

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. Executive Summary Overview

Putnam Seabury Partners, L.P (the “Applicant”) has petitioned the Town Board of the Town of Southeast, NY, for an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance and Map of the Town of Southeast, and is applying to the Town of Southeast Planning Board for re-subdivision and Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit approval for an approximately 1,125,000 square foot logistics center to be known as Northeast Interstate Logistics Center (the “proposed project”) on an approximately 328 acre site located at New York State (NYS) Route 312 and Pugsley Road (the “project site”) (see Figures II-1 and II-2).

The project site, which is currently comprised of 156 tax parcels, is proposed to be re-subdivided into 6 tax parcels (Figures II-3 and II-4). The proposed Northeast Interstate Logistics Center would include four buildings ranging in size from 173,775 to 366,404 square feet. The proposed buildings would be located on Lots 1, 2, and 3; Lot 4 would remain vacant except for potable water wells; Lot 5 is proposed to be donated to Putnam County for new access for Tilly Foster Farm to Pugsley Road and the Applicant’s proposed traffic improvements at the intersection with NY 312, and potential related uses. Lot 6 would be donated to the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) for right-of-improvements.

The Applicant is requesting that the Town Board rezone approximately 42 acres of the property currently zoned RC District into the OP-3 District. The 42 acre parcel is currently on the Putnam County Tax Map as Section 45, Block 1, Lot 4 and would become part of the proposed Lot 1 (Figure III.A-2). The remaining portions of the present parcel known as Section 45, Block 1, Lot 4, which would become the proposed Lots 5 and 6, would remain in the RC District. The Applicant is therefore requesting approximately 40% of the site’s existing 102.8 acre RC zoned property be rezoned to OP-3, while the remaining approximately 60%, which fronts onto Route 312, would remain in the RC

District. Following the rezoning 61.2 acres of the property would be zoned RC and 266.8 acres would be zoned OP-3. Additionally, the Applicant proposes to add “logistics center” as a “conditional use permit” use in the OP-3 Zoning District.

The purpose of this Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is to assess the potential environmental impacts of the proposed zoning text and map amendments and the development approvals for the Northeast Interstate Logistics Center (the “proposed project”), as required under the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) and its implementing regulations (6 NYCRR Part 617). The Town of Southeast Planning Board (“Planning Board”) is the designated Lead Agency for the SEQRA process. Following circulation of its intent to serve as Lead Agency to all Involved Agencies, the Planning Board declared itself Lead Agency on May 14, 2018. This DEIS has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of SEQRA, including 6 NYCRR Part 617.9

This Executive Summary section summarizes the key components of the proposed project. The summaries of the DEIS sections are discussed in the “Summary of DEIS Sections” of this Executive Summary. Please refer to individual DEIS sections for a full analysis.

The site was previously subject to OP-2 zoning, which permitted among other uses, warehousing. The Applicant petitioned for and obtained the rezoning of the site to OP-3, in connection with a mixed-use plan, featuring single family-homes, retail, office and hospitality uses that would pose significantly greater impacts than the instant proposal. The 143-unit residential component of that project, for example, would, unlike the instant proposal, require a sewage treatment facility and generate 150 school aged children. In recognition of dramatic changes to the real estate and financing markets in the 21st century, the Applicant rethought its master plan to identify a viable use in demand under current market conditions, reduce the environmental impacts of the prior mixed-use plan, create strong and sustainable economic impacts for the community, and meet the intent of the community's comprehensive plan for economic development in the I-84/312 area. After careful analysis, the Applicant determined that a logistics center use is

highly desirable under current market conditions, would pose significantly fewer environmental impacts, including retaining over 80% of the site open space and requiring approximately a third of the water, and would have a strong positive economic impact on the community. The DEIS examines in detail the proposed project, its impacts and methods of mitigating them where appropriate.

The proposed project in the Applicant's opinion fulfills both the spirit and intent of the Town's laws while providing a major economic development engine for the community. The proposed project, has both current market and financing support, generates significant economic impacts for the community and retains much of the environmental/rural character of the property. The Applicant set a number of objectives when determining a strategy to develop its 328 acre property in Southeast and is comfortable and confident that the development scheme contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) achieves these objectives in a constructive and environmentally sensitive way.

Market Demand: Logistic centers are a use that has current market demand and insufficient supply in the region, and is an achievable business plan for the property. Logistic space meets the increasing market demand for high-bay warehouse/distribution facilities driven by ecommerce. (See *Where Internet Orders Mean Real Jobs, and New Life for Communities*, Natalie Kitroeff, Oct. 22, 2017, and *As Amazon Moves In, Demand for Warehouse Space Climbs*, Micah Maidenberg, October 24, 2017—in Appendix I-A.) The State of New York recognizes the growth potential of this use, and it is consistent with the Southeast Comprehensive Plan for new job creating industry. (See N.Y. State, Build Now-NY, Development Profile for Warehouse/Distribution/Logistics Center Sites, August 2008--in Appendix I-A.) As a result, the use has a high likelihood of being developed in the near future.

Feasibility: The proposed logistic center use is economically feasible and of sufficient size to pay for the on-site and off-site infrastructure requirements without public assistance. Development of this site entails high upfront costs. The engineers estimated these costs

to be in the \$30,000,000 range. The proposed project sized at 1,125,000 sf can cover these infrastructure costs, which include significant traffic improvements.

Fiscal Impact: The project, which poses relatively few demands on governmental services, provides a substantial net fiscal gain to the community. It would generate an annual average of approximately ten times the current property taxes of \$140,000. The Projected annual fiscal contribution from each building is estimated for 50% of assessed value to 100% of assessed value over a generally ten year period commencing with the issuance of a certificate of occupancy based on the implementation of a Payment in Lieu of Tax Program (PILOT) the Applicant would seek. Under a PILOT, instead of paying property taxes on the full assessed value of a property, a land owner negotiates a fixed payment with the various property taxing jurisdictions for a period of time. In no case would a PILOT payment be less than the taxes the land owner is currently paying on the unimproved property. By way of example, if the property taxes at full assessment were \$2,000,000 for the full build out, PILOT payments would begin at \$1,000,000 and increase to \$2,000,000 over a generally ten year period. The actual PILOT payments would be determined on a phase by phase basis based on each phase's assessed value. The thirty year cumulative impact of net tax gains could approach \$40,000,000, and the fifty year impact could approach \$60,000,000. This is noteworthy when compared to the current, approved site plan for the property, which includes 143 single-family homes generating approximately 150 school aged children at a cost to the school board of approximately \$15,000 per student or over \$2,000,000 in annual costs.

Phillips Price prepared a study estimating the economic benefits of the proposed project, both during construction and during operation, using an Impact Analysis for Planning (IMPLAN) model (see Appendix H-2). When aggregating direct, indirect and induced outputs from the construction phase, the project is expected to contribute \$110,555,593 of economic output to the local Southeast economy. During the operations phase, the project is estimated to annually generate \$91,581,976 in economic output to the local economy.

During the construction period, the cost of labor is expected to reach \$45,511,667, and many of these labor dollars will flow to the local workforce. Annually during the operations period, wages and salaries are projected to reach \$32,370,903, and many of these dollars will flow to the local workforce and economy.

The development and implementation of the proposed project would have a positive impact on the economy of the Town of Southeast.

Please refer to DEIS Chapter III.H “Tax Analysis” for a full analysis.

Jobs: Direct, indirect and induced jobs to be created during the construction phase of the logistics center are anticipated to reach 818 jobs. In addition, the operation of the proposed project is anticipated to generate 919 direct, indirect, and induced jobs at the local level, including 665 direct jobs from the operation of the proposed facility across a wide level of skills. Logistics is an evolving industry that is rapidly applying technology to operations. As a result, the new jobs are likely to include more skills than warehouse worker and truck driver. The logistics industry is an important and stable growth industry according to industry analysts and the State of New York.

Maintenance of Rural Character: The project is consistent with the rural character of Southeast. The buildings are up and away from Route 312 and virtually invisible from any location in the Town and along I-84. Along Route 312, the property would remain visually rural and rustic. Moreover, the Applicant will offer several acres at the Route 312/Pugsley intersection to Putnam County for inclusion in the Tilly Foster Farms project, further enhancing the rural character along Route 312 and assuring the protection of the Town’s aesthetics.

