ATTACHMENT TO
NEGATIVE DECLARATION
REASONS SUPPORTING DETERMINATION

APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN, SPECIAL USE PERMIT
AND SUBDIVISION APPROVAL FOR EDGEWATER

22 Edgewater Place:
Tax Grid Nos. 5954-25-581985, 5954-25-574979, 5954-25-566983, 5955-19-59002

CONCLUSIONS

Based upon a review of Parts 1 and 2 of the Full Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) and all other application materials that were submitted in support of the Proposed Action, along with reports from City staff and consultants, information from involved and interested agencies, and information from the public, the Planning Board, acting as Lead Agency, makes the following conclusions.

The Proposed Action is a Type I action pursuant to 6 NYCRR 617.4(b)(5)(iii) because the project proposes the construction of more than 250 new residential units to be connected to public water and sewer in a city having a population of less than 150,000. The Planning Board, as Lead Agency, opened a public hearing to consider comments regarding any environmental impacts of the Proposed Action on May 9, 2017 and continued the hearing to July 11, 2017, August 8, 2017, September 12, 2017, October 12, 2017, November 14, 2017 and December 12, 2017, at which time the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) public hearing was closed.

The Proposed Action will not result in any significant adverse impacts on the environment. In summary:

- **Impact on Land: The Proposed Action will not have a significant adverse environmental impact as a result of any physical change to the project site.**

  The Project Site consists of four (4) parcels which are proposed to be merged into one development parcel of approximately 12 acres. Approximately 10 acres of the Site will be disturbed for development of the Project. The Site is currently developed with two buildings and is characterized by prior soil disturbance across much of the Site. Several stockpiles of aggregate and topsoil are currently located within the central portion of the Site on either side of the remnants of an asphalt road that extends across the central portion of the Site.

The Site is located within the RD-1.7 Zoning District. The Project proposes 307 dwelling units (413 bedrooms) in seven (7) apartment buildings with associated infrastructure including utility lines, stormwater facilities, and a below-grade parking garage and on-grade parking. Land banked parking will be utilized for a portion of the proposed parking spaces (33 parking spaces to the west of Building 1) to minimize land disturbance and impervious coverage. The Project will require the removal of approximately 3.2 acres of woods, which generally involves smaller trees located on the interior of the site. No wetlands or wetland buffer areas will be disturbed as a result of the Project. Disturbance of slopes will be stabilized using best management practices during construction and post-construction.

- **Impact on Geological Features: The Proposed Action will not have a significant adverse environmental impact on any unique or unusual land forms on the site.**

There are no unique geological features on the Property.

- **Impacts on Surface Water and Groundwater: The Proposed Action will not have a significant adverse environmental impact on surface or groundwater quality or quantity.**

Residential land uses are generally not associated with the discharge of contaminants into aquifers or other ground water sources. There will be no bulk storage of petroleum or chemicals on-site. The Project does not include or require wastewater discharged to groundwater, and is not located within 100 feet of potable drinking water or irrigation sources.

Site disturbance will exceed 1-acre and therefore a full Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) was prepared in order to obtain coverage under NYSDEC SPDES General Permit GP-0-15-002. The proposed stormwater practices shown on the plans and described in the SWPPP are designed in accordance with the NYSDEC Stormwater Management Design Manual, including design of an underground site stormwater conveyance system and three infiltration basins.

The Project will be connected to the existing public water distribution system. At full build-out, the Project is expected to require 45,430 gallons of water per day. A 6" ductile iron (DI) water main runs beneath Tompkins Terrace and an 8" DI main runs beneath Bank Street. An 8" DI spur runs into the Site beneath Branch Street from Bank Street to an existing hydrant. It is proposed that the Site will connect to the 8" DI pipe (DIP) on Bank Street through a 8" DIP. The 8" DIP will be brought through the Site to provide water supply to the new buildings and continue to Branch Street and connect to the 8" DIP forming a looped connection to the City water system.

The Applicant proposes to dedicate the new 8" water main to the City, along with a 20' wide utility easement for maintenance purposes. Flow and pressure tests have confirmed adequate flow and pressure are available for the Project. New fire hydrants and periodic isolation valves are proposed within the Site. In the event the City does not accept dedication of the 8" water main and easement, the infrastructure will remain privately owned and maintained but will need to be modified to include backflow prevention devices and meters. Notably, the Project does not propose to use public water for irrigation purposes. Rather, the Project includes an underground cistern for harvesting roof runoff for irrigation purposes.

