present day. The facility included a sewage disposal plant that operated from 1926 until circa 1955, which 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 Armory parcel was historically used as an armory and training ground for servicemen and included a shooting range and a facility for 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. The following are summaries of the RECs identified in relation to the current uses and historic uses of City Yard and Armory parcels, as well as surrounding properties’ current and historic land uses.

a. Historic Uses

The City Yard property contained a sewage disposal plant from 1926 to about 1955 and several of the current buildings were formerly used for vehicle repair. The
Armory site was utilized as a training ground, training site for the Fire Department, a site for movie screenings, and a staging area for fleet vehicles and construction equipment. These prior uses utilized hazardous substances or petroleum products and thus, contribute to potential existence of these materials in the subsurface of the Site. Based on the information gathered as a result of the Phase I ESA process, Roux Associates has identified the following Historical REC (HREC) in connection with the Site.

(1) **HREC – Armory Parcel**
The release on the ground and into a storm sewer drain of approximately 25 gallons of No.2 fuel oil as a result of a tank overfill dated March 16, 2001 (NYSDEC spill #00-13171) is the only HREC identified on the Project Site. Approximately 12 tons of contaminated soil were excavated and disposed offsite. The spill was closed on March 9, 2004. Based on information contained in a prior Phase 1 Environmental Report (EDR, see Appendix 7 CD), this spill incident was remediated by the responsible party and apparently did not adversely impact groundwater at the Site. In addition, based on the age of the spill and the reported connection of the Site to the municipal sewer, this HREC is no longer considered a REC.

b. **Environmental Conditions – Armory Parcel**
Prior uses on the Armory parcel have contributed to potential contamination of the subsurface media. Based on the information gathered as a result of the Phase I ESA process, Roux Associates identified the following RECs in connection with the Armory Site:

(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.

(6) **Additional Conditions Not Categorized as RECs – Armory Parcel**  
Although not technically defined as RECs, the following is a list of potential environmental concerns at the Site that could potentially impact subsurface conditions at the Armory parcel:

- The Site is underlain by historic/urban fill material, the origin and environmental quality of which is unknown. In particular, a small strip of land was made from fill material placed along Echo Bay, including at the location of the existing pier in the southeast corner of the Site.
- Construction and demolition debris was found in the western region of the Site, to the south of the Drill Deck. No documentation was provided for the environmental quality of this debris.

### c. **Environmental Conditions – City Yard Parcel**

Both historic and current uses on the City Yard parcel have contributed to potential contamination of the subsurface media. Current uses were found to contribute to potential contamination, particularly on the City Yard parcel, since the Armory parcel has not been in active use for a number of years. Current on-site use for vehicle repair continues to contribute to potential environmental risks. Infrastructure that contributes 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. Based on the information gathered as a result of the Phase I ESA process, Roux Associates identified the following RECs in connection with the Armory Site:
(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**
At the following locations, staining indicative of a release of petroleum products or hazardous substances was observed:

1. On the concrete floor underneath the oil burner’s oil filter, in the basement of the Bureau of Streets and Highways office building. The concrete floor at that location was cracked and in poor condition.
2. On the concrete pad and underlying pavement of the outdoor gasoline storage shed abutting the stock room.
3. On the concrete floor around the southernmost of two oil burners located in the boiler room in the rear (west) of the bureau of sanitation offices. The concrete floor at that location was cracked and in poor condition.
4. On the ground at the location of an outdoor drum storage area (which also includes several one-gallon containers and associated spillage nearby). Grade at that location consisted at one time of the concrete floor of a building, now razed and overgrown with vegetation, making the concrete at that location cracked and easily permeated.

(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). This is indicative of petroleum product in on-site subsurface media. 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 material 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.
(9) **Additional Conditions Not Categorized as RECs – City Yard Parcel**

Although not technically defined as RECs, the following is a list of potential environmental concerns at the Site that could potentially impact subsurface conditions at the City Yard parcel:

- The Site is underlain by historic/urban fill material whose origin and environmental quality is unknown. In particular, a strip of fill material, approximately 50 feet wide, accreted along Echo Bay at or around the time of construction of the existing vehicle repair garage.
- A large amount of soil and debris has been placed between the recycling yard and the vehicle storage garage. No documentation was provided for the environmental quality of this debris.
- *De minimis* staining resulting from poor housekeeping was observed in the vehicle repair garage and throughout the outdoor paved and unpaved areas, including those used for the staging of fleet vehicles.

2. **Future Conditions Without the Project**

Without the Project, the City Yard and Armory parcels would likely remain in their current conditions. 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. If no action is taken, these conditions would persist.

3. **Potential Impacts**

A Phase II Investigation is recommended to further examine the RECs identified for both the City Yard and Armory parcels, and the Phase II would be completed prior to the submission of the FEIS.

a. **Impacts Relating to Demolition of Buildings or Remediation of Other Areas of Concern Identified in the Phase I Environmental Assessment**

(1) **Armory Parcel**

A Phase II Investigation is recommended to further examine the RECs identified for the City Armory property, and would be completed prior to the submission of the FEIS. The investigation would include sampling of subsurface media (soil, groundwater and potentially soil vapor) on the property and fill material along Echo Bay. It is also recommended that the environmental quality of the construction and demolition debris in the western region of the Site be assessed as part of the Investigation in an attempt to determine appropriate removal and disposal options. It is also recommended that prior to and/or during redevelopment of the property,
proper characterization and disposal of stored chemicals be performed. As noted, access was not gained to some areas of the property during the site reconnaissance. As such, it is also recommended that access be obtained to those areas in an attempt to determine if additional RECs are present. If additional RECs are identified, then the Phase II Investigation could be refined accordingly to address them.

(2) **City Yard Parcel**

A Phase II Investigation is recommended to further examine the RECs identified for the City Yard property. The investigation would include sampling of subsurface media (soil, groundwater and potentially soil vapor) on the property. It is also recommended that investigation and characterization of fill material on the Site, in particular a strip of fill material, approximately 50 feet wide, accreted along Echo Bay, be performed. It is also recommended that prior to and/or during redevelopment of the property, proper characterization and disposal of stored chemicals and drums be performed.

As noted, access was not gained to the overgrown strip of land along the rear (west) exterior wall of the northernmost buildings during the site reconnaissance. As such, it is recommended that access be obtained to that area in an attempt to determine if additional RECs are present. If additional RECs are identified, then the Phase II Investigation could be refined accordingly to address them.

At least three spills (i.e., one recent and two that appear not to have been addressed since 2007) remain open for the City Yard. As part of the Phase II Investigation, it is recommended that further investigation and evaluation of these spills be conducted. Based on the results of the Phase II Investigation, the need for remedial action would be evaluated.

(3) **Limited Access Areas During Phase I Site Reconnaissance**

Several areas of the Armory parcel were not accessible during the site reconnaissance visit. Those which include the small building located off the southwest corner of the Drill Deck, the truck trailer staged in the eastern central region of the Site, and most of the southern region of the Site, which was overgrown with vegetation, would require investigation during the Phase II investigation.

On the City Yard parcels, overgrown vegetation did not allow for the inspection of a strip of land along the rear (west) exterior wall of the northernmost buildings (i.e., those buildings used as a locker room, stock room, and storage room) during the site reconnaissance visit.
4. **Potential Mitigation Measures**

   **a. Potential Remediation Measures**
   Building demolition would be undertaken in a systematic fashion, in accordance with the Construction Schedule and Phasing (see Appendix 11). As part of that process, measures such as detailed investigations for lead paint, asbestos, and other hazardous materials and their removal and disposal in accordance with applicable governmental regulations would be undertaken prior to building demolition or renovation.

   **b. Additional Investigations Performed to Address Recognized Environmental Conditions**
   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.

   **c. Conceptual Approach to Site Remediation**
   The Remedial Action Work Plan would be developed in collaboration with, and subject to the approval of, the NYSDEC, an involved agency. The NYSDEC would make its own SEQRA findings regarding the remediation matters under its jurisdiction. The specific elements of the Remedial Action Work Plan would not be determined until it is approved by the NYSDEC. However, based upon the available data that is summarized in Roux Associates’ Phase I reports, the limited investigation results completed to date, the current and past operational activities, and historic fill practices, the remedial strategy for the Armory Parcel and the City Yard Parcel would generally be expected to address the following issues and contain the following elements.