Traffic: Extensive mitigation is proposed to accommodate the project and the associated site generated traffic volumes (Figures III.B-2 and III.B-3). The reconstruction of Pugsley Road and the improvements proposed at the NY 312/Pugsley Road intersection, together with the signal and potential lane use improvements to the nearby interchange with I-84

at NY 312, which reflect preliminary discussions with the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT), will provide an excellent roadway system to accommodate the proposed logistics center development.

Environmental Sensitivity: The proposed project leaves over 80% of the site (264 acres) as open space. The project's development team has been sensitive to the site's wetlands. Under the proposed plan, far less than an acre of wetlands (0.05 acres) is disturbed due to a road widening at an existing stream crossing, which is far less than the previously approved single-family home community. The visual impacts of the project have been minimized through proven engineering techniques that have effectively reduced the visual impact by approximately half. Noise and air quality impacts are within the limits of the Town Ordinances and, will likely decrease over time as more and more vehicles in general become electric, quiet and emission free. The building area will remove trees at a level well below the limits permitted in Town Code, and the project will plant a very large number of new trees and other landscaping material.

Watershed Compliance: The use meets the regulations of the NYCDEP with minimal impacts to the watershed. Logistic spaces use comparatively low levels of water, discharge waste in amounts that can be accommodated by septic systems and generate lower levels of traffic than comparable mixed-use projects including single family homes, retail and office space and hotel as was contemplated in 2004 and are permitted by the current OP-3 and RC zoning.

The Applicant's conclusion is that the proposed logistics center would provide the community with a great economic engine for the foreseeable future with minimal environmental disruption. The Applicant has studied the impacts of the former single-family home site plan plus additional permitted mixes of uses to assure itself that the proposed plan delivers greater economic impacts (it does), less traffic (it does) and less environment impacts (it does) than the partially approved alternative.

This DEIS examines the potentially significant adverse impacts of the proposed project in

detail. The Applicant welcomes working with the community to implement a mutually beneficial development.

B. Brief Description of the Proposed Action

This DEIS has been prepared to evaluate potential adverse environmental impacts associated with the proposed resubdivision and development of a portion of the subject property with four Class A logistics buildings totaling 1,124,575 s.f., that may be based on user preference, become (4) high-cube and automated logistics center buildings, and discusses measures that have been incorporated into the project design to negate the project's potential significant adverse environmental impacts. The Full Environmental Assessment Form Part I is included in Appendix I-1a "High-cube" is defined by the Institute of Transportation Engineers as follows:

"A high-cube warehouse (HCW) is a building that typically has at least 200,000 gross square feet of floor area, has a ceiling height of 24 feet or more, and is used primarily for the storage and/or consolidation of manufactured goods (and to a lesser extent, raw materials) prior to their distribution to retail locations or other warehouses. A typical HCW has a high level of on-site automation and logistics management. The automation and logistics enable highly-efficient processing of goods through the HCW."

A logistics center incorporates the traditional storage, assemblage and manufacturing uses, but adds a number of additional valuable services to support the distribution demands and increased productivity that has resulted. For example, the additional uses under a logistics center use include handling, shipment, consolidation, repackaging, labeling, assembly, aggregation, transloading, refrigeration, management or other similar activities of nonhazardous goods and materials.

This site is a particularly appropriate location for a logistics center. It is easily accessible, close to I-684 and I-87, and is situated along Interstate I-84 directly off Exit 19, which is a full four (4) way interchange (Route 312 Interchange). Further, its central Putnam County location is convenient not only to Putnam County residents but also to the area

employment centers of Westchester, Dutchess and Orange Counties in New York and Fairfield and Litchfield Counties in Connecticut. Nearby centers of commerce include White Plains, Poughkeepsie and Newburgh, NY, as well as Greenwich, Stamford and Waterbury, CT. The site's location off the Route 312 Interchange and Pugsley Lane would allow for ample transportation access without disturbing local traffic within the Town. The site's proximity to the Metro-North Southeast train station provides an excellent opportunity for potential private jitney service to the site to serve employees.

Direct, indirect and induced jobs to be created during the construction phase of the logistics center are anticipated to reach 818 jobs. Nine-hundred-and-nineteen (919) permanent jobs are expected to be added to the labor force during operation of the facility, which include 665 direct jobs from the operation of the proposed facility. The project will thus be a significant source of job creation.

The subject property is located on either side of Pugsley Road and Fields Corner Road, to the northwest of the Exit 19 I-84/Route 312 interchange. It is entirely located within the Town of Southeast, and extends to the Town line of the Town of Patterson to the north (Figures II-1 and II-2). The site is within the New York City Department of Environmental Conservation (NYCDEP) watershed. A portion of the property is zoned OP-3 "Office Park OP-3 District", with the remainder zoned RC "Rural Commercial District". It is proposed to rezone part of the RC portion of the property to OP-3 (Figure III.A-2). A zoning text amendment is proposed to permit a new "logistics center" conditional use within the OP-3 district (Appendix I-1b).

The overall property is proposed to be subdivided into six lots (Figures II-3 and Figure II-4). Lot 1 is to contain two logistics center buildings, with Building #1 having 261,320 s.f. and Building #2 having 173,775 s.f. Lot 2 is to contain Building #3 with 323,076 s.f. and Lot 3 is to contain Building #4 with 366,404 s.f. Total logistics center space is therefore 1,124,575 s.f. Lot 4 contains the existing supply well NW4, and Lot 3 contains the existing supply well OW3. Together, these two wells will serve the project. The Applicant is discussing donating Lot 5 to Putnam County in connection for use with the County's Tilly

Foster Farm & Educational Institute, which is adjacent and could gain access to Pugsley Road and to the Applicant’s proposed traffic improvements at the intersection with NY 312. The County has expressed an interest. Lot 6 would be donated to the NYSDOT for right-of-improvements.

Proposed lot acreages are shown below:

Lot #	Approximate Acreage
1	69.86
2	99.37
3	97.59
4	57.28
5	3.16
6	<u>0.77</u>

Total Acres 328.03 acres

The OP-3 zone permits a maximum building height of 45 feet, excluding parapet walls up to four feet. The buildings will have a height of approximately 40-42 feet, excluding the parapet. The parapet height is planned at 6 inches, except at the corners of the buildings, where it will be two feet, in all instances below the maximum permitted parapet height of 4 feet. With a 6-inch parapet, the total apparent height is 40.5-42.5 feet, except at the corners of the buildings where it will be 42-44 feet. (See Figures II-5 and II.5-A for a typical buildings elevation and building perspective.)

Buildings 1 and 2 have been designed with the finished floor elevations of the buildings below the highest existing grades of the top of the ridgeline, thus reducing their visibility along the ridgeline, consistent with the intent of the Town’s ridgeline protection law. The proposed project would remove the top of the ridgeline, spread removed material to create the necessary flat development pad and set the building at a lower elevation, thus minimizing the impact to the viewshed. Similarly, Buildings 3 and 4 have been sited so that the finished floor elevations of the buildings are below the highest existing grades, with

Building 4 being 17.5 feet below the top of the existing ridgeline which will be removed. Figures III.C-1 and III.C-2 provide cross sections of the proposed buildings through the existing ridgelines. The cross sections illustrate the existing grades with a dashed line and the proposed grades with a solid line. With the proposed finished floor elevations below the existing grades of the ridgetops, the visibility of the proposed buildings has been reduced to the maximum extent practicable, as required by the Town Code. Further lowering of the buildings could create a major imbalance, on a phase by phase basis, of the amount of fill that would need to be exported from the site. This reduces the effective height of the proposed roof level height for Building 4 from 40-42 feet to approximately 22.5 - 24.5 feet (after subtracting the 17.5 feet below the existing ridgetop) along the top of the existing ridgeline, as compared to the 49 feet of maximum permitted roof height including a four foot parapet, resulting in a total reduction of up to approximately 50 percent at the top of the existing ridgeline. Figure III.C-2A shows a comparison of the proposed Building 4 with a finished floor elevation 17.5 feet below the highest existing grade compared to a permitted 49 foot (including the parapet) high building constructed on the ridgetop.

In addition, the visibility of the buildings will be further reduced by preserving existing trees within the ridgeline and adjacent areas where practicable, removing trees at a ratio substantially below the maximum number of trees permitted by the Town (see Figures III.C-3 and III.C-4), providing a substantial buffer from roadways and residents, coloring the buildings to blend into the surroundings, providing retaining walls which will be terraced and have plantings between the individual walls as well as along the tops of the walls to screen the walls and buildings, providing extensive evergreen and deciduous tree plantings, and providing dark sky friendly site lighting.