The Project will be connected to the existing public sanitary sewer system. At full build out, the Project is expected to generate 45,430 gallons of wastewater per day (413 bedrooms x 110 gpd /bedroom). Under normal operating conditions the public sanitary sewer system is sufficient for the Project; however the West Main Street sewer pump station may require upgrades. If it is determined that upgrades are necessary as the City's hydraulic model of the sewer system is updated, the upgrades will be implemented as necessary. The Site currently contains an existing apartment building, and a single family residence. Both structures will be demolished thereby eliminating any current inflow and infiltration (I&I) entering the City sanitary sewer system (North interceptor) from the Site.

- **Impact on Flooding: The Proposed Action will not have a significant adverse environmental impact on or alter drainage flows or patterns, or surface water runoff.**

For the Proposed Action, the treatment of stormwater will be provided for the new impervious area. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of NYSDEC SPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activity Permit No. GP-0-15-002. The final stormwater management system will consist of minimal conveyance systems which will include culverts and grass-lined swales/dikes where required. It is anticipated that most, if not all perimeter diversion swales/dikes will be unnecessary and removed after installation; however, there may be a need for some as site conditions warrant. The remainder of the drainage area will remain undisturbed with natural vegetation remaining.

Green infrastructure practices will be implemented to the greatest extent possible to reduce runoff, including avoidance of sensitive areas, minimizing grading and soil disturbance, minimizing impervious areas on internal access ways, driveways and parking areas, and use of meadow as permanent final groundcover to provide better water quality. Parking spaces and drive aisles were reduced in size from 9'x20' with a 25' drive aisle to 9'x18' with a 24' drive aisle, to comply with the

newly amended City Code requirements and consistency with the "Greenway Connections" and NYSDEC stormwater objectives to reduce impervious surfaces. Infiltration/bioretention practices, use of open channel vegetated conveyance systems, and an underground cistern for roof runoff will also be implemented.

Pretreatment practices proposed for the Project include overland flow, vegetated swales, stone check dams, hydrodynamic devices, treatment practices, bioretention areas, infiltration basins and grass filter strips.

Proposed Bioretention areas 1 and 2 do not meet 100% Runoff Reduction Volume (RRV) due to shallow bedrock constraints. The January 2015 NYSDEC Stormwater Design Manual describes acceptable site limitations to include shallow depth to bedrock. Therefore, Bioretention area 1 will be supplemented with cisterns for roof runoff, and Bioretention area 2 will be supplemented with a vegetated swale to maximize the RRV.

- **Impact on Air: The Proposed Action will not have a significant adverse environmental impact on air quality.**

Construction activities associated with grading and excavation could result in temporary air quality impacts. Air quality in the area, however, is not expected to be significantly impacted by project construction because the construction activities will be temporary and confined to the Site. Construction vehicles will emit certain air pollutants through engine exhaust. There is also the potential for fugitive dust to be created during the construction period from site preparation activities, including removal of existing impervious surfaces and vegetation, and site grading. Fugitive dust emissions will be mitigated by wetting and stabilizing soils to suppress dust generation. Other dust suppression methods will include the spraying of soil stockpiles during dry periods and covering trucks carrying solid and other dry materials. These unavoidable short term impacts to air quality will cease upon project completion. Construction will be conducted in accordance with the final filed site plan and in accordance with all applicable federal, state and local codes. It is anticipated that nearby properties will experience temporary fugitive dust and an elevation in vehicle emissions from construction vehicles throughout occasional periods during construction of the proposed project. This is a temporary, construction-related, unavoidable impact that is not significant.