   The remedial approach would require approvals from several agencies including the NYSDEC, the NYSDOH, Westchester County Department of Health, and appropriate agencies within the City of New Rochelle. It is anticipated that the Project Site would be remediated under the NYSDEC Brownfields Cleanup Program, through a joint application by the City of New Rochelle and the Applicant. Specific soil cleanup standards identified in the Final Part 375 Environmental Remediation Program regulations dated December 2006 would be applicable depending on proposed usage.

   As described above, several RECs are present on each parcel. Soil (and to a more limited extent), groundwater at the Site are impacted and would require remediation to some extent. Based on the soil and groundwater impacts, soil vapor impacts are possible and if present would require mitigation to address potential vapor intrusion...
Potential remedial alternatives would be evaluated and a selected remedial approach would be documented for each parcel in an Alternatives Analysis Report/Remedial Action Work Plan (AAR/RAWP). The AAR/RAWP would be completed in accordance with Sections 4 and 5 of the NYSDEC “DER-10 Technical Guidance for Site Investigation and Remediation (DER-10),” dated May 2010. NYSDEC review periods and all necessary citizens’ participation activities for the AAR/RAWP would comply with DER-10 and Part 375.

Following NYSDEC approval of the RAWP, and depending upon the complexity of the remedy selected for each parcel, remedial design documents (e.g., drawings and specifications) may be prepared. If required, NYSDEC review periods and citizens’ participation activities in connection with these documents would comply with DER-10 and Part 375. Any required permitting would also be completed during the design phase.

Based on the currently available information regarding RECs on both parcels and the proposed plans for the Project, the approach to site remediation would potentially consist of the following:

- Asbestos and lead abatement and demolition of existing structures;
- Removal of any USTs and ASTs and identified sump structures;
- Soil “hot spot” removals associated with spills or other RECs;
- Soil removal for any piles/foundation and utilities for proposed development;
- Addressing any past “open” spills that have impacted groundwater with product recovery and/or in situ treatment, as applicable;
- Removal of impacted sediments and storm sewer abandonment;
- Treatment and discharge of contaminated construction dewatering effluent for limited deep excavations associated with elevator pits or utility chambers;
- Installation of a sub slab depressurization system (SSDS) consisting of a vapor barrier and passive venting system beneath each new building; and
- Placement of a cap comprised of building slabs, asphalt roads/parking areas and/or soil two feet deep.

Following the remedy completion, a Final Engineering Report, sealed by a licensed New York State Professional Engineer would be completed in accordance with Section 5.8 of DER-10.

Based upon the potential remedial approach described above, after completion of the remedial work, impacted materials and constituents would potentially remain on-site at depths greater than two feet below land surface at concentrations in excess of the regulatory use criteria. In addition, onsite groundwater might exceed groundwater...
criteria. For this reason, a Site Management Plan (SMP) would be developed and implemented in accordance with Section 6 of DER-10. The primary components of the SMP would include:

- A Soil Management Plan (SoMP);
- Institutional and Engineering Controls Plan; and

**Soil Management Plan**

The SoMP would be prepared and implemented to minimize the potential exposure of workers and the community to constituents in soil after the remediation is completed. Further, the SoMP would establish applicable management practices for the future disturbance/reuse of soils exceeding the applicable use criteria at depths greater than two feet below grade.

Specifically, the SoMP would include:

- A description of the proper procedures for the management of excavated soil in a manner that would protect workers and the surrounding community from exposure (including health and safety procedures, dust control and CAMP); and
- A description of the proper procedures for repairing the cap.

The SoMP would also set requirements for the analytical testing of soil below remediated areas (i.e., areas below two feet) requiring excavation work as part of future Site activities.

**Institutional and Engineering Controls Plan**

Since impacted materials might remain beneath the cap, engineering controls and institutional controls would be implemented to protect public health and the environment in the future. The Institutional and Engineering Controls Plan would identify and describe the applicable engineering and institutional controls and the requirement for annual certifications of the controls. The plan would include:

- A description of the institutional controls for the management and operation of the Site including the Environmental Easement required to restrict the use of the parcels and the use of groundwater;
- description of the engineering controls, including the maintenance of the cap and SSDS; and
- A requirement that the property owner provide an Institutional Control/Engineering Control certification on an annual basis by a Professional Engineer licensed in New York State.

An Environmental Easement is an institutional control that subjects the Site to use restrictions or engineering controls that run with the land in perpetuity. An
Environmental Easement acts as an enforcement mechanism to ensure required institutional and engineering controls remain in place. The Environmental Easement would potentially include some or all of the following:

- Compliance with the SMP;
- Restriction of the use of the parcels;
- Identification of areas of impacted materials remaining on-site that would be managed in place;
- Identification of engineering controls that must be maintained and monitored (i.e., passive vent system);
- Identification of areas where the cap is to be maintained or restored in the event of intrusive work;
- Restriction of the use of groundwater as a source of potable water; and
- Annual certification (by a licensed New York State Professional Engineer) that the institutional and engineering controls remain in place and that they remain effective for the protection of human health and the environment.

Any future development and use of the parcels would need to comply with the Environmental Easement.

**OM&M Plan**

The OM&M Plan would provide the detailed procedures necessary to maintain the engineering controls (e.g., cap and SSDS). This would include any inspection and maintenance of the cap and the SSDS. Post remediation groundwater monitoring would also be described in the OM&M Plan.
L. CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS
L. CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS

This section describes the process by which the Applicant proposes to construct the proposed Project. It identifies a series of construction phases designed to construct the Project in an efficient manner, while minimizing potential impacts. As described in Sections III.H, Phasing, and III.I, Construction Operation, in the Project Description section of the DEIS, the Construction Manager has identified three phases for the construction of the Project, which would extend over a 24 month period. It is expected that demolition would begin in 2014 and the Build Year would be 2016.

The Project has been divided into the following three phases to enable construction logistics and to reduce any potential impacts to the extent practicable. Major construction and milestones are indicated in their respective phases on the construction schedule and in the construction snapshots, all of which are included in Appendix 11, Construction Sequencing.

**Phase 1 - Snapshots 1-4**
To reduce impacts to the community, heavy demolition and earth hauls have been scheduled in this early phase and have been condensed for minimal disruption. In Phase 1 demolition of existing Department of Public Works (DPW) buildings leads way to sitework, sheeting, and then the start of platform residential (the main section of the residential building to be built on the “platform” of the parking level below) construction and the south Residence building (the south leg of the residential building) 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 Residence building and March 2015 for Platform Residential. The Clubhouse Amenities building would be completed in April 2015 (prior to the completion of the Residence building) for a permanent leasing office. The new retail space would be completed October 2015. Reconfiguration at Huguenot Street and East Main Street intersection would begin in Phase 2 but would be completed in Phase 3.

**Phase 3 - Snapshots 8-10**
Huguenot Street / East Main Street reconfiguration would be completed during Phase 3. The entrance at the Northeast side of the site would be used for construction access along with material being brought on and off site for public space site and landscape work. Grading, landscaping and finishes for walkways, public activity areas and Echo Bay Walk and landscaping would be done at this time.
1. **Potential Impacts**

   a. *Potential Short-Term Impacts From Demolition, Site Preparation and Construction*

(1) **Demolition**

The Project would require the demolition of a total of six buildings and several other smaller structures. Demolition would be undertaken all in the same phase. To affect a quick demolition period, multiple buildings would be deconstructed and demolished at the same time.

The demolition process begins with the removal of materials inside the building, by hand, that are intended for recycling or re-use on site. Using an excavator, the remaining building materials would be pulled down and separated. All masonry and concrete materials from exterior walls, slabs, and foundations would be broken into smaller pieces with a hydraulic hammer, then crushed and recycled. Materials that cannot be re-used, such as wood, windows, and metal, would be disposed of off-site at approved disposal facilities. Upon demolition of all buildings, all suitable materials would be stock piled and processed through a crusher and re-used on site for aggregates and structural fill.

All parking areas to be removed would also be subject to recycling and re-use. Asphalt would be stripped and processed on-site to be re-used in the creation of new roads and parking areas.

The Applicant and its Construction Manager have reviewed the draft Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) to better understand current materials and hazardous materials on site.