The project will retain substantial open space and vegetation throughout the property. Approximately 196 acres, or 60% of the site, will be undisturbed, including Lot 4 (57.28 acres). Also, additional landscaping is proposed to promote a rural feel and buffer other land uses in the area. Over 82% of the property will be green, pervious area following the construction. The project has been specifically designed to provide buffering with

residences in the general vicinity of the proposed development. to help protect property values, and preserve community character. In addition to preserving significant open space and vegetation on the property, such as on-site trees and shrubs, the Applicant is proposing additional screening on portions of the property to enhance buffering from abutting properties (see full-size drawings C-501, C-502, C-503, C-504, and C-505 “Landscaping Plan”).

Extensive mitigation is proposed to accommodate the project and the associated site generated traffic volumes (Figures III.B-2 and III.B-3). The reconstruction of Pugsley Road and the improvements proposed at the NY 312/Pugsley Road intersection, together with the signal and potential lane use improvements to the nearby interchange with I-84 at NY 312, will provide an excellent roadway system to accommodate the proposed logistics center development. While all four buildings may not be constructed concurrently, depending on market conditions, all of the proposed intersection improvements will be completed in association with the construction of the first building(s), which will benefit other motorists traveling through the study area.

The proposed site lighting will be dark sky friendly to minimize the visibility of the lighting. All lighting fixtures will be directed down and shielded to mitigate light spillage. Thus, the lighting is designed in such a way that it will have minimal impact on neighboring properties.

Regional access to the site would be primarily via I-84, which intersects NY 312 at interchange 19. Secondary regional access is provided via NY 6. Pugsley Road provides access to the site from NY 312. Since the existing Town roads are relatively narrow and in poor condition and thus not suitable for the proposed use, the Applicant will reconstruct both Pugsley Road and Barrett Road to provide proper lane widths, grades and turning radii.

Barrett Road is proposed to become a private road as it will only serve the property, and as a private road will save the Town the cost of maintenance, which will become the

responsibility of the Applicant. Fields Corner Road will be closed at the request of the Town of Patterson by providing an emergency access gate at the Town line, with gravel turnarounds provided. This will restrict any truck or other traffic accessing the site directly from the Town of Patterson.

Access to Building #1 and Building #2 will be provided via a driveway off of Pugsley Road, with loading docks provided at the rear (westerly) side of the buildings (see full-size drawing C-100 "Overall Layout Plan"). Access to Building #3 and Building #4 will be provided via Barrett Road, with a turnaround provided just past and to the west of the entrances to each of the two buildings. Loading docks are positioned to the east side of the buildings to face away from the residential uses to the west and northwest.

Water will be sourced from two existing wells, one on proposed Lot 4 and one on proposed Lot 3. A freestanding water tank of approximately 269,000 gallons would be required for the non-transient, non-community public water supply system, which includes fire suppression requirements as well. Septic systems will be installed adjacent to each of the buildings.

Approximately 0.05 acres of NYSDEC wetland disturbance (due to the proposed Barrett Road crossing improvements) and approximately 7.68 acres of Town and NYSDEC buffers would be disturbed (Figure III.D-3), with mitigation of potential impacts provided by a Wetland Mitigation Plan. The Wetland Mitigation Plan will provide mitigation for the wetland encroachment at the Barrett Road proposed crossing improvements through restoration of the upper portion of Wetland 4, as discussed with the NYSDEC. This area has been overgrown by invasive species which degrade the overall habitat value of the wetland. Wetland buffer impacts will be mitigated through extensive wetland plantings in the stormwater management basins, which will enhance wetland functional values.

Potential adverse impacts to vegetation and wildlife habitats have been avoided to the maximum extent practical by utilizing portions of the property which are former agricultural fields, which are primarily the old field and transitional woodland vegetative

communities (Figure III.G-2). These communities are extensive on the site, so loss of vegetative cover type or wildlife habitat are not of concern. However, there are two protected wildlife species that have been identified as potential inhabitants for this site. One is the Northern Long-eared bat, and in accordance with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service guidelines, no tree cutting will occur from June 1 through July 31, because of the potential of occupied maternal roost trees on the site during the bat's pups rearing months. The other protected species is the Bog Turtle, and direct impacts to Bog Turtle habitat have been completely avoided because the only potential Bog Turtle habitat on the site is associated with Wetland 6, and no wetland impacts are proposed to Wetland 6, nor is any work proposed within 200 feet of the potential Bog Turtle habitat.

Development of this site will also include stormwater management improvements such that the quantity and quality of stormwater runoff during and after construction are not adversely altered or are enhanced when compared to pre-development conditions, and are not anticipated to have any adverse impacts to the site or surrounding areas.

Because the project has no residential component, the project itself will create no demand for additional parkland. However, the Applicant is discussing donating Lot 5 to Putnam County in connection for use with the County's Tilly Foster Farm & Educational Institute, which is adjacent and could provide access to Pugsley Road and to the Applicant's proposed traffic improvements at the intersection with NY 312. The County has expressed an interest.

C. Project Purpose and Need and Benefits

The proposed logistics center is a modernized distribution use. The need for distribution facilities has evolved and will continue to do so into the foreseeable future, due largely to e-commerce and computerization of society. Retail shopping, as noted widely, has shifted from conventional stores to online marketplaces where consumers can order from the convenience of their homes and businesses and have the goods delivered to their homes and businesses often within a day or two. According to a New York State Division of

Research and Statistics report titled “The Transportation and Warehousing Sector in the Hudson Valley”, dated June 2017, the number of jobs in warehousing and storage grew by 72% between 2010 and 2016. The report concludes that the transportation and warehousing sector has a bright outlook, with several national big-box retailers currently operating distribution centers in the Hudson Valley region with more scheduled to open in the coming years.

A logistics center incorporates the traditional receipt, storage, and distribution of non-hazardous goods and materials, but adds a number of additional valuable services to support the distribution demands and increased productivity that has resulted. For example, the additional uses under a logistics center use include handling, shipment, consolidation, repackaging, labeling, assembly, aggregation, transloading, refrigeration, management or other similar activities of nonhazardous goods and materials.

To enable the development of a logistics center in the Town, the Applicant is petitioning the Town Board to establish a “logistics center” as a defined use, which would be defined as:

“A building or structure used for the receipt, storage, distribution, handling, shipment, consolidation, repackaging, labeling, assembly, aggregation, transloading, refrigeration, management or similar activities for non-hazardous goods, products, freight, cargo and/or materials. A Logistics Center may include associated office space and/or facilities for loading, unloading, transfer, repair and/or maintenance. A Logistics Center may also include accessory retail space, provided that such space shall comprise no more than two percent (2%) of the total floor area of such use.”

This site is a particularly appropriate location for a logistics center. It is easily accessible, close to I-684 and I-87, and is situated along Interstate I-84 directly off Exit 19, which is a full four (4) way interchange (Route 312 Interchange). Further, its central Putnam County location is convenient not only to Putnam County residents but also to the area employment centers of Westchester, Dutchess and Orange Counties in New York and Fairfield and Litchfield Counties in Connecticut. Nearby centers of commerce include White Plains, Poughkeepsie and Newburgh, NY, as well as Greenwich, Stamford and

Waterbury, CT. The site's location off the Route 312 Interchange and Pugsley Lane will allow for ample transportation access without disturbing local traffic within the Town. The site's proximity to the Metro-North Southeast train station provides an excellent opportunity for potential private jitney service to the site to serve employees.

The closest major airport is Westchester County Airport, approximately 30 miles distant, with connections to many cities on the east coast, as well as Chicago. Stewart International Airport is approximately 36 miles distant with passenger service to northern Europe and selected US cities, and freight service via Fed Express and UPS. The airport is operated by the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey (PANYNJ) and is destined for expansion for both passenger and freight services and is designated as a free trade zone.

Due to the rapid expansion of this real estate sector, demand often exceeds supply and due to the technological requirements of the space users, much of the standing inventory is functionally obsolete. All markets see increasing demand coupled with a scarcity of development sites to meet the industry's needs. The proposed project will provide needed state-of-the-art space.