- **Impact on Plants and Animals: The Proposed Action will not have a significant adverse environmental impact on flora or fauna.**

Pursuant to a March 30, 2017 letter from NYSDEC, the only state-listed species recorded within or near the Project Site is the Indiana Bat (NYS Listing:

Endangered). The main impact of concern for bats is the removal of potential roost trees. The Applicant submitted a Threatened and Endangered Species Habitat Suitability Assessment Report, dated September 15, 2017, prepared by Ecological Solutions, LLC, Southbury, CT. The Report concluded "The proposed project will require the removal of approximately 3.2 acres of woods for the proposed project, which generally involves smaller trees located on the interior of the site that consist of opportunistic trees that are not prime for Indiana bat habitat." Pursuant to NYSDEC recommendations, removal of trees greater than four (4) inches in diameter at the Project Site will take place between October 1 and April 1 during the bat hibernation period to avoid the removal of trees which may be utilized by Indiana Bats as roosting trees. The Proposed Action also includes shielded, cut-off light fixtures that direct light down to minimize light pollution and not interfere with potential bat foraging activities. Lastly, the Proposed Action includes implementation of soil conservation and dust control best management practices, such as watering dry disturbed soil to keep dust down, and using staked, recessed silt fence and anti-tracking pads to prevent erosion and sedimentation in surface waters on the site. Also, native vegetation is proposed to enhance wildlife habitat.

- **Impact on Agricultural Resources: The Proposed Action will not have a significant adverse environmental impact on agricultural resources.**

There are no agricultural resources in the vicinity of the Site.

- **Impact on Aesthetic Resources: The Proposed Action will not have a significant adverse environmental impact on aesthetic resources.**

The Proposed Action will not result in the obstruction, elimination or significant screening of one or more officially designated scenic views, or visible from any publicly accessible vantage points either seasonally nor year around. The Local Waterfront Revitalization Program (LWRP) does not list viewsheds from the Site, or viewsheds that would be obscured by the Project. Seasonal views of the Project will be experienced from the Metro North train station and from the Hudson River. The Applicant submitted an LWRP Consistency Statement, prepared by Aryeh Siegel, Architect, which was reviewed by the City Planner. Photo renderings of the Project were also submitted by the Applicant demonstrating the possible seasonal views from these vantage points. The renderings demonstrate that the tops of the buildings will be visible to some degree and the level of visibility will change with the seasonal leaf coverage. Architectural review of the proposed building roofs includes attention to the roof materials and finishes to harmonize with the existing landscape. The buildings have been designed to be set back from the property lines to allow for the maintenance of the existing wooded hillsides around the proposed development areas. The seasonal views of the Project are

consistent with the existing viewshed and will not result in a significant adverse environmental impact.

It is noted that the height of the proposed buildings complies with the maximum building height permitted in the RD-1.7 District. However, due to the method in which the buildings are measured under the City of Beacon Zoning Code three (3) of the seven (7) proposed buildings require a variance from the maximum number of stories permitted. Buildings 3, 4 and 6 will be 55 feet in height, consistent with the limitations in the Zoning Code, but are measured as 5 stories where a maximum of 4.5 stories is permitted.

- **Impact on Historic and Archeological Resources: The Proposed Action will not have a significant adverse environmental impact on historic or archeological resources.**

Pursuant to a March 30, 2017 letter from NYSDEC, the records of the statewide inventory of archaeological resources maintained by the New York State Museum and the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (NYS OPRHP) state that the Proposed Action is located within an area considered to be sensitive with regard to archaeological resources.

A Phase 1A Archeological Investigation for the Project Site dated September 2017 was submitted for the Board's review. The Phase 1A Report provides the following conclusion:

"The project area has experienced extensive soil disturbance, initially the result of historic development followed by excavation related to the removal of the historic buildings that once occupied the site. The recent use of the property for aggregate and topsoil stockpiling have also affected the landscape. A significant portion of the property, especially along the eastern, southern and western perimeters, have slopes exceeding 12%. With the high level of disturbance and the presence of slopes greater than 12%, no further archeological investigation is recommended."

Additionally, based on its review of the Project (OPRHP Project Review #17PR06370), in a letter dated October 10, 2017, the NYS OPRHP provided the following opinion: "...[the] project will have no impact on archaeological and/or historic resources listed in or eligible for the New York State Register of Historic Places."

- **Impact on Open Space and Recreation: The Proposed Action will not have a significant adverse environmental impact on open space and recreation.**

  The area of the Proposed Action is not designated as open space by the City of Beacon. The Proposed Action will not result in the loss of a current or future recreational resource, eliminate significant open space, or result in loss of an area now used informally by the community as an open space resource, as the Site is primarily a vacant lot, with improvements limited to an existing apartment building and a single family residence. If a park of adequate size and practical location does not address the need for additional recreation/parkland within the City, a recreation fee will be required which will be used for the future need for park and recreational opportunities in the City of Beacon.