The Applicant estimates 27,000 cubic yards of site-related materials to be cut onsite based on the site grading and building elevations as designed: 8,500 cubic yards to be processed and remain on site and 18,500 cubic yards to be exported.

- 1/2 of the export is assumed to be non-contaminated = 9,250 cubic yards
- 1/2 export is assumed to be contaminated = 9,250 cubic yards
  - 1/3 to be soils contaminated with petroleum SVOCs = 3,000 cubic yards
  - 2/3 to be soils contaminated with urban fill = 6,250 cubic yards

These numbers are only estimates and are based on the preliminary information received regarding the site and environmental survey.
It is not expected that the DPW operations or an activity at the Armory would be ongoing while the site is undergoing demo and construction and therefore, no disturbance to those operations are expected during building demolition.

(2) Site Preparation
Based on earthwork calculations, it is anticipated that approximately 9,500 cubic yards of excess earth would remain after grading activities. This volume may be reduced based upon the presence of rock and unsuitable material such as buried construction debris, if any, that may be discovered during earthwork operations. Importation of fill material would be minimized to the extent practicable, both common and structural, by processing as much existing materials as possible.

The Phase 1 ESA and Preliminary Geotechnical Assessment indicates bedrock in the northwestern quadrant of the City Yard parcel within close proximity to the road. Therefore, blasting would be required for the elevations needed at the garage. Construction controls for blasting as mentioned in the blasting protocol section (Section III.I, Construction Operation) would be implemented. Operations would be undertaken by New York State Licensed Powder Men and Licensed Blasting Contractors, under the direct supervision of a geo-technical engineer and blasting consultant, in accordance with all applicable laws and in coordination with the City building officials.

(3) Noise
The construction of the proposed Project, as with any construction project, would create short-term noise disturbances; however, since no on-site DPW operations would be occurring, noise disturbance is expected to be minimal. Abutting properties to the northeast would experience noise impacts during demolition of the existing structures occurring in Phase 1. Neighbors across the street to the north would experience construction noise due to blasting. Typical protocols for blasting (outlined in the Mitigation Measures following this section) are expected to reduce noise disturbances during this work, and the Applicant would comply with construction-related regulations for hours of operation outlined in Chapter 213 (Noise Control Ordinance) of the City Code for sites in commercial/retail zones.

(4) Air Quality
The Project has been designed and would be managed to avoid potential impacts to air and water quality during demo and construction. Excavation typically causes dust especially during periods of dry weather. However, this impact is temporary in nature and would be minimized by using best construction practices and mitigation measures discussed below. As a result of these mitigation measures impacts from dust would be minimal.
(5) **Stormwater**  
The Project has been planned and would be managed to avoid potential impacts to storm water quality during demolition and construction. With the inclusion of erosion control measures (outlined in the Mitigation Measures following this section and detailed in Sections IV.B.1.d and IV.B.2.c of this DEIS), storm water impacts would be minimal.

(6) **Traffic**  
As the Project is located in a commercial area, there would be times where traffic of the surrounding streets would be impacted due to construction activities. Traffic disturbances would be expected during Phase 1 when blasting in the northeast quadrant would occur adjacent to East Main Street. During Phase 2, a street reconfiguration at the intersection of Huguenot and East Main Street would also require changes in traffic flow. The plan would be to provide temporary traffic control measures in close coordination with City of New Rochelle Police and to complete this portion of the work in a timely manner in order to minimize potential impacts to traffic conditions to the extent practicable.

Traffic patterns surrounding the site may potentially be affected indirectly by construction deliveries and soil hauls. Round trip truck flow would peak during times of soil export and trash hauls due to demolition. This is indicated below in Table No. IV.L-1 during 2014 Q2 and 2014 Q4. There would be a significant drop in truck trips after demo and sitework is complete, giving way to lighter construction traffic in 2015 Q2 and through the end of the project. Most construction traffic at that point would be associated with material deliveries. To mitigate negative impacts on traffic, a traffic route plan would be established, communicated and enforced.

**Table No. IV.L-1: Average Trucks (Round Trip) Per Day**

![Average Trucks (Round Trip) Graph]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Average Trucks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **Potential Mitigation Measures**

Construction of the Project would be managed to minimize and mitigate potential impacts to the greatest extent possible. Mitigation measures include the following:

*a. Construction Management Techniques, Control Plans and Best Management Practices To Be Employed*

(1) **Earthwork**

Due to the disturbance of earth during construction of the Project, best practices would be employed to mitigate potential impacts to air quality and storm water quality. To mitigate potential dust impacts, selective clearing and grubbing would be performed as needed. As soon as grading operations for an area are completed, the area would be temporarily stabilized until it can be paved, landscaped or otherwise completed. Dust would also be controlled with the use of an on-site water truck and misting stations. Other mitigation measures during earthwork would include wetting the soil surfaces, covering trucks and stored materials with a tarp, and proper maintenance of equipment. Soils would be stabilized with tackifiers, geotechnical fabrics, natural ground coverings, and the establishment of seed beds. Haul roads within the site would be stabilized with tackifiers, geotechnical fabrics and stone ballast as required to also minimize dust.

To minimize storm water runoff, erosion control measures would be employed including silt fences, wheel wash down areas, temporary seeding, outlet protection, dust control, temporary sediment traps and outlet control devices, covering of stockpile materials and hay bales.

(2) **Blasting**

The blasting work would be subcontracted to a Licensed Contractor and would be supervised by the Construction Manager’s Superintendent and a geotechnical engineer. To ensure safe blasting, explosives would not be stored on-site overnight and would be delivered to the site as needed on a daily basis, delivering only the amount of material that would be used each day. Blasting operations would be limited to the maximum allowed by local authorities. 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.

(3) **Hazardous Material and Contamination**

(4) **Traffic**

Construction truck activity would be limited to the hours of 7:00 AM and 3:30 PM. Where necessary, a police detail would control the entering and exiting traffic at the northeast entrance at the intersection of Huguenot Street and East Main Street during a special delivery outside of this time frame. Conceptual route plans for all construction vehicles and deliveries are as follows:

- Construction deliveries would enter and leave the site from the northwest entrance during Phases 1 and 2.
- Construction deliveries would enter and leave the site from the northeast entrance for Phases 2 and 3.
- Sitework traffic and trucks hauling export would enter and leave the site from the northeast entrance during Phases 1, 2, and 3.
- Construction employees would enter the Site from these same entrances.
- All construction traffic for the Mancuso Marina site would use Evans Street and Huntington Place for access and activity during all phases.

Additionally, all construction parking would be identified on site.

(5) **Noise**

During earthwork operations heavy equipment would be used for site excavations and material processing. Whenever possible, processing equipment would be located away from neighbors and current community locations. Although noise from construction equipment would be generated, all equipment would be rubber-tired and properly maintained and muffled in compliance with the EPA's noise emission standards.

Construction of the Project has been designed to minimize and mitigate potential short-term construction-related impacts to the extent possible with the mitigation measures outlined above and as a result, no additional mitigation measures are required.
The purpose of Section V is to compare the Proposed Action to reasonable alternatives that are consistent with the Applicant’s objectives and capabilities. In the discussion that follows, six alternatives are analyzed with regard to the same types of potential environmental impacts assessed in Subsections IV, VI, VII, VIII and IX of this DEIS for the Proposed Action.

Conceptual site plans for each alternative have been prepared. The site plans for each alternative are located at the end of this section and labeled as Figure Nos. V-2 through V-6. A site plan illustrating the proposed Project has been included for reference as Figure No. V-1.

The alternatives are as follows (See Table No. V-1: *Alternative Programs*):

- 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 preserving the Armory Annex building 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.