The New York State Department of Labor recognizes in its study entitled "The Transportation and Warehousing Sector in the Hudson Valley", dated June 2017, that these uses have been attracted to the region notably due to its proximity to major airports and major highways. Warehousing and storage uses added approximately 1,500 jobs to the region between 2010-2016, and accounted for 3.3% of the region's employment in 2016. The report notes, however, that Putnam County may be underserved. As such, there is an obvious opportunity for increased economic development in this area for the County.

The Town of Southeast's "Comprehensive Plan Update" (CPU), adopted August 21, 2014, notes that the Town of Southeast is the economic center of Putnam County. The Town's access to major transportation corridors, including I-84, has made the Town an attractive

location for new economic activity. Firms seeking to take advantage of the metropolitan market while providing quality-of-life for its employees would locate within Putnam County.

The CPU recommends that new uses be added to the Zoning Code to capture the types of commercial enterprises envisioned today. This would include such uses as the “logistics center” proposed by the Applicant. Figure 7-1 of the CPU depicts the Campus at Fields Corners site (the same site as the proposed project) within a potential commercial activity area.

The project would contribute substantial additional revenue to the Town’s property tax base via a PILOT program the Applicant is seeking, which would be induced by the Putnam County IDA (Industrial Development Agency). It is anticipated that the revenue generated by the project would exceed revenue generated from its existing vacant land condition and from the previously approved 143 unit residential development. Additionally, the project will contribute no additional school children to the Brewster Central School District, and would generate few additional demands for municipal services. As such, it is anticipated that the revenue generated by the project would easily outweigh the project’s demand on municipal services.

Direct, indirect and induced jobs to be created during the construction phase of the logistics center are anticipated to reach 818 jobs. In addition, the operation of the proposed project is anticipated to generate 919 direct, indirect, and induced jobs at the local level, of which 665 would be on-site and related to the operation of the facility. The project will thus be a significant source of job creation.

A goal of the Town’s CPU is to diversify the Town’s base of business and industry to strengthen the Town’s tax base and to provide employment opportunities for area residents (CPU Section 7.4). The CPU further notes that the Town is the economic center of Putnam County (CPU Section 2.1). The project is consistent with the

community's intent on growth to assure its economic sustainability while protecting the integrity of its natural resources and infrastructure (CPU Section I.4).

D. Summary of DEIS Sections

I. Land Use and Zoning

In the Applicant's opinion, the proposed logistics center use, zoning text and map amendment, subdivision and site plan are consistent with the vision and goals of the Town's 2014 Comprehensive Plan Update to balance a healthy economic environment with quality commercial character while protecting the integrity of the Town's natural resources and infrastructure. The proposed project provides significant economic development for the Town in terms of direct, indirect, and induced jobs, as well as millions of dollars of direct, indirect and induced economic output during both the construction phase and annually during the operations phase.

The proposed project protects the Town's natural resources with 82.6% open space, adherence to the Town's ridgeline protection measures, provision of a substantial natural buffer from roadways and residential properties, and other measures to protect the area's rural community character. Traffic improvements are proposed to protect the Town's highway infrastructure, with no significant impacts resulting from the proposed project, with the mitigation measures in place.

The Applicant seeks to amend Chapter I38 "Zoning" of the Town Code as follows:

- Make a "logistics center" a defined term under Section I38-4(b), to be defined as:
"A building or structure used for the receipt, storage, distribution, handling, shipment, consolidation, repackaging, labeling, assembly, aggregation, transloading, refrigeration, management or similar activities for non-hazardous goods, products, freight, cargo and/or materials. A Logistics Center may include associated office space

and/or facilities for loading, unloading, transfer, repair and/or maintenance. A Logistics Center may also include accessory retail space, provided that such space shall comprise no more than two percent (2%) of the total floor area of such use.”

- Allow logistics centers as a permitted conditional use in the OP-3 District, allowable only on lots of at least twenty-five (25) acres and subject to prescribed Design Guidelines and
- Rezone part of the parcel referred to on the Putnam County Tax Map as Section 45, Block I, Lot 4 from the RC District into the OP-3 District.

The Applicant is proposing to amend the Zoning Code to provide a definition of “logistics center” to support the modern distribution services. In addition to the traditional warehouse and light manufacturing functions that are already permitted under the Town’s Zoning Code, such as receipt, storage and distribution of non-hazardous goods and materials, a logistics center, as proposed by the Applicant, would also provide for handling, shipment, consolidation, repackaging, labeling, assembly, aggregation, transloading, refrigeration, management or other similar activities. The Applicant relied in significant part on the State’s Development Profile to develop its proposed definition.

Inasmuch as the Applicant is only proposing to make logistics centers an allowable use in in the OP-3 District, the impacts of the amendment would be geographically limited in the Town. The OP-3 District is only present on this site, and does not appear anywhere else within the Town.

Moreover, the Applicant is proposing to make logistics standards allowable as a Conditional Use, meaning that the Planning Board would have significant authority to impose conditions to ensure that such facilities are in harmony with the surrounding community. Under the proposed Conditional Use standards for logistics centers, the Planning Board would be required to assess an application’s conformance to

prescribed Design Guidelines. The text of the proposed Conditional Use standards is included within Appendix I-1b as Exhibit H, and is also at the rear of the Land Use and Zoning Section III.A. The proposed Design Guidelines are intended to ensure that logistics centers are appropriately designed and landscaped. In addition, not only would a plan for a logistics center have to meet general conditions and standards required for all conditional uses, as set forth in Section 138-53 of the Zoning Code, but the Planning Board would also maintain authority to set forth plan-specific conditions.

The Applicant is also requesting that the Town Board rezone from the RC District into the OP-3 District approximately 38.6 acres of the approximately 42 acre parcel now referred to on the Putnam County Tax Map as Section 45, Block 1, Lot 4. The portion that is proposed to remain in the RC District fronts Route 312, and would be part of the proposed Lots 5 and 6. (Figure III.A-2). The remaining portions of the present parcel known as Section 45, Block 1, Lot 4, which would become the proposed Lots 5 and 6, would remain in the RC District. This would ensure the preservation of the rural character of the RC District along Route 312, including by making the proposed project not visible from Route 312, and offering to donate a portion of the rezoned property (Lot 5) to Putnam County in connection for use with the County's Tilly Foster Farm & Educational Institute, which is adjacent.

While 55% lot coverage is permitted, the proposed lot coverage over the 328 acre site is only 17.4%. Also, the maximum permitted building coverage is 25%, while the proposed building coverage is 7.9%. As a result, while the minimum required open space is 45%, the proposed project is providing 82.6% open space, assuring green spaces for the watershed. Also, because the project is proposing road improvements necessary to accommodate the proposed development, a maximum floor area ratio (FAR) of 0.25 is allowable in the OP-3 district. The FAR for each proposed Lot is well below the maximum permitted: Proposed Lot 1 would have an FAR of 0.148; Lot 2 of 0.078; and Lot 3 of 0.096. If the maximum FAR was constructed on these

lots, the proposed building area would total 2,724,827 square feet, as opposed to the 1,124,575 square feet of the proposed project.

The proposed zoning text and map amendments would permit a newly defined use within the Town, under the strict controls of a Conditional Use Permit, while allowing for many potential economic benefits including job creation. The Comprehensive Plan promotes a diversified base of business and industry, while providing employment opportunities for area residents, all of which the proposed zoning text and map amendments promote.

Please refer to DEIS Chapter III.A “Land Use and Zoning” for a full analysis.

2. Traffic

Extensive mitigation is proposed to accommodate the project and the associated site generated traffic volumes, which will result in an excellent roadway system to accommodate the proposed logistics center development and existing traffic. The mitigation measures proposed include the reconstruction of Pugsley Road, improvements proposed at the NY 312/Pugsley Road intersection (Figures III.B-2 and III.B-3), and signal improvements to the nearby interchange with I-84 at NY 312.

A summary of the project mitigation is provided below.

a. Pugsley Road & Barrett Road Improvements

Since the existing Town roads are relatively narrow and in poor condition and thus not suitable for the proposed use, the Applicant will need to reconstruct both Pugsley Road and Barrett Road to provide proper lane widths, grades and turning radii. The reconstruction will include the construction of wider roads with a thicker road section. At the request of the Town, a portion of Fields Corner Road immediately north of Barrett Road will also be improved to eliminate existing curves in the Pugsley Road/ Barrett Road/ Fields Corner Road

intersections. A gravel road will be provided along the improved Fields Corner Road.