- **Impact on Critical Environmental Areas: The Proposed Action will not have a significant adverse environmental impact on Critical Environmental Areas.**

  The Proposed Action is not located in a Critical Environmental Area.

- **Impact on Transportation: The Proposed Action will not have a significant adverse environmental impact on transportation.**

  A Traffic Impact Study, dated January 18, 2017, revised February 27, 2017, (the "Study") was prepared by Maser Consulting, P.A., Hawthorne, N.Y. for review by the Planning Board. The Study was prepared to identify current and future traffic operating conditions on the surrounding roadway network and to assess the potential traffic impacts of the Project. The Study was subject to review and comment by the Planning Board's Traffic Consultant, Creighton Manning Engineers, LLP, Albany, N.Y.

  The Project proposes access to the Site at a reconstructed driveway connection to Tompkins Avenue located between Tompkins Terrace and Bank Street. The Project also includes an extension at the southern end of the Site to Branch Street, providing access directly to Bank Street, which connects to West Main Street to the south.

  The Study established Year 2017 Existing Traffic Volumes and then projected a 2022 Design Year which took into account background traffic growth and traffic from other potential or approved developments in the area. Estimated volume from the Project during peak hours was added to the Study and the Existing, No-Build and Build Traffic Volumes were compared to roadway capacities based on procedures from the Highway Capacity Manual to determine existing and future Levels of Service (LOS) and operating conditions.

The following intersections were studied:

Wolcott Avenue (NYS Route 9D)/Tompkins Avenue/Ralph Street
Tompkins Avenue/Bank Street
Beekman Street/W.Main Street
W.Main Street/Bank Street
Wolcott Avenue (NYS Route 9D)/Verplanck Avenue
Wolcott Avenue (NYS Route 9D)/Beekman Street/West Church Street
Wolcott Avenue (NYS Route 9D)/Main Street/Municipal Place
Tompkins Avenue/Site Access
Branch Street/Bank Street

The Study concludes and the Planning Board's Traffic Consultant concurred that similar levels of service and delays will be experienced at the area intersections under the future No-Build and Build Conditions. The majority of the intersections studied will experience a traffic volume increase of 7% or less as a result of Edgewater or the West End Lofts project recently approved by the Planning Board. The traffic projections do not take any credits for the anticipated use of Metro North and/or pedestrian trips to the train by residents of the new developments, which will likely reduce the actual peak vehicular traffic generated given the walking distance to the train station. The Applicant's traffic consultant prepared analyses for the Project as a transit-oriented development, based on the Site's proximity to the Metro-North train station. Where a mass transit credit is applied to the Project, which the Applicant's traffic consultant identified could be obtainable for the Site, the Applicant's traffic consultant concluded: "...the expected delays would be less at the study area intersections as a result of the lower vehicular traffic generation from the project."

Notwithstanding, due to anticipated delays at the Wolcott Avenue/Verplanck Avenue and Wolcott Avenue/Beekman Street intersections, traffic signal timing modifications are proposed during the AM Peak Hour for the Wolcott Avenue/Verplanck Avenue intersection and during the PM Peak Hours for the Wolcott Avenue/Beekman Street intersection, to address the project related delay increases. With these traffic signal timing modifications, the intersections will operate similar to No-Build conditions without the Project. Additionally, the intersections of Wolcott Avenue/Tompkins Avenue and Beekman Street/West Main Street are proposed to be monitored after occupancy of the Project to assess whether traffic signal warrants will be satisfied at these locations.

Related to transportation, the Project also proposes improved pedestrian access to and from the Project, upgraded pedestrian facilities along Branch Street, Bank Street and West Main Street, and pedestrian striping and signing improvements at

the intersection of Bank Street and West Main Street. The Project also proposes ample bicycle storage and a car share program for its residents.

- **Impact on Energy: The Proposed Action will not have a significant adverse environmental impact on energy.**

  It is anticipated that existing energy infrastructure will continue to serve the Proposed Action and that enough surplus exists to meet potential demand. The Proposed Action does not require a new, or an upgrade to any existing substation.

  Several green building techniques have been incorporated into the Project. The building design will allow for the ability to utilize solar energy in the future if and when it becomes feasible.