The proposed Project would utilize the City Yard DPW parcel for the mixed use residential and commercial building and the waterfront esplanade, and a portion of the Armory parcel for shared driveway access, the waterfront esplanade and public parking for the waterfront. Two of the alternatives described above include the redevelopment of the Armory site. At its September 19, 2012 meeting, the City Council selected “Good Profit,” the sponsor of a proposed local food marketplace with restaurants. In November, the Council approved a six-month, non-binding “letter of agreement” 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. Upon the expiration of the six-month time period, Good Profit is required to submit a detailed site plan, analysis of public costs and benefits and a detailed financing program to the City. The development program and site plan for the Armory has not been finalized at this time. Although the Good Profit development program and site plan for the Armory buildings and parcel are not yet finalized or approved by the City, the current proposal includes the City-owned Mancuso Marina parcel and the privately-owned Nelstad parcel for parking and access to the Armory. To illustrate 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. In the Good Profit proposal, the public parking for the waterfront proposed by the Applicant on the Armory parcel would be relocated to
the Mancuso Marina and/or Nelstad parcels. It is noted that even though it is incorporated into those alternatives, the proposal would nevertheless require its own separate environmental analysis under the State Environmental Quality Review Act. A copy of the July 20, 2012 Good Profit site plan is located in Appendix 13 for reference.

The expected impacts of each alternative are discussed below and summarized and compared to those of the Proposed Action.

**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.

**Land Use, Zoning, and Planning Consistency**

Under this alternative, the DPW site would continue to be an underutilized waterfront property, blocking both physical and visual access to Echo Bay. Without the proposed Project, the Project Site would remain in its current condition, owned by the City of New Rochelle. It is probable the DPW site would continue to be used as the City Yard operated by the Department of Public Works. The Armory parcel would remain in its current condition until, and if, the City Council selects a developer for the redevelopment of the Armory buildings.

Additionally, without the proposed Project, the land use characteristics of the parcels would be unchanged. The current use of the City Yard parcel and the vacant Armory building are not consistent with the permitted principal uses or special permit uses in the Planned Waterfront Development District (PWD-5 and PWD-3). The current use of the DPW and Armory parcels is not consistent with the City’s long standing redevelopment vision for the Echo Bay area as outlined in the Main/Echo Urban Renewal Plan. The continued use of the DPW parcel as the City Yard does not advance the goals and objectives in the City’s Comprehensive Plan, City Harbor Management Plan or LWRP related to the Echo Bay area, as well as other general City-wide objectives. Additionally, without the proposed Project, no public land use amenities such as the proposed Echo Bay Walk esplanade, seating areas, public parking and boat access would be provided.

**Land, Water and Ecological Resources**

Without the Project, site conditions would remain essentially in their current conditions. If measures are not taken to secure the shoreline, it is probable that tidal erosion will persist. Many of the current coastal stabilization measures have undergone significant deterioration and are no longer effective. Current industrial uses on the City Yard may continue to degrade water quality, contributing to the decrease of coastal vegetation and existing wildlife. Additionally, the stormwater system on the City Yard parcel would remain in its current condition, with no improvements to the treatment of stormwater.
Utilities
Without the proposed Project, the City of New Rochelle Department of Public Works Yard would remain and both water supply connections and water use demands would be similar to the present day conditions.

Visual Resources
Under this alternative, the DPW and Armory sites would continue to block visual access to Echo Bay from the surrounding area. It is expected that most of the Main Street commercial corridor will remain in its current state and use for the foreseeable future. Streetscape improvements and the waterfront esplanade improvements would not occur under this alternative. One significant change, which is currently underway, is the infrastructure upgrades to the New Rochelle Wastewater Treatment Plant. As a part of a 2008 Consent Order between Westchester County and the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC), the New Rochelle Wastewater Treatment Plant is required to meet certain standards by 2014. The WWTP will increase in height with the infrastructure upgrades, with the Solids Handling Building designed to be approximately 48 feet tall above ground surface and the BNR Building designed to be approximately 81 feet above ground surface. These buildings, particularly the BNR Building, will be taller than the current WWTP buildings and will be visible from the surrounding areas, including the Project Site. However, a dense, mostly deciduous, mature vegetated buffer exists along the north, south, and western sides of the WWTP property which provides dense screening of the Treatment Plant buildings during the late Spring, Summer, and early Fall months.

Transportation
The “No Build” condition analyzes future traffic operating conditions without the development of the Project. Future conditions were projected for the Year 2016. The Existing Traffic Volumes were conservatively increased by a compounded 2% annual background growth rate for four years (total of 8.2% increase) as described below based upon discussions with representatives of the City of New Rochelle.

All intersections would generally operate at an overall acceptable Level of Service. Some delays will be experienced by vehicles turning left from eastbound Echo Avenue to northbound Main Street and thus, additional green time is recommended for this advanced phase.
### Table No. V-2
**Peak AM Hour Existing and No-Build Levels of Service**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>No-Build</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Delay)</td>
<td>(Delay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street &amp; Echo Avenue</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street &amp; Stephenson Boulevard</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street &amp; LeFevres Lane</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huguenot Street &amp; Echo Avenue/River Street</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Street &amp; Radisson Plaza</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table No. V-3
**Peak PM Hour Existing and No-Build Levels of Service**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>No-Build</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Delay)</td>
<td>(Delay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street &amp; Echo Avenue</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street &amp; Stephenson Boulevard</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street &amp; LeFevres Lane</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huguenot Street &amp; Echo Avenue/River Street</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Street &amp; Radisson Plaza</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Noise**
Without the Project, the sources of noise would be substantially similar to the existing condition. Background levels would remain the same, but traffic noise could show a slight increase due to growth in traffic volume.

**Air Quality**
Without the Project, there would be no change in existing uses and therefore no change to air quality.
Socioeconomic and Fiscal Impacts
Without the addition of the proposed Project, the demographic characteristics of the City of New Rochelle are expected generally to change only slightly, with several exceptions. The population of the City looks to continue its trend of aging, with an increase in the number of persons age 65 and older. In addition, income levels are projected to continue rising. However, with projected background population growth of only 622 people by 2016, demographic conditions in the City will likely remain very similar to current conditions, albeit with a somewhat wealthier population.

For the immediate areas around the Project Site, however, demographic characteristics are likely to change during the next few years. By 2016, both Census Tract 59.02 and Block Group 1 are projected to lose 9.4% of their respective populations, and over 10% of their resident family households. In addition, the over 12% projected decreases in residents age 0 to 19 in both Census Tract 59.02 and Block Group 1 will help hasten the aging of the underlying local population. Despite these changes, Census Tract 59.02 and Block Group 1 will experience similar levels of growth in median household income and per capita income as the City as a whole. These increases will help generate additional disposable income dollars that can be spent at local businesses.

Without the Project, the Project Site would continue not to generate tax revenue for both the City of New Rochelle and Westchester County. Assuming no private development on the Project Site, no taxes would continue to be collected for the foreseeable future. With no new development on the site, it is assumed that any municipal costs associated with the Project Site will remain negligible.

Community Facilities and Services
Without the Project, the Fire Department indicated that future demand for fire and emergency services should be fairly stable, with current volume only experiencing slight increases. The Police Department did not provide specific information related to future conditions, but based upon telecommunications with the Department, it is expected that police services would also be stable with current volume.

Historic and Archaeological Resources
Without the Project, impacts to the existing Armory parcel and City Yard parcel would be limited to those associated with continued current uses of the City Yard parcel and Armory parcel.

Hazardous Materials
Without the Project, the City Yard and Armory parcels would likely remain in their current conditions. 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. If no action is taken, these conditions will persist.

Construction Impacts
This alternative would not include any demolition or new construction. Therefore, there would be no potential for short-term impacts on noise, air quality or traffic related to construction activity.
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-3, 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 Amory, 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.

Visual Resources
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 enlarged from approximately 70 feet wide in the proposed Project to 120 feet wide in this Alternative. Figure Nos. V-3A, V-3B and V-3C illustrate the visual photo simulation of the viewshed from Main Street.

These figures illustrate the entrance into the project for Alternative B. In this alternative design, the separation between the proposed mixed-use building and the Armory would be widened to approximately 120 feet. 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.

Historic and Archaeological Resources
As described above, 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, removal of the annex block would not have significant adverse impacts on historic resources.

Transportation and Parking
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, as illustrated on Figure No. V-3. Levels of Service for this Alternative are contained in Table No. V-1 and Appendix 8.
Construction Impacts
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 snapshots. Figure Nos. V-3C – 3L illustrate the snapshots of construction for Alternative B. Depending on the condition of the wall separating the Annex from the entry tower, a temporary wall may be installed immediately following demolition, with the final façade improvement completed in Phase 3.