The proposed improvements to the NY 312/Pugsley Road intersection, and the Pugsley Road/Barrett Road intersection have been designed to accommodate a WB-67 design (Special Dimension Vehicle) with a 53' trailer. .

b. NY 312/Pugsley Road Improvements

As a result of three meetings with the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) and additional analyses of traffic and geometric considerations, a modern roundabout is the preferred traffic control for the intersection, rather than the signalized intersection. The proposed roundabout would provide two entry/exit lanes for the eastbound NY 312 approach and two entry/exit lanes with a right turn bypass would be provided for the westbound NY 312 approach. Along the Pugsley Road approach two entry lanes and one exit lane would be provided. A mountable section in the center island would accommodate turning maneuvers from larger vehicles.

Projected operations with the roundabout indicate the intersection would operate at level of service C or better with the roundabout alternative, with the delays for certain movements being shorter than with a signalized intersection. With respect to the capacity of traffic movement through the intersection, the roundabout accommodates the projected traffic volumes well within the capacity while the signalized intersection operates closer to capacity, which is less desirable. Accordingly, the roundabout mitigation is preferred by the Applicant as compared to the signalized intersection with turn lanes improvements and is expected to remain preferred by NYSDOT upon its detailed review of the projected traffic operations.

In addition to the improved traffic flow, modern roundabouts typically experience

substantially fewer accidents than signalized intersections, and the accidents that do occur typically have significantly less injuries and vehicle damage due primarily to the low travel speeds associated with roundabouts.

c. Additional Intersection Improvements

NYSDOT intends to coordinate the three existing traffic signals along NY 312 at the I-84 ramps and International Boulevard. The NYSDOT improvements will enhance traffic flow between the intersections.

Vehicles exiting the Caremount Medical driveway experience peak hour delays when exiting onto NY 312. NYSDOT previously determined in association with the Crossroads 312 project that a traffic signal was not warranted based on the site driveway volumes. While not reflected in this analysis, Caremount Medical has approached the Town to expand its parking lot and construct a second site driveway through Town property which would provide access to Independent Way, which provides access to the traffic signal at NY 312.

The improvements proposed by the Applicant at additional intersections vary depending on the various scenarios considered as follows:

I. With Crossroads 312 Development

Traffic signal timing improvements are also proposed at the intersection of NY 312 and Independent Way. The Applicant will coordinate with NYSDOT, who owns and maintains the existing traffic signal at Independent Way, to recommend the signal timing improvement.

2. Without Crossroads 312 Development

The Applicant would be willing to provide certain improvements proposed by the Crossroads 312 development in the event that development is not constructed.

At the intersection of NY 312 & Independent Way/I-84 Eastbound Ramps, the Applicant would restripe the southbound approach for separate left, thru, and right turn lanes; restripe the northbound approach to provide two left turn lanes, one thru lane, and one right turn lane; provide no right turns on red at the eastbound, northbound, and southbound approaches; and revise the traffic signal timing plan.

At the intersection of NY 312 & I-84 Westbound Ramps the Applicant would provide no right turns on red at the eastbound and southbound approaches; and revise the traffic signal timing.

At the intersection of NY 312 & International Boulevard the Applicant would revise the traffic signal timing. The Applicant will coordinate with the NYS DOT, who owns and maintains the existing traffic signals at the intersections, to recommend the improvements.

Please refer to DEIS Chapter III.B “Traffic” for a full analysis.

3. Visual Resources

The project will not result in any significant adverse visual impacts.

The DEIS considers seven (7) off-site vantage point locations in order to comprehensively assess the views of the proposed project. The seven vantage point locations include:

- I-84
- Route 312
- Twin Brook Manor
- Maple Road
- Putnam Trailway
- Sunset Drive
- Garrity Road

Analysis of these vantage points show that the proposed project would be minimally, if at all, visible off-site. The proposed project would not be visible from the Route 312 vantage point and Garrity Road vantage point due to substantial vegetative screening and topographical variation. The proposed project would be barely visible from most locations along the I-84 vantage point and Twin Brook Manor vantage point due to traveling speeds, substantial vegetative screening, and intervening distances. The proposed project would be partially visible from the Maple Road vantage point, Putnam Trailway vantage point, and Sunset Drive vantage point. Several steps have been taken to ensure the proposed project would not be visually intrusive including: designing the finished floor elevations of the buildings below the highest existing grades, protecting existing mature trees, using neutral building colors such as various shades of green and light grey/green, installing extensive landscaping, and planning for deep building setbacks from roadways and lot lines. Accordingly, the proposed development is not expected to have a significant visual impact or impacts on community character.

Approximately 82.6 percent of the site will be open space after development, which will not be occupied by buildings or other impervious areas, and is well in excess of the minimum open space zoning requirement of 45%.

Please refer to DEIS Chapter III.C “Visual Resources” for a full analysis.

4. Surface Water and Wetlands

Surface Waters

The proposed stormwater facilities have been designed such that the quantity and quality of stormwater runoff during and after construction are not adversely altered or are enhanced when compared to pre-development conditions. The proposed stormwater improvements will result in reductions of peak rates of runoff from existing conditions for all storms and design points analyzed, resulting in no impacts to off-site properties. All water quality practices, including the enhanced phosphorus removal required because the project is within the NYCDEP watershed, exceed the requirements of the stormwater management practices criteria as outlined in Chapter 6 of the NYS Stormwater Management Design Manual.

A Preliminary Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) has been prepared (Appendix D-1). The design of the project’s stormwater management as discussed in the SWPPP has been in accordance with the following:

- Requirements of the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (SPDES) General Permit No. GP-0-15-002, effective January 29, 2015, last modified November 23, 2016;
- NYS Stormwater Management Design Manual last revised January 2015;

- New York City Department of Environmental Protection Rules and Regulations for the Protection from Contamination, Degradation and Pollution of the New York City Water Supply and its Sources, amended April 4, 2010;
- Chapter 119 "Stormwater Management and Erosion and Sediment Control" of the Town of Southeast Code.

An Erosion and Sediment Control Management Program will be implemented for the proposed development, beginning at the start of construction and continuing throughout its course, as outlined in the "New York State Standards and Specifications for Erosion and Sediment Control," dated November 2016. A continuing maintenance program will be implemented for the control of sediment transport and erosion control after construction and throughout the useful life of the project.

The Applicant will have a qualified professional conduct an assessment of the site prior to the commencement of construction and certify that the appropriate erosion and sediment controls, as shown on the Erosion & Sediment Control Plans, have been adequately installed to ensure overall preparedness of the site for the commencement of construction. In addition, the Applicant will have a qualified professional conduct one site inspection at least every seven calendar days and at least two site inspections every seven calendar days when greater than five acres of soil is disturbed at any one time.

Please refer to DEIS Chapter III.D "Surface Water and Wetlands" for a full analysis.

Wetlands

Wetland and adjacent area impacts were avoided to the maximum extent practicable in the design of the proposed project, and the project's minimal impacts will be fully mitigated.

A total of six wetland systems are found on the subject property (Figure III.D-2). Two of these wetlands, described as Wetland 1 and Wetland 3, are locally regulated by the Town of Southeast, while the remaining wetlands are regulated by both the Town of Southeast and the NYSDEC. The remaining wetland systems on the property consist of portions of NYSDEC Freshwater Wetlands LC-18 (Class I wetland) and LC-28 (Class II wetland). All the wetlands on the property are also regulated by the US Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE).

Minor permanent encroachments (0.05 acres) into the wetland would occur only at the existing on-site road crossing (improvements at the Barrett Road wetland crossing between Wetlands 4 and 5); otherwise only minor encroachments into the adjacent areas are proposed, with 2.44 acres of disturbance to NYSDEC wetland buffers (which are also regulated by the Town), and 5.37 acres of disturbance to Town-only regulated wetland buffers (Figure III.D-3). These include impacts from grading activities for some of the warehouse foundation/platforms and one stormwater management area (just southwest of Barrett Road and Pugsley Road), and from improvements to the site entrance at Route 312. ACOE does not regulate an adjacent area.

Mitigation for the wetland encroachment at the Barrett Road crossing will be provided through restoration of the upper portion of Wetland 4. This area has been overgrown by invasive species which degrade the overall habitat value of the wetland. If left alone, it is likely that these species will continue to spread and will eventually eliminate the native species within this portion of the wetland.