- **Impact on Noise, Odor and Light: The Proposed Action will not have a significant adverse environmental impact as a result of objectionable odors, noise or light.**

  The Proposed Action is not anticipated to generate any noxious odors.

  Noise impacts associated with the proposed Project will be limited to temporary impacts generated during construction. Temporary noise impacts associated with construction will be mitigated by limiting construction activities to the hours between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Soil testing was conducted onsite to investigate the depth of the soil and rock conditions. In the area of Bioretention area 1, shale bedrock was found less than 5 feet from the existing grade. In the area of Bioretention area 2, bedrock depths were found to be slightly deeper than 4 feet. If blasting becomes necessary, it will be performed in accordance with all applicable state and local requirements. In addition, there will be no significant noise impacts post-construction.

  All proposed lighting will be fully shielded and dark sky compliant. Lighting levels along the access drive will generally be low (within 0.0 - 1.0 footcandles along the majority of the access drive, with discrete areas of increased intensity under lighting fixtures (up to about 3.0 footcandles). The proposed Lighting Plan shows minimal to no light spillage over property lines. Lighting at the perimeter of the site is negligible.

- **Impact on Human Health: The Proposed Action will not have a significant adverse environmental impact on human health from exposure to new or existing sources of contaminants.**

  According to information available on the NYS DEC Site Remediation Database, the off-site contamination under the following Site Codes identified in the EAF has either completed a remediation program or does not pose a threat to development on the Edgewater Site: V00293, C314112, V00096, 314069, 546031.

- **Consistency with Community Plans and Community Character: The Proposed Action is not inconsistent with adopted community plans and community character.**

  The Project is consistent with the recommendations and goals identified in the 2007 Comprehensive Plan and 2017 Comprehensive Plan Updates regarding density of developments. The Site is the only property in the City classified in the RD-1.7 Zoning District and the number of proposed dwelling units complies with the provisions of the RD-1.7 District. The transit oriented nature of the Project is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan which seeks to encourage development and allow for increased density of housing in the waterfront/train station area of the City. (2007 Comprehensive Plan, pp. 7 & 17; 2017 Comprehensive Plan Update, p. 10). The Project is also consistent with the surrounding neighborhood which includes the existing Tompkins Terrace and Colonial Springs residential developments.

  The Project will create an increased demand for community services such as emergency services and the Beacon City School District. The application was referred to the City of Beacon Police and Fire Departments. The Project will be constructed in accordance with all applicable state and local emergency and fire safety requirements. The Applicant also submitted a School Impact Study, dated June 26, 2017, prepared by Cleary Consulting. The School Impact Study concluded that approximately 47 school age children would reside in the new development. This estimate was calculating using the Rutgers University, Center for Urban Policy Research multipliers which tends to be a conservative method for determining the amount of school age children generated by a development project.

  The School Impact Study was reviewed by the Planning Board's Planning Consultant. Cleary Consulting's August 7, 2017 letter responds to questions from the Planning Consultant and comments from the public. It clarifies and concludes that the value associated with each unit type in the Rutgers study is based on 2006 market conditions, but it is the ratio of the value to other factors that is more important than the value itself. For example, the values could just as effectively been expressed as low, medium and high, rather than attaching a numeric value to each housing type. The value selected to be utilized in the calculation of the number of

school age children generated by the Project reflects the Applicant's anticipated price point for the market rate units at the proposed transit oriented development project.

The Planning Board's Planning Consultant concludes in his October 6, 2017 review memorandum that the projected 47 school-age children is conservative given (1) average household sizes have declined since the 2006 multipliers were published, (2) several large-scale studies have shown that apartments near train stations generally have lower school children counts, (3) 96 of the 307 proposed units are smaller studio apartments which should have a lower student ratio than the one-bedroom ratio used for studios in the School Impact Study, and (4) the survey of Beacon multifamily housing developments set forth in a chart on page 9 of Cleary Consulting's August 29, 2017 letter, particularly the most recent three projects on the chart (Leonard Street – 74 total units, 49 units rented to date, 0 school-aged children; 1 East Main Street – 19 units, 1 school-aged child; and 11 Creek Drive – 6 units, 0 school-aged children), provides local supporting background information for a lower average number of school age children. The chart of "Actual School-Age Children Residing in Selected Comparable Multi-Family Developments in the City of Beacon," demonstrates an average ratio of 0.71 school-aged children per unit. (August 29, 2017 Cleary Consulting Letter, p. 9) Using this ratio, the Project would produce only 22 school-aged children.