With the Annex currently vacant, it is not expected the demolition of the Annex building at the same time as the DPW buildings would have substantively different short term construction-related impacts as the proposed Project. Since the Amory buildings are owned by the City and not listed on the National Register of Historic Places, there is no special approval process for removal of the deteriorated portions of the Amory that include the annex and metal storage shed.

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). At the time of the adoption of the Scoping Document in May 2012, the future of the Armory parcel was uncertain. Therefore, 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, since the adoption of the Scoping Document, the City has determined that the majority of the Armory parcel and the Armory building will be redeveloped separately from the Project and solicited re-development proposals for the Armory building. At its September 19, 2012 meeting, the City Council selected “Good Profit,” the sponsor of a proposed local food marketplace with restaurants. In November, the Council approved a six-month, non-binding “letter of agreement” 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. However, “Armory Place” and the waterfront esplanade on the Armory parcel (including public walkway and kayak dock) would still be developed as part of the proposed Project.

The Applicant has prepared an analysis of the redevelopment of the City Yard parcel under current PWD-5 District zoning regulations. However, evaluating the maximum development of the Armory parcel as an assemblage with the City Yard parcel is no longer a feasible alternative given the City’s decision to pursue separate redevelopment of the majority of the parcel.

C-1. DEVELOPMENT OF AN ASSEMBLED SINGLE PROJECT SITE
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.
C-2. Development of Individual Parcels Included in the Proposed Project Site

Figure No. V-1 illustrates a site plan for the City Yard parcel that 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, Annex and shed building to the east of the Annex 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.

Land Use, Zoning, and Planning Consistency

Table No. V-4, Zoning Compliant Alternative identifies the specific zoning compliance for this Alternative. This Alternative complies with all zoning requirements for the PWD-5 District, including dimensional requirements, standards for medium density residential uses and standards for planned waterfront development, as well as parking requirements. The maximum development of the site is restricted primarily by the required minimum lot area per dwelling unit of 3,500 square feet as outlined in Section 331-67.B of the City Zoning Ordinance, which yields 81 dwelling units.

This Alternative, while consistent with the regulations outlined in the City’s Zoning Code, is not consistent with the City’s long standing redevelopment vision for the Echo Bay area as outlined in the Main/Echo Urban Renewal Plan, and redevelopment goals and objectives in the City’s Comprehensive Plan, City Harbor Management Plan or LWRP related to the Echo Bay area. The URP and other City planning documents identified objectives such as increased density, opening of views and physical access to Echo Bay, and increased tax generation. This Alternative would provide reduced public land use amenities (Echo Bay esplanade, seating areas, public parking and boat access) as compared to the proposed Project.

Land, Water and Ecological Resources

This Alternative is similar to the proposed Project in terms of land disturbance and ecological resources. The demolition of the DPW buildings would occur in the same manner as the proposed Project and the new mixed-use building would be built in a smaller configuration. The area between the building and the esplanade would be grassed lawn with landscape. This Alternative would provide the same public land use amenities as the Project including the proposed Echo Bay esplanade, seating areas, public parking and boat access.
This Alternative would also include the same shoreline improvements and stormwater management improvements as the proposed Project.

Utilities
This Alternative is similar to the proposed Project in terms of the types of utilities required and water supply connections, but the water use demands and sanitary demands would be less than the proposed Project due to the reduced number of residential units (from 285 in the Proposed Project to 81 in this Alternative). The water use demands would be approximately 20,000 gallons per day (gpd) as compared to approximately 54,000 gpd in the Project, and the sanitary demands would be approximately 18,000 gpd as compared to approximately 49,000 gpd in the Project. Because the building would be smaller and located primarily along East Main Street, the sanitary sewer lines would not require as much relocation as the proposed Project. Required stormwater management improvements would also be less as the impervious area would be smaller than the proposed Project.

Visual Resources
This Alternative is similar to the proposed Project in terms of the views from the areas to the north, including Lispenard Avenue, Stephenson Boulevard, and Pratt Street intersections with East Main Street. The building along East Main Street for this Alternative would be four stories and 50 feet in height like the proposed Project. Views of the site from Five Islands Park, Sutton Manor and Echo Bay would be different in this Alternative from the proposed Project in that the building would not extend as far south towards the bay. Views from the building to the bay and the WWTP in this Alternative would be more distant than those from the proposed Project since the building would end approximately 130 feet from the edge of East Main Street.

Transportation
This Alternative is similar to the proposed Project in terms of the proposed access driveway locations at Stephenson Boulevard and Armory Place, but the traffic generation for the residential portion of this Alternative would be substantially less than the proposed Project due to the reduced number of residential units (from 285 in the proposed Project to 81 in this Alternative). The retail traffic generation would be substantially similar to the proposed Project. The trip generation is illustrated in Table No. V-1. Because this Alternative would include the Armory Place site entrance drive to public parking for the Echo Bay waterfront esplanade, the recommendation of a new traffic signal at Armory Place would be included as part of this redevelopment alternative. Since no significant adverse traffic impacts have been identified with the proposed Project, none would be anticipated from this alternative since the traffic generation would be less than the proposed Project.

Noise
With this Alternative, the anticipated traffic generation would be less than with the proposed Project since there would be 204 fewer residential units. The commercial square footage would be slightly less than the proposed Project. Therefore, noise levels would be expected to be somewhat lower. Since no significant adverse noise impacts have been identified with the proposed Project, none would be anticipated from this Alternative.
**Air Quality**
Like noise, the anticipated traffic generation would be less than with the proposed Project since there would be 204 fewer residential units. As a result, the potential generation of air pollutants from mobile source emissions would be reduced. Since no significant air quality impacts have been identified with the proposed Project, none would be anticipated from this Alternative.

**Socioeconomic and Fiscal Impacts**
This Alternative would add significantly less residential population and public school children than the Proposed Project. This Alternative would add fewer total residents and public school children to the City’s population due to the reduced number of residential units (from 285 in the proposed Project to 81 in this Alternative). Additionally, this Alternative would have 8 affordable housing units as compared to the 29 affordable units in the proposed Project. Using the same percentages of studios, one-bedroom and two-bedroom apartments planned for the proposed Project (25%, 48% and 27%, respectively), this Alternative would have 20 studio apartments, 39 one-bedroom apartments and 22 two-bedroom apartments. Using the same population and public school multipliers from Rutgers University, Center for Urban Policy Research used to analyze the proposed Project, the total population for this Alternative would be 149 (as compared to 524 in the proposed Project) and total public school population would be 7 (as compared to 22 in the proposed Project).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Type</th>
<th># of Units</th>
<th>Rent Level</th>
<th>Population Multiplier</th>
<th>Public School Student Multiplier</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Public School Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$1,525</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1BR</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$1,750</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2BR</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$2,350</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>81</strong></td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td><strong>149</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Rutgers University, Center for Urban Policy Research, "Residential Demographic Multipliers," June 2006; compiled by MMI.

This Alternative would have less impact on the City’s demographic profile, fewer public school children, fewer jobs created during construction, and would generate less tax revenue from the residential portion of the development, approximately $730,000 less than the Project with no PILOT and approximately $307,000 less than the Project with a PILOT\(^1\).

**Community Facilities and Services**
This Alternative is similar to the proposed Project in terms of the addition of residential dwelling units and retail space and would require the same types of community facilities and

\(^1\) Milone and MacBroom estimated the decreased tax revenue associated with 81 residential units as compared to the proposed 285 units by pro-rating the construction costs for the residential component of the project in proportion to the reduction in the number of residential units.
services (police, fire, emergency services, public school education and open space) as the proposed Project, but would require fewer services due to the reduced number of residential units (from 285 in the proposed Project to 81 in this Alternative). As noted above, the total residential population and public school children for this Alternative would be much less than the proposed Project at 149 and 7, respectively. Since no significant adverse impacts related to community facilities and services have been identified with the proposed Project, none would be anticipated from this Alternative.

**Historic and Archaeological Resources**
This Alternative is similar to the proposed Project in terms of the proposed demolition of the City Yard buildings and construction of a new mixed-use commercial and residential building. Like the proposed Project, this Alternative also includes the retention of the Armory Annex building. Like the proposed Project, the metal shed would be removed for the creation of Armory Place and the public parking for the Echo Bay waterfront esplanade. Since no significant adverse historic and archaeological impacts have been identified with the proposed Project, none would be anticipated from this Alternative.