The mitigation area will be monitored for a minimum of three (3) years following the restoration work to ensure that invasive species do not become reestablished. The restoration area will be monitored at least three times during the growing season for each of the first three years following installation of the plugs, and monitoring reports, including recommendations for maintenance, will be submitted to the Town and to the NYSDEC.

Please refer to DEIS Chapter III.D “Surface Water and Wetlands” for a full analysis.

5. Geology, Soils, and Topography

Geology

The proposed project will have little to no impact to geological resources due to the relatively deep depth to bedrock as determined by the geotechnical investigations, and any impacts will be fully mitigated.

Geotechnical investigations were conducted on the site, and borings were drilled within the four proposed building footprints to depths of 12 to 22.5± feet below existing grade. The stormwater and septic test pits were advanced to depths ranging from 5.5 to 12± feet and 8 to 10.5± feet, respectively. Bedrock was not encountered to the depths explored. Since bedrock is very far below the surface, blasting is not expected to be needed to remove bedrock. Conventional earth excavation equipment is anticipated to be used to handle all grading activities. If it is determined to be necessary, blasting will be conducted in accordance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations including Town Code Chapter 71, “Explosives and Blasting.” Blasting is strictly controlled by local, state, and federal regulations.

Please refer to DEIS Chapter III.E “Geology, Soils and Topography” for a full analysis.

Soils

No significant adverse impacts to soils are anticipated for the proposed project. An Erosion and Sediment Control Management Program will be implemented for the proposed development, beginning at the start of construction and continuing throughout its course, mitigating any potential adverse impacts to soils.

The soils map for the site as presented in the DEIS depicts the location and acreages of soils within the limit of disturbance (Figure III.E-2). The majority (85%) of the proposed disturbance is situated within Paxton fine sandy loam, and approximately 14% is within Woodbridge loam. These soils do not present severe limitations such as those that are very steep, very stony, which have a shallow depth to bedrock, or which are very wet.

The geotechnical investigation conducted during early 2018 concluded that from a soils and foundation support standpoint, the existing subsurface conditions can be considered good with respect to providing satisfactory support of the planned buildings and roadways.

The intent of the grading design of the site is to balance the earthwork, such that no excess material will need to be exported off of the site, and no material will need to be brought into the site as fill. Currently, the existing grading design results in slightly more cut than fill. The site is large, and this excess amount of excavated material will be utilized as berm material within the limit of disturbance.

Please refer to DEIS Chapter III.E “Geology, Soils and Topography” for a full analysis.

Slopes

The topography of the site will be developed in accordance with the Town Code, resulting in no significant adverse impacts.

The Town of Southeast Code defines “moderate slopes” as areas with a slope equal to or greater than 15% and less than 25% over a horizontal distance of 50 feet or more, or any minimum area of 200 square feet with a vertical elevation change of 10 feet or more. The Town’s Code defines “steep slopes” as areas with an average slope equal to or greater than 25%, with a minimum area of 200 square feet and a minimum width perpendicular to the contour of 10 feet.

Steep slopes on the site are concentrated near the western site perimeter, in the southern portion of the property near Pugsley Road, and in the south central portion of the site along a stream valley. Overall, approximately 80% of the site has slopes less than 15 percent, approximately 15 percent of the site has slopes ranging from 15 up to 25 percent; and 5% of the site has slopes 25% and greater (Figure III.E-3).

The slopes map for the site as presented in the DEIS depicts the location and acreages of soils within the limit of disturbance (Figure III.E-4). Approximately 133.2 acres are within the estimated limit of disturbance. Of this total, 4.9 acres are steep slopes (equal to or greater than 25%) or approximately 3.7% of the site disturbance area. 17.6 acres of moderate slopes equal to or greater than 15% and less than 25% are proposed to be impacted, or approximately 13% of the site disturbance area. 111 acres of slopes less than 15% are proposed to be impacted, or approximately 83% of the site disturbance area.

Please refer to DEIS Chapter III.E “Geology, Soils and Topography” for a full analysis.

Ridgeline protection as required by the Town Code is discussed in Visual Resources, Section III.C.

6. Groundwater

No significant adverse impacts to the bedrock aquifer or watershed are anticipated from the planned groundwater withdrawal. The data indicates that the available groundwater recharge from precipitation is more than sufficient to meet the water demand of the project.

Two of the site’s on-site wells will be utilized for the non-transient, non-community water-supply for the site. The existing onsite proposed supply well OW-3 is located on the northern portion of the project site, west of Fields Corner Road and north

of Barrett Road. The existing onsite proposed supply well NW-4 is located on the southeastern portion of the project site, east of Pugsley Road and north of Route 312.

The proposed groundwater withdrawal from wells OW-3 and NW-4 of 29,000 gpd is significantly less than the estimated groundwater recharge to the bedrock aquifer underlying the project site under normal precipitation conditions of 205,000 gpd and drought conditions of 133,250 gpd. The data indicates that the available groundwater recharge is sufficient to meet the water demand of the project. Based on the existing well pumping test data, no significant adverse impacts to existing offsite wells near the project site are anticipated from pumping in onsite wells OW-3 and NW-4.

Infiltration and recharge of a portion of the water withdrawn back into the groundwater system through the use of an onsite septic system will also reduce the consumptive water withdrawal of the project, further reducing the potential for cumulative aquifer impacts.

Therefore, no mitigation measures in regard to the planned groundwater withdrawal are warranted.

Please refer to DEIS Chapter III.F “Groundwater” for a full analysis.

7. Vegetation and Wildlife

For the reasons described below, the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse impacts to vegetation or wildlife.

The project site is former agricultural land. The uplands on the site were originally maintained as agricultural fields and pastures associated with a dairy farm, but are now mostly overgrown with trees and invasive shrubs and vines such as autumn olive,

multiflora rose, mile-a-minute, and oriental bittersweet. No buildings remain on the property, although roads and utility poles are still present.

The wetlands on the property contain a variety of vegetative habitats. Most of the wetlands on the site are deciduous wooded swamps that are seasonally or intermittently flooded, with the exception of the farm ponds which likely remain ponded year-round. To the east of Pugsley Road, the northern portion of Wetland 6 at the base of the hillside is wetter than the remainder of the wetlands on the site, and contains an area of emergent wetland habitat with deep muck soils. This area of Wetland 6 is suitable habitat (hydrology and soils) for Bog Turtles (*Glyptemys muhlenbergii*), a federal-listed Threatened species and a state-listed Endangered species. However, because no project impacts are proposed to Wetland 6, the project will have no impacts to these turtles, should they be present.

The remainder of the uplands on the site are potential summer habitat for the Northern Long-eared Bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*), also referred to as the northern myotis, which is a Federal and State listed Threatened species. The Northern Long-eared Bat is primarily associated with uplands and mature interior forest habitat, but will utilize a diversity of forest habitats for roosting, foraging, and raising young. Impacts to the Northern long-eared Bat are avoided by not cutting potential roost trees during the bat pup's rearing months of June 1 through July 31.

Please refer to DEIS Chapter III.F "Vegetation and Wildlife" for a full analysis.

8. Tax Analysis

As a result of the proposed project, significant economic development would occur for the benefit of the community including increased property tax revenue based on increased assessed value of the property, sales tax revenue, and revenue to support local businesses passed on by the creation of over 800 construction jobs and over 900 permanent jobs.

The Applicant would seek a PILOT program which is a mechanism to encourage economic development while providing appropriate revenue to the municipality and other taxing jurisdictions. Under a PILOT, instead of paying property taxes on the full assessed value of a property, a land owner negotiates a fixed payment with the various property taxing jurisdictions for a period of time. In no case would a PILOT payment be less than the taxes the land owner is currently paying on the unimproved property. As part of the PILOT negotiations, the Applicant will ensure that the PILOT payments exceed the costs of providing governmental services to the project.

The State has empowered local Industrial Development Agencies (IDA) to help facilitate/induce economic development and job creation with incentives that help make New York's opportunities feasible, productive, competitive and successful. The Applicant would seek IDA inducement from the Putnam County IDA for the proposed project. The Applicant would seek IDA benefits as these benefits are needed to assure the project is competitive with other comparable projects and to further assure the realization of resulting economic development benefits for local, county and state governments.

The property is currently assessed as vacant land, and generates approximately \$140,000 in annual property taxes. In practice, the Applicant would continue to pay the taxes on the undeveloped property prior to any development. The local community would not lose this revenue.