The Beacon City School District has called into question the accuracy of the data and rationale behind the School Impact Study's conclusions in letters dated August 7, 2017, October 12, 2017, November 3, 2017 and December 8, 2017 (received December 11, 2017), and verbal testimony before the Board. The Applicant's consultant responded to the School District's concerns in letters, dated August 29, 2017, September 26, 2017, October 25, 2017 and November 28, 2017. Also, upon request of the Planning Board, in a memorandum dated November 14, 2017 the Beacon City Assessor provided an estimated valuation of Project of $34-40 million based upon her knowledge of the Project to-date.

Upon review of all correspondence, the Planning Board's Planning Consultant provided his professional opinion regarding the school impacts in his November 9, 2017 memorandum:

As a summary of the school impact positions, the applicant's June 26, 2017 School Impact Study and supplemental comments conclude that the Beacon City School District (BCSD) has adequate capacity for the projected 47 school-age children and that the proposed project will have a net positive financial impact on the district. Three central assumptions have been disputed by the BCSD: the estimate of public school-age children, the assessed value of the completed project, and the cost per student to be used in the fiscal calculation. The schools have available capacity, since overall enrollment has dropped 20%, or 735 students, between 2004-5 and 2015-16.

Both parties agree that the 2006 Rutgers Residential Demographic Multipliers for New York are the industry-accepted standard for estimating school children, but they disagree on what level ratios to apply in this case. The applicant's estimate of 47 appears, if anything, high since the total school-age children table was used from the Rutgers Study, rather than the more targeted public school-age children (PSAC) ratios. Also, 96 of the 307 proposed units are smaller studio apartments, which should have a lower student count than the one-bedroom ratio used in the School Impact Study. My best estimate is below, using the higher 67th-100th percentile PSAC ratio for the market rate units and the medium 34th–66th percentile PSAC ratio for the required workforce units:

Units	#	Market	Ratio	PSAC	Workforce	Ratio	PSAC	Total PSAC
Studio	96	86	.07	6.02	10	.27	2.7	8.72
1 BR	115	104	.07	7.28	11	.27	2.97	10.25
2 BR	86	77	.16	12.32	9	.45	4.05	16.37
3 BR	10	9	.63	5.67	1	1.3	1.3	6.97
Totals	307	276			31			42.31

The City of Beacon Assessor has estimated that the assessed value of the completed project will be between $34 and 40 million. At the midpoint of this estimate, the development will generate $810,300 of annual tax revenue for the BCSD.

For the cost of the additional PSAC, the applicant has proposed using the BCSD 2015-16 Instructional Budget cost of $17,102 per student, which includes teaching salaries/benefits, special needs, library, attendance, guidance, health and social services, interscholastic and other activities, transportation, and similar more student-sensitive functions. The BCSD has maintained that the total budget cost of $23,116 per student should be used, which also accounts for the Board of Education, central administration, finance, legal, personnel, records management, supervisors' salaries/benefits, and capital budget items, including central services and debt services. The net fiscal impacts depend on which one of these figures seems most reasonable. As another factor of comparison, the actual local tax levy, after state aid and other revenue, is $12,653 per student.

	Cost/Student	# Students	Add'l. Costs	Revenue	Net Impacts
Instructional Budget	$17,102	42	$718,284	$810,300	+ $92,016
Total Budget	$23,116	42	$970,872	$810,300	-$160,572

Marginally increasing enrollment by about 42 students in a district that is down 735 students since 2004-5 and down 128 students from the previous year should not significantly affect the capital and administrative budget sections. I think that the Instructional Budget calculation is justifiable.

Based on the information provided the Planning Board's professional planning consultant, the Applicant's professional planning consultant and the BCSD, it is the Planning Board's opinion that the addition of 42 school-age children represents the most accurate application of the Rutger's ratios. After considering all testimony and written submissions to the Planning Board on this subject, the Planning Board

determines that the addition of 42 school-age children as a result of this Project will not create a significant increased demand on the School District.[1]

Based upon all information before the Planning Board to-date, including the Full Environmental Assessment Form, the Planning Board finds that the Proposed Action will not have any significant adverse impacts upon the environment. This Negative Declaration indicates that no environmental impact statement need be prepared and that the SEQRA process is complete.