**Hazardous Materials**
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 parcels, that present current and future potential risks for contamination. Remediation would be required under this Alternative as it would be under the proposed Project.

**Construction Impacts**
This Alternative would likely generate short-term noise and air quality impacts typically associated with construction activity, and similar to those of the proposed Project. Since the scale of development would be less than the proposed Project, the extent of construction would be less as well.

### D. PROPOSED PROJECT AND GOOD PROFIT PROPOSAL 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)

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.

**Summary of The Good Profit Proposal for the City of New Rochelle Armory (July 20, 2012)**

At this time, according to its proposal, Good Profit proposes multi-use programming, centered on a local food marketplace. This indoor open market would include both vendors and restaurants that prepare, serve and sell locally raised and harvested food. The market would occupy the ground floor of the former drill hall. A mezzanine and terrace would contain a wine and oyster bar with both indoor and outdoor seating. In addition, the basement would serve as a storage facility, a depot for collection and distribution of produce and meat from farms throughout the region, and as a space devoted to food preparation.

Good Profit proposes to retain the Annex, which would have some military uses as well as house an active transportation-related use. The first floor would include space for veterans’ services, the second floor would house the American Legion, and the basement would house a program to salvage and repair broken bicycles in an effort to support the success of the multimodal transportation system.

An addition on the north side of the Armory building would be constructed to create an exhibition hall along the exterior street façade. The capacity would be approximately 100 seats. The site has been designed to have three points of entry. These access points would include a drop-off path along the front of the building, subterranean parking accessible via a curb-cut along the east side of the current access drive, and Huntington Drive to the west. The subterranean parking access would be achieved through a widening of the current access drive and would be preceded by angled parking spaces on both sides of the current access from Main Street, just beyond the point of entry. Huntington Drive would be converted from private to public access, and would provide access to the rear of the building. 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. Although the proposed site design includes 191 parking spaces, the City Zoning Ordinance requires 210 spaces and the proposal indicates this deficit would be mitigated through shared parking of uses whose peak demand operate at different hours.

The Good Profit proposal contemplates the use of the former Mancuso Marina parcel (Block 84, Lot 110) owned by the City of New Rochelle, and the former Nelstad Concrete Company parcel (Block 84, Lot 120) which is in private ownership. The Nelstad parcel is approximately 0.97 acres and the Mancuso Marina parcel is approximately 0.66 acres for a total of 1.63 acres. Based upon Good Profits’ proposal, the two parcels would be utilized primarily for parking, walkways and open space. Future development of both parcels would be subject to separate State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) review.
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

This Alternative assumes that the Project and Good Profit proposal will both be developed. Figure No. V-5, shows how the Project can be developed and the Annex preserved and re-used as part of the Good Profit development. However, the following two minor modifications would be required (shown in blue on Figure No. V-5 as modified edge of pavement):

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.

Transportation and Parking

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. The potential Trip Generation for Good Profit is illustrated in Table No. V-1 and in Appendix 8. 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 is 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. The Levels of Service with the two projects are contained in Table No. V-1 and Appendix 8.

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.

Utilities
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 is illustrated in Table No. V-1, and 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.

D-2. THE D-1 ALTERNATIVE WITHOUT MINOR MODIFICATIONS TO ARMORY PLACE DESIGN
This Alternative 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. Figure No. V-6, illustrates that the Good Profit site plan works with the proposed Project. However, without any modification to Armory Place, the layout and circulation of at-grade parking and driveway circulation are not optimal.

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 Armory 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.
**TABLE NO. V-1**

**ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM COMPARISON TABLE**

**ECO BAY CENTER - NEW ROCHELLE, NEW YORK**

**ALTERNATIVE DESCRIPTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>Alternative Design - Proposed Project + Vacant Armory + Remove Armory Annex</th>
<th>Zoning Compliant - Project Site as Single Parcel</th>
<th>Zoning Compliant - Project Site as Individual Parcels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Action</td>
<td>Project site remains in existing condition</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private parking and surface storage</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking for EBC contained within building</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bike parking and sidewalk storage</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No new construction</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public parking + amenities at waterfront</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

- Armory Annex Building: Retain
- Requires Zoning Amendments: Yes
- Land Use: Commercial/Restaurant/OFFICE/Exhibition
- Zoning District: PWD*5
- Project Site Area (acres): 9.4
- Total Project Site Area (acres): 9.4

**ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS**

- Armory Annex Building: Retain
- Requires Zoning Amendments: Yes
- Land Use: Commercial/Restaurant/OFFICE/Exhibition
- Zoning District: PWD*5
- Project Site Area (acres): 9.4
- Public Waterfront Open Space (acres): 2.0
- Public School Children: 22

**ECHO BAY CENTER DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

1
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## Table V-1
### Alternative Program Comparison Table

**Echo Bay Center - New Rochelle, New York**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Description</th>
<th>Alternative A</th>
<th>Alternative B</th>
<th>Alternative C-1</th>
<th>Alternative C-2</th>
<th>Alternative D-1</th>
<th>Alternative D-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Municipal Services

- **Calculated Sanitary Demand (gpd)**: 49,344, 4,870, 49,344, N/A, 18,264, 59,768, 59,768
- **Calculated Water Demand (gpd)**: 54,278, 5,337, 54,278, N/A, 20,090, 65,745, 65,745

### Traffic Generation (vph)

- **Peak AM Hour Inbound**: 44, 12, 44, N/A, 24, 65, 65
- **Peak AM Hour Outbound**: 124, 12, 124, N/A, 43, 127, 127
- **Peak PM Hour Inbound**: 149, 0, 149, N/A, 106, 223, 223
- **Peak PM Hour Outbound**: 92, 0, 92, N/A, 89, 141, 141

### Traffic Level of Service (Peak AM Hour)

- **Main St. & Echo Ave.**: C (29.6), D (36.1), C (29.6), N/A, Less than P.P., C (29.6), C (29.6)
- **Main St. & Stephenson Blvd.**: B (11.2), B (14.8), B (11.2), N/A, Less than P.P., B (11.2), B (11.2)
- **Huguenot St. & Echo Ave./River St.**: C (20.0), B (18.8), C (20.0), N/A, Less than P.P., C (20.0), C (20.0)
- **River St. & Stephenson Blvd.**: B (14.8), B (14.8), B (14.8), N/A, Less than P.P., B (14.8), B (14.8)
- **Main St. & Amory Place**: B (10.2), B (10.2), N/A, Less than P.P., B (10.2), B (10.2)

### Traffic Level of Service (Peak PM Hour)

- **Main St. & Echo Ave.**: C (29.6), C (31.8), C (29.6), N/A, Less than P.P., C (29.6), C (29.6)
- **Main St. & Stephenson Blvd.**: B (18.6), B (16.7), B (18.6), N/A, Less than P.P., B (18.6), B (18.6)
- **Huguenot St. & Echo Ave./River St.**: B (18.6), B (18.6), B (18.6), N/A, Less than P.P., B (18.6), B (18.6)
- **River St. & Stephenson Blvd.**: D (27.2), D (27.2), D (27.2), N/A, Less than P.P., D (27.2), D (27.2)
- **Main St. & Amory Place**: A (9.0), N/A, A (9.0), N/A, Less than P.P., A (12.7), A (11.7)

### Shared Parking Spaces - For Proposed Project Only

- **Commercial ratio**: 4,100 sq. ft., N/A, 4,100 sq. ft., N/A, 4,100 sq. ft., N/A, 4,100 sq. ft.
- **Residential ratio**: 1.5 dwelling unit, N/A, 1.5 dwelling unit, N/A, 1.5 dwelling unit, N/A, 1.5 dwelling unit
- **Total shared parking space - For Proposed Project Only**: 436, N/A, 436, N/A, 436, N/A, 436