In Putnam County, PILOT's generally last for a minimum of ten years and permit the payment of 50% of the assessed value taxation based on local tax rates in the first year a project is completed and ramps the PILOT payments to 100% in year eleven. Under a PILOT, the property's increased assessed value as a result of the project would result in a PILOT payment for the first year significantly above \$140,000. The Applicant would seek that each building or phase would receive a PILOT specific to

the building or phase, which would commence upon the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the building or phase.

Each taxing jurisdiction (School District, Town, County and Fire Department) would share the PILOT revenue in the same ratio as they would share the property taxes from the parcels within the project site. In the final analysis, each recipient of property tax revenue would receive at a minimum those taxes based on assessed value for undeveloped land and benefit from the additional revenue generated by phased development of the property because of its land and building improvements.

As discussed in the Economic Impact Analysis in Section III.H.4.b, there are two phases of the proposed project that generate economic benefits: The construction phase and the operations phase.

When aggregating direct, indirect and induced outputs from the construction phase, the project is expected to contribute \$110,555,593 of economic output to the local Southeast economy. During the operations phase, the project is estimated to annually generate \$91,581,976 in economic output to the local economy.

During the construction period, labor income is expected to reach \$45,511,667 at the local level. During the operations period, labor income is projected total \$32,370,903 towards the local economy on an annual basis.

Direct, indirect and induced jobs to be created during the construction phase are anticipated to reach 818 jobs. Permanent jobs to be generated during operation of the facility are expected to be 919 jobs, which include 665 direct jobs from the operation of the proposed facility.

The development and implementation of the proposed project would have a positive impact on the economy of the Town of Southeast.

Please refer to DEIS Chapter III.H “Tax Analysis” for a full analysis.

9. Community Services

The proposed project is not anticipated to generate any significant impacts for the two police forces serving the project site. Police protection is provided to the Town by both the Putnam County Sheriff's Department and the Brewster Barracks of the New York State Police (Troop K). Private security measures will be provided at the site. Revenues from property taxes or the proposed PILOT program the Applicant would seek would offset any impacts from the project.

The Town of Southeast and the site is served by the Brewster Fire Department, which is within the Brewster-Southeast Joint Fire District. The Department is a volunteer force of 140-150 members. The Fire District also provides EMS services. The Applicant has agreed to the Fire Department's request to draw on the site's fire emergency water supply from the proposed hydrants on Pugsley Road in the event of an off-site fire emergency.

The Brewster Central School District serves the site. Because the proposed project is a commercial use, there will be no school children generated, and hence no direct impacts to the District. The District would gain from revenues generated by the project's property taxes or proposed PILOT program, with no associated expenses.

The Town of Southeast does not provide refuse/recycling services to commercial uses. As such, the proposed project will hire their own private contractor for these services, with no impact to Town services.

Although the project has no residential component and thus the project itself will create no demand for additional parkland, the Applicant is discussing donating Lot 5 to Putnam County in connection with the County's Tilly Foster Farm & Educational Institute, which is adjacent. The County has expressed an interest in this Lot 5 parcel.

With this donated lot, Tilly Foster Farm has the potential to create a second means of access to the property via Pugsley Road and to the Applicant's proposed traffic improvements at the intersection with NY 312, and may use the parcel for a small building that expands their mission (see full sized drawing C-100 "Overall Layout Plan").

Please refer to DEIS Chapter III.I "Community Services" for a full analysis.

10. Utilities

There are no significant adverse environmental impacts associated with the provision of utilities for the proposed project. The available groundwater recharge is sufficient to meet the water demand of the proposed project, and the existing wells can be used for the project without adverse impacts to existing offsite wells. Similarly, the proposed project's subsurface sewage disposal systems have been designed to be fully compliant with all applicable regulations, and there will be no off-site or other adverse impacts associated with their usage. Finally, New York State Electric and Gas Corporation can provide electricity and gas service to the proposed project, and there are no significant adverse impacts associated with either of these services.

Water Supply

There are three wells on the property which were drilled in association with the previous approvals of the Campus at Fields Corner development on the property. A water supply and distribution system was designed and a Public Water Supply Permit was issued in 2005 by NYSDEC for the system to serve the 143 single family homes and the 237,000 s.f. of commercial space, and to use a supply of water of up to 78,010 gallons per day(gpd).

The proposed project is estimated to use approximately 29,000 gpd, including irrigation. Approximately 17,000 gpd are associated with the employees, based on a

rate of 15 gpd utilized in the NYSDEC 2014 Wastewater Standards For Intermediate Sized Systems. The proposed groundwater withdrawal from the on-site bedrock wells of 29,000 gpd is significantly less than the previously permitted 78,010 gpd. It is also significantly less than the estimated groundwater recharge to the bedrock aquifer underlying the project site under normal precipitation conditions of 205,000 gpd and drought conditions of 133,250 gpd. The available groundwater recharge is sufficient to meet the water demand of the project.

Extensive information on the existing wells is provided in the Groundwater chapter of this DEIS, including previous testing of the wells and the potential for drawdown effects.

Please refer to DEIS Chapter III.J “Utilities” for a full analysis.

Sanitary Sewer

There are currently no on-site sanitary sewer systems in operation. Subsurface sewage disposal systems (SSDS) are proposed. Each building will have its own SSDS (septic field) which will consist of a primary field with a capacity of up to 5,000 gpd as well as a 100% expansion area, in accordance with Putnam County Department of Health requirements. The SSDS have been designed to be fully compliant with all applicable regulations. There will be no offsite or other adverse impacts and no mitigation is required.

Please refer to DEIS Chapter III.J “Utilities” for a full analysis.

Electric

While electric service was previously provided to the former residences within the property, there is currently no electric service. New York State Electric and Gas Corporation (NYSEG) serves the area and has indicated that it will gladly provide

electric service to the site (see Appendix I-2). It is anticipated that each building will have its own point of electric service, and individual utility meter. The total estimated electric load at the site is 2,343 KW. A load letter has been submitted to NYSEG requesting new electric service.

According to NYSEG representatives, new overhead utility distribution lines may be required to bring power from Route 312 to Pugsley and Barrett Road. If required, the total estimated length of new overhead distribution is approximately 5,400 feet.

The Applicant will continue to coordinate with NYSEG regarding the utility extension.

Please refer to DEIS Chapter III.J “Utilities” for a full analysis.

Gas

There is currently no natural gas supplied to the site. Similar to the electric service, NYSEG provides gas service to the vicinity of the site and has indicated that it will gladly provide gas service to the site (see Appendix I-2). According to NYSEG representatives, there is a gas main servicing The Highlands Shopping Center located at the intersection of Independent Way and Route 312 across from the site. A load letter has been submitted to NYSEG requesting gas services for the new buildings. The total gas load input is 184,000 CFH. This quantity includes the heating load and domestic water heating load for the four buildings. Depending on the service and pressure available, it is anticipated that a 6-inch high-pressure main will be required to meet the load of all four buildings.

The Applicant will continue to coordinate with NYSEG regarding the utility extension.

Please refer to DEIS Chapter III.J “Utilities” for a full analysis.

II. Cultural Resources

The project will pose no significant adverse impacts to cultural resources.

While documentary research found that the property lies in a region of known precontact use, the extensive survey by Historical Perspectives, Inc. (HPI) of the adjacent Campus at Field Corners Area of Potential Effect (APE) in 2005, including 1189 shovel tests, identified no precontact resources on land with similar characteristics. (An APE is the portion of the site that would experience subsurface impacts as a result of a project.) Therefore, while the APE for the currently proposed project theoretically could be considered to be potentially sensitive for precontact resources, the 2005 Phase IB testing for the Campus at Field Corners shows that the APE for the currently proposed project is unlikely to contain precontact resources. The New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP), also known as the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) has confirmed that the lack of archeological resources revealed from the prior Phase IB testing obviates the need for further Phase IB testing in the APE for the currently proposed project.

Documentary research also found that the site has only a low potential for historical period cultural resources since structures were not mapped in the APE until the 1960s. Therefore, while there is historic archaeological potential in locations near the former locations of these mapped historic structures, it is considered to be low due to their distances from the APE.

The OPRHP provided a letter of No Effect, stating that the proposed project will have no effect on historic/cultural resources. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required or necessary.

Please refer to DEIS Chapter III.K “Cultural Resources” for a full analysis.