[1] The Planning Board notes that even if the Total Budget is used to calculate the cost/student, the resulting estimated $160,572 deficit is not significant as compared to the BSCD's annual budget of approximately $66.75 million (2016-2017 final budget), and therefore does not rise to the level of a significant adverse environmental impact.

Agency Use Only [If Applicable]

Project: Edgewater

Date: October 11, 2017

Full Environmental Assessment Form
Part 3 - Evaluation of the Magnitude and Importance of Project Impacts and Determination of Significance

Part 3 provides the reasons in support of the determination of significance. The lead agency must complete Part 3 for every question in Part 2 where the impact has been identified as potentially moderate to large or where there is a need to explain why a particular element of the proposed action will not, or may, result in a significant adverse environmental impact.

Based on the analysis in Part 3, the lead agency must decide whether to require an environmental impact statement to further assess the proposed action or whether available information is sufficient for the lead agency to conclude that the proposed action will not have a significant adverse environmental impact. By completing the certification on the next page, the lead agency can complete its determination of significance.

Reasons Supporting This Determination:

To complete this section:

- Identify the impact based on the Part 2 responses and describe its magnitude. Magnitude considers factors such as severity, size or extent of an impact.
- Assess the importance of the impact. Importance relates to the geographic scope, duration, probability of the impact occurring, number of people affected by the impact and any additional environmental consequences if the impact were to occur.
- The assessment should take into consideration any design element or project changes.
- Repeat this process for each Part 2 question where the impact has been identified as potentially moderate to large or where there is a need to explain why a particular element of the proposed action will not, or may, result in a significant adverse environmental impact.
- Provide the reason(s) why the impact may, or will not, result in a significant adverse environmental impact
- For Conditional Negative Declarations identify the specific condition(s) imposed that will modify the proposed action so that no significant adverse environmental impacts will result.
- Attach additional sheets, as needed.

Please see attached

Determination of Significance - Type 1 and Unlisted Actions

SEQR Status: ☑ Type 1 ☐ Unlisted

Identify portions of EAF completed for this Project: ☑ Part 1 ☑ Part 2 ☑ Part 3

Upon review of the information recorded on this EAF, as noted, plus this additional support information
All application materials submitted by the Applicant, memoranda from City staff and consultants, agency and public comment, and testimony from meetings held on the application.

and considering both the magnitude and importance of each identified potential impact, it is the conclusion of the City of Beacon Planning Board as lead agency that:

☑ A. This project will result in no significant adverse impacts on the environment, and, therefore, an environmental impact statement need not be prepared. Accordingly, this negative declaration is issued.

☐ B. Although this project could have a significant adverse impact on the environment, that impact will be avoided or substantially mitigated because of the following conditions which will be required by the lead agency:

There will, therefore, be no significant adverse impacts from the project as conditioned, and, therefore, this conditioned negative declaration is issued. A conditioned negative declaration may be used only for UNLISTED actions (see 6 NYCRR 617.d).

☐ C. This Project may result in one or more significant adverse impacts on the environment, and an environmental impact statement must be prepared to further assess the impact(s) and possible mitigation and to explore alternatives to avoid or reduce those impacts. Accordingly, this positive declaration is issued.

Name of Action: Edgewater

Name of Lead Agency: City of Beacon Planning Board

Name of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency: Jay Sheers

Title of Responsible Officer: Chairman

Signature of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency: Jay Sheers Date: December 18, 2017

Signature of Preparer (if different from Responsible Officer) Jennifer L. Gray, Esq. Date:

For Further Information:

Contact Person: Etha Grogan, Planning Secretary

Address: 1 Municipal Plaza, Beacon, New York 12508

Telephone Number: 845-838-5002

E-mail: egrogan@cityofbeacon.org

For Type 1 Actions and Conditioned Negative Declarations, a copy of this Notice is sent to:

Chief Executive Officer of the political subdivision in which the action will be principally located (e.g., Town / City / Village of)
Other involved agencies (if any)
Applicant (if any)
Environmental Notice Bulletin: http://www.dec.ny.gov/enb/enb.html

Received in the Office of the
City Clerk
December 20, 2017

PRINT FULL FORM