### NOTES:

1. Actual Levels of Service for Alternative C-2 were not calculated since the only difference is a reduction in residential units from 285 in Project to 81 in this Alternative. The actual Levels of Service for this Alternative would be less than shown as the Project size and trip generation for this Alternative would be less.
2. Traffic generation includes pass-by trips.
3. Includes traffic estimated using the limited information in the July 20, 2012 Good Profit proposal and site plan.
4. Public open space for the waterfront esplanade in Alternative D includes only acreage for the DPW parcel; open space acreage for the Good Profit proposal is unknown at this time.
5. Public parking estimated using the limited information in the July 20, 2012 Good Profit proposal and site plan.
TABLE NO. V-4:
ZONING COMPLIANT ALTERNATIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEC.</th>
<th>ZONING REQUIREMENT</th>
<th>All Districts</th>
<th>PWD-5</th>
<th>Proposed Site Plan</th>
<th>Zoning Compliant Alternative Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily Residential Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail / Restaurant Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331-52 PWD-5 Planned Waterfront Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Uses allowed by Special Permit by City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Maximum FAR for following residential uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily dwellings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331-67 PWD-5 Planned Waterfront Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Dimensional requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Max. building height</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within 300 feet of East Main Street</td>
<td>5 stories / 50 feet</td>
<td>5 stories / 50 feet to 305 feet of East Main Street; Amendments req'd</td>
<td>4 stories / 50 feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beyond 300 feet of East Main Street</td>
<td>3 stories / 30 feet</td>
<td>4 stories / 55 Feet; Amendment req'd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Max permitted FAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water dependent uses</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Permit residential/non-residential uses</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>FAR = 1.22; Amendment req'd</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Total = 1.22; Amendment req'd</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Standards for medium density residential use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Min lot area per DU</td>
<td>3,500 sf</td>
<td>998 sf; Amendment req'd</td>
<td>3,506 sf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Req'd off-street parking spaces</td>
<td>1.5 spaces / DU</td>
<td>To comply, with Shared Use approval per §331-126A</td>
<td>To comply, with Shared Use approval per §331-126A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Standards for planned waterfront development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Min lot size</td>
<td>6 acres</td>
<td>6.52 ac</td>
<td>6.52 ac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

331-126 Schedule of Parking Requirements

| Restaurant | 1 / 3 seats or 1 / 200 GSF, whichever greater | To comply, with Shared Use |
| Retail, national brand | 1 / 250 GSF + 1 / 1,000 sf accessory use | To comply, with Shared Use |
| Retail shop, personal service establishment | 1 / 250 GSF | To comply, with Shared Use |

Table 331 Attachment 2 - Schedule of Dimensional Regulations, Mixed-Use Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PWD-5</th>
<th>Max FAR</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All other special uses</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.22; Amendment req'd</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.22; Amendment req'd</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Height</td>
<td>5 stories/50' w/in 300' of East Main Street; elsewhere 3 stories/30'</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amendment req'd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Coverage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%, Amendment req'd</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impervious surfaces</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>±30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. SHORT TERM CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS

Construction activities associated with the Project would result in temporary construction impacts, including noise, traffic and dust. Although the Project has been designed to minimize the loss of trees and all reasonable precautions would be taken to protect vegetation during the construction process, the Project would require the removal of some trees on the Project Site. Although the Applicant would seek to mitigate this loss in the manner described below, this would nevertheless constitute an adverse construction impact.

The Applicant would seek to mitigate this impact through proposed plantings that include approximately 100 shade and street trees, 20 evergreen trees, 30 ornamental flowering trees, 365 deciduous and evergreen shrubs, and 500 ornamental grass groupings. Proposed plantings would complement the architecture and provide a park-like setting to the visitors of the open space area and Echo Bay Walk. The water’s edge would be enhanced with a riprap slope and planting shelf featuring coastal wetland species and grasses that would contribute to the local ecosystem and support wildlife.
A. LAND, WATER AND ECOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Construction of the Proposed Action, including buildings, parking areas and landscaped areas would result in the alteration of both previously developed and undeveloped land area. The construction of the Proposed Action would require removal of a limited number of invasive and opportunistic trees located on the Project Site, located primarily in the northwest corner of the DPW Yard adjacent to the refuse and material storage piles.

B. UTILITIES

1. WATER USAGE

The Proposed Action would result in an average daily water demand of approximately 54,000 gallons per day (gpd) from the public water supply. This estimate is based upon the use of low flow fixtures and the application of published New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) Design Standards for Wastewater Treatment Works wastewater design flow unit rates, which are then adjusted upward by 10% to obtain the expected water demand.

2. WASTEWATER FLOWS

Estimated sewer demands for the proposed Project are in the range of 45,000 GPD to 50,000 GPD based on NYSDEC standards.

3. ELECTRIC AND GAS

The Proposed Action would result in an increase in natural gas and electricity to provide heating and cooling, lighting, and electricity services for the businesses, residents and employees of the Proposed Action.

C. ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY RESOURCES

Economic resources committed in the construction of the Proposed Action would include the cost of land, construction materials (i.e. timber, steel, concrete and glass), energy (i.e. petrochemicals and electricity) and labor resources. Additionally, the Proposed Action would result in a limited commitment in community services in terms of police, fire protection and emergency medical services.
A. EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTION ON THE FUTURE REDEVELOPMENT OF THE ADJOINING ECHO BAY AREA

1. MANNER IN WHICH THE PROPOSED ACTION’S INFRASTRUCTURE, ROADWAYS, MEANS OF INGRESS AND EGRESS, AND PUBLIC FEATURES COULD BE LINKED TO AND SUPPORT DEVELOPMENT TO THE EAST AND WEST OF THE PROJECT SITE

The Project Site is located along East Main Street, which includes a mix of commercial, institutional, and mixed-use non-residential land uses, with Fauneil Park serving as a small buffer between the Armory site and commercial zone along Huguenot Street. The Stephenson Park and Spencer Park residential neighborhoods are located to the north of the Main Street corridor with Pratt Street and Stephenson Boulevard providing the most direct pedestrian and vehicular access to the Project Site.

To the east of the Project Site are commercial uses, including primarily automotive sales and services; Salesian High School; the New Rochelle WWTP; the Hazelhurst Park neighborhood; and Five Islands Park. The Project Site adjoins one commercial parcel (Aamco Car Care Service, M.V. Services) on the eastern property line at East Main Street. A large Honda auto dealership and small car repair shop are located between the Aamco Car Care Service parcel and LeFevres Lane, just north of the WWTP. These parcels are located across the Echo Bay inlet. To the west of the Project Site are a variety of commercial uses, including auto services and car dealerships; fast food chain restaurants, including McDonald’s along the western boundary of the Armory parcel; and various light industrial uses such as the Landscape Depot. The parcels adjoining the Armory parcel to the west include the McDonald’s restaurant and the Nelstad parcel. Huntington Place is a dead end street located to the west of the Project Site that runs parallel to Main Street and is accessed from Evans Place. Proposed roadways and associated infrastructure, including the pedestrian bridge connecting to the WWTP, have been designed to permit future connections as the redevelopment of the overall Echo Bay area continues.

Figure No. VIII-1, Project Linkages, illustrates the proposed pedestrian and vehicular linkages as part of the proposed Project, as well as the potential connections for future development of the larger Echo Bay redevelopment area. Solid blue circles illustrate proposed pedestrian connections to Stephenson Boulevard and the residential neighborhoods to the north of the Project Site, connections along Main Street and East Main Street, and connections to the Echo Bay waterfront esplanade within the Project Site from the site driveway at the Stephenson Boulevard/East Main Street intersection and the new Armory Place entrance driveway. Proposed vehicular connections, depicted as solid green rectangles, also include the Stephenson Boulevard/East Main Street intersection and the new Armory Place entrance driveway.

Potential pedestrian connections (hollow blue circles) to future development include the expansion of the Echo Bay waterfront esplanade westward towards the former Mancuso
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Marina parcel and Huntington Place, as well as the expansion of the esplanade eastward from the proposed pedestrian bridge along the north edge of the WWTP parcel to LeFevres Lane, Five Islands Park and residential neighborhoods to the east. Future vehicular connections (hollow green rectangles) to Huntington Place would depend upon the Armory redevelopment plans and the ability to extend Huntington Place across the Nelstad property to the Armory parcel.

2. **CATALYTIC EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTION ON FUTURE REDEVELOPMENT OF THE ADJOINING ECHO BAY PLANNING AREA**

As detailed in the Socioeconomic and Fiscal Impacts Analysis and Growth Inducing Impacts Analysis (see Appendix 9), the proposed Project would result in new economic activity in the surrounding area of New Rochelle. The potential exists for secondary induced growth and development resulting from the proposed Project, which could instigate land use changes or increased intensity of use of properties in the immediate vicinity around the Project Site. This induced development could take the form of either new or intensified commercial development, or new residential development.

If new off-site commercial or residential development is generated by the proposed development, it would most likely occur within a relatively close distance from the proposed development where vacant buildings or developable lots might be available for development or redevelopment. For example, the development of Echo Bay center is the likely first step to inducing the rest of Echo Bay to develop further. Future development of the other areas of Echo Bay is unlikely without the progress of Echo Bay Center. Further future development of the rest of Echo Bay is the most likely long term inducement of the successful development of Echo Bay Center. The market impact area (“MIA”) consisting of a one mile radius around the Project Site would be the geographic area most likely to experience direct physical impacts from the secondary economic impacts of the proposed development.

Off-site discretionary spending of new residents resulting from the proposed Project and employees could potentially create the need for expansion of or additions to existing building stock. However, the amount of potentially induced commercial and residential development that could result from the proposed Project is unlikely to have any appreciable impacts on either the MIA or the City as a whole, with the exception of raising the economic values and development potential of the properties immediately adjacent to the Project Site.

As a result of the proposed Project, consumer spending would increase due to the addition of disposable income from new residents of the proposed development and from discretionary spending from on-site retail employees. The additional spending would potentially induce additional demand for goods and services in the commercial districts within the MIA surrounding the Project Site, which could result in an expansion of existing commercial operations and/or potential new development to accommodate additional business space.
It is also expected that the proposed Project would have a twofold impact on the potential for inducing additional residential development in the surrounding area. First, the presence of the proposed development would increase the visibility and the desirability of property in the immediate area, similar to the impact that household spending from residents of the Project would likely have on surrounding properties. This enhanced visibility and desirability may induce other underutilized properties nearby to be redeveloped as residential properties. The size of the development, its convenient location near downtown New Rochelle and associated amenities, the opening up of waterfront access to the general public, and the high quality of the Project would give the development a significant level of recognition.

Secondarily, on-site retail employees and any additional employees employed at commercial development induced by the Project may form a small market for additional housing units within the immediate area. With the addition of approximately 50 full-time retail jobs on-site, as well as between 5 and 13 additional jobs generated through induced commercial development, some demand for new residential units may be induced through this increase in employment. While most of these jobs are expected to be filled by persons within the local labor pool, some employees may wish to live closer to work and would demand housing units close to the proposed Project. While the existing housing stock would be the most likely source for housing units for employees seeking housing near the proposed development, it is possible that a small number of new housing units may be induced as a result of the proposed Project.

Consideration of environmental justice issues and concerns is a component of the analysis of growth inducing impacts of proposed new development, including the concern that new development in an area or redevelopment of existing properties would raise property values in the impacted area to the point where existing low-income, moderate-income and disadvantaged populations may be “priced out” of their neighborhood and may therefore be forced to displace to another neighborhood or community. With projected stabilized monthly rents for market rate residential units at the proposed Project of between $1,729 and $2,665, it is possible that the Project would place upward pressure on rents in smaller residential developments within the designated one mile radius MIA. However, the proposed Project would also include 29 units, or roughly 10% of the total units, that are designated as affordable “moderate-income housing units.” Provision of affordable housing is consistent with the Environmental Protection Agency’s position that environmental justice concerns can be addressed through the preservation and provision of affordable housing.

As a densely developed city of over 77,000 people, New Rochelle has a long history of readily absorbing new development. With its myriad of commercial zones in four mixed use or commercial districts within a one mile radius of the Project Site, the City has the development patterns and infrastructure to absorb the amount of potentially induced growth resulting from the proposed Project.
3. **Future Public or Private Actions Necessary or Likely to Facilitate Redevelopment of the Adjoining Echo Bay Area**

The 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.

As part of the future redevelopment of the adjoining Echo Bay area, it is possible that the City may choose to take actions under New York Eminent Domain Procedure Law in order to acquire the Nelstad parcel for future development adjoining the Armory parcel. As part of the eminent domain process, a fair market value would need to be established for the property, but no condemnation may take place prior to 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 up to $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.

As part of the future pedestrian connection to the City’s parkland from the Echo Bay esplanade, the City may need to coordinate with Westchester County to create an adequate and well-designed pedestrian pathway along the northern edge of the WWTP parcel, which would permit access from Five Islands Park and residential neighborhoods to the east of the Project Site to access the Echo Bay esplanade and the Armory redevelopment project.
A. ENERGY CONSERVATION MEASURES

All buildings will 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 space will 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:

- Fixtures installed within the residential and commercial buildings will be reduced flow, water conservation fixtures complying with the 2010 Plumbing Code of New York State or latest edition.
- Use of drip landscape irrigation systems in planting beds.
- Individually metered water use.

The use of reduced flow water conservation fixtures is expected to reduce the water demands of the Project by approximately 20%.

B. GREEN BUILDING PRACTICES

Consistent with the national mission of Forest City, the development will pursue LEED Silver Certification. A number of sustainable initiatives will be incorporated into the design of the project site and building, including the following.

Site Sustainability:
- Recycling and repurposing of the Echo Bay Project Site
- Proximate 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

The energy conservation measures, green building practices and site plan design sustainability outlined above are consistent with the recently adopted (2011) GreeNR: The New Rochelle Sustainability Plan 2010-2030. GreeNR proposes improvements to regulations and development practices in order to improve energy efficiency in terms of electricity, heating, water use, design, habitat protection, and augmentation of open space and waterfront access. Under the GreeNR plan, energy efficient design will be enhanced by standards for roofing that is cool/reflective, white or landscaped or contains solar panels or other renewable energy sources. Additionally, GreeNR encourages the enhancement of the natural environment, including provision of open space for passive recreation uses.

GreeNR promotes environmental remediation as well as retention of the proportion of land in its natural state and expansion of open space for passive recreation. A key goal of the land use component of the GreeNR plan is to add one additional mile of shoreline access and to maintain the quantity of land in a substantially natural state. Reclaiming contaminated properties for public use and benefit is also recommended, as well as reduction of stormwater runoff, protection of freshwater and coastal wetlands, establishment of better links among waterfront parks and enhancement of opportunities for both recreation and tourism.

The Project will advance those goals outlined above. Echo Bay Center will reclaim the contaminated City Yard property and a portion of the Armory property for public use in the form of open space and the Echo Bay Walk, while also serving to increase shoreline access. The proposed landscape will enhance the protection of freshwater and coastal wetlands and provide for increased trees along the waterfront and in the right-of-way. The stormwater management plan, in tandem with the nature of the proposed change in land use, will greatly increase permeable surface area of the Project Site through use of green infrastructure including new lawn and planting areas and low gradient slopes to reduce runoff. The design of the Project will restore a portion of the shoreline along the southern portion of the Project Site. The building has been designed in a manner to reduce energy use and the infrastructure, including the roof and HVAC system, will consist of energy efficient features that comply with the New York State Building Code.
A. LIST OF STUDIES AND REPORTS USED IN PREPARING DEIS


62. Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps:
   1911 Insurance Maps of New Rochelle, Westchester County, New York;
   1931 Insurance Maps of New Rochelle, Westchester County, New York;
   1942 Insurance Maps of New Rochelle, Westchester County, New York;
   1951 Insurance Maps of New Rochelle, Westchester County, New York;
   1990 Insurance Maps of New Rochelle, Westchester County, New York;


B. LIST OF FEDERAL, STATE, REGIONAL AND LOCAL AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS, CONSULTANTS AND PRIVATE PERSONS CONSULTED IN PREPARING THE DEIS

1. **NEW YORK STATE**
   a. New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
   b. New York State Department of State
   c. New York State Office of Parks, Recreation & Historic Preservation
   d. New York State Office of General Services

2. **WESTCHESTER COUNTY**
   a. Westchester County Department of Health
   b. Westchester County Department of Planning
   c. Westchester County Department of Environmental Facilities

3. **CITY OF NEW ROCHELLE**
   a. Department of Development
   b. City Engineer
   c. City Traffic Engineer
   d. Department of Public Works
   e. Fire Department
   f. Police Department
   g. City School District of New Rochelle
   h. Recreation Department
   i. City Consultants
      (1) Buckhurst Fish & Jacquemart, Inc.

4. **OTHER**
   a. Con Edison
   b. United Water of New Rochelle