12. Noise

The project does not exceed any of the threshold limits established in the Town Code, and, therefore, the project has no significant projected noise impacts. The only mitigation measure required is a standard one that all gasoline and diesel construction equipment operating on-site should have properly maintained mufflers.

Please refer to DEIS Chapter III.L “Noise” for a full analysis.

13. Construction

All construction activities will be conducted in accordance with all municipal and state regulations, and would not result in significant adverse impacts.

All construction activities will be conducted in accordance with Section 96-6.D of the Town Code, with construction only taking place between the hours of 7:00 am and 8:00 pm Monday through Friday, and occasionally between 9:00 am and 5:00 pm on Saturdays.

The intent of the grading design of the site is to balance the earthwork, such that no excess material will need to be exported off of the site, and no material will need to be brought into the site as fill, avoiding the need for dump trucks for this purpose, which lessens potential off-site truck traffic trips.

Most construction-related trucking will utilize I-84 and exit at Exit 19 (NY 312), and proceed along NY 312 to Pugsley Road and the construction site.

Construction workers will generally arrive before the 7:30-8:30 AM peak weekday morning traffic hour, and depart before the 5:00-6:00 PM peak weekday afternoon hour, and generally utilize the same route as the construction truck traffic.

An Erosion and Sediment Control Management Program will be implemented for the proposed development, beginning at the start of construction and continuing throughout its course, in accordance with the requirements of the "New York State Standards and Specifications for Erosion and Sediment Control," dated November 2016.

Please refer to DEIS Chapter III.M "Construction" for a full analysis.

14. Air Quality

With the proposed mitigation measures for the project's construction phase, the project would not pose any significant adverse air impacts. Mitigation measures for the project's construction phase will ensure that there is no violation of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)

Traffic generated by the proposed project would not result in an exceedance of NYSDOT's screening criteria for mobile source air quality impacts. The operation of the logistics center buildings themselves will not pose any significant air quality impacts. Therefore, the proposed project would not have any significant adverse air quality impacts.

Please refer to DEIS Chapter III.N "Air Quality" for a full analysis.

15. Hazardous Materials

The proposed project has no potential for adverse impacts related to hazardous materials. There are no Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) at the property, and the proposed logistics center definition specifically limits the use to non-hazardous goods.

An REC is defined by the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) publication "*Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process*", E 1527-13, as the presence of any hazardous substance or petroleum product in, on, or at the property due to any past, current, or future release to the environment.

CA RICH Consultants, Inc. ("CA RICH") completed a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) of the subject property in March 2018 (see Appendix O-1). The Phase I ESA was performed in substantive conformance with the suggested informational requirements, scope, and limitations of the American Society for Testing & Materials (ASTM) Standard Practice E 1527-13 for ESAs.

The property is currently undeveloped and consists of mature woodlands and overgrown fields separated by stone walls. The property was reportedly historically used as a dairy farm.

The information and findings of the March 2018 ESA are based upon the data acquired during a property visit and through pertinent information obtained from regulatory agencies, responsible persons knowledgeable about the property, and other historical information sources. Based upon the site inspection and the historical information reviewed for the Phase I ESA, no RECs were identified in connection with the subject property.

Please refer to DEIS Chapter III.O "Hazardous Materials" for a full analysis.

E. Summary of Project Alternatives

Alternatives to the proposed project are described below. Please refer to DEIS Chapter IV "Alternatives" for a full discussion and analysis, and Table IV-1 in Chapter IV in which features of the various alternatives are summarized for comparison to the proposed project.

I. **No Action**

The “No Action” alternative would involve no development of the 328-acre site, which would mean leaving the property vacant. Without the proposed project, the site would remain vacant land, and offer none of the economic benefits to the community that a logistics center would generate in a manner which is consistent with protecting the integrity of its natural resources and infrastructure.

Inasmuch as the proposed project is largely not visible from off-site, the visual impacts of the no build scenario would be comparable to those posed by the proposed project.

In the absence of the mitigation and other measures proposed for the project, the site would be subject to degradation, including through the spread of invasive species.

Without the proposed development, the property would continue to pay minimal taxes as vacant land. The tax benefits to the community (while providing no impacts to the school district and few demands for municipal services) would not occur from the higher assessed value resulting from the proposed land and building improvements. The Fire Department, however, would not have the use of a fire emergency water supply for off-site fire emergencies from the proposed hydrants on Pugsley Road associated with the proposed project.

There would be no aggregate direct, indirect and induced outputs from the construction phase of the proposed project of \$110,555,593 of economic output to the local Southeast economy. There would be no annual generation of \$91,581,976 in economic output to the local economy during the proposed project’s operational phase.

There would be no expected labor income during the construction phase of \$45,511,667 at the local level. There would be no expected annual labor income during the operations phase of \$32,370,903 towards the local economy.

There would be no direct, indirect and induced jobs to be created during the construction phase of 818 jobs. In addition, the operation of the proposed project is anticipated to generate 919 direct, indirect, and induced jobs at the local level, including 665 direct jobs from the operation of the proposed facility.

The development and implementation of the proposed project would not occur, resulting in no positive impact on the economy of the Town of Southeast.

Under No Action, there would be no potential donation of Lot 5 to Putnam County in connection with the County's Tilly Foster Farm & Educational Institute, which is adjacent. The County has expressed an interest. Without this donated lot, Tilly Foster Farm would not have the potential to create a second means of access to the property via Pugsley Road and to the Applicant's proposed project's traffic improvements at the intersection with NY 312, and would not have the opportunity to use the parcel for a small building that expands their mission.

This alternative does not meet the goals and objectives of the project Applicant nor benefit the local community or correlate with its reasonable investment backed expectations.

2. Previously Approved Residential, with Planned Office/Commercial

This alternative is based on the Campus Phase I approval of 143 single-family homes and 237,000 square feet of office/commercial space, as illustrated in Figure IV-1, on 185.2 acres. If the Phase 2 portion of the project, which consisted of 823,000 s.f. of remaining commercial/office space plus a 300 room hotel component, is

approved/constructed on the remaining portion of the site, the environmental impacts would be significantly greater.

This alternative would require no change to the site's existing OP-3 zoning, because this alternative would have been developed on the OP-3 portion of the property.

Impervious area within the 185.2 acres of Phase I is less at 31.7 acres compared with 57.2 acres of the proposed project, reflective of the development of only the Phase I portion of the property with this alternative. Lot coverage at 17.0% of the 185.2 acre Phase I site is only slightly less than the 17.4% lot coverage of the proposed project.

Building coverage for Phase I at 6.3% is less than the 7.9% of the proposed project, and the gross floor area of 999,410 s.f. is less than the 1,124,575 s.f. of the proposed project, because of the significant residential component of this alternative. The floor area ratio of the 185.2 acre Phase I is 0.12 and greater than the 0.08 of the proposed project.

The Phase I alternative generates more traffic than the proposed project, with AM and PM weekday peak hour traffic trips of 539 and 565, respectively. This is 202 and 205 trips more than the 337 AM and 360 PM weekday peak hour trips of the proposed project.

The building heights of 45 feet (likely for the office/commercial portion of this alternative) are higher than that of the proposed project where the buildings will have a roof height of 40-42 feet. The 1992 DEIS of this project notes that development would be concentrated at the top of the drumlins (ridgelines), where the grades are most gentle. The 1992 DEIS also notes that the tallest buildings on the site, which are the proposed office buildings, would be located on top of the ridgeline. The development on top of the ridgeline would be similar in concept to Figure III.C-2A, which shows the proposed project without the proposed reduction of the ridgelines,

with the proposed buildings perched on top of the ridgeline at a greater height, with a correspondingly greater impact on the viewshed.

The 0.11 acres of wetland disturbance of Phase I is greater under this alternative than the 0.05 acres of the proposed project. The wetland buffer disturbance of 24.57 acres is significantly greater than the 7.81 acres of the proposed project. This calculation includes 20.08 acres of disturbance to Town wetland buffer, although at the time that this application was in-process, there were no wetlands locally regulated by the Town of Southeast.

For Phase I, although only 185.2 acres were proposed to be developed, the proposed disturbance area of 134.1 acres, or 72.4% of the 182.2 acres, is greater than the 133.2 acres of disturbance or 40.6% of the proposed project on 328 acres.

The water demand of this alternative is significantly greater at 78,010 gallons per day (gpd) compared with the 29,000 of the proposed project.

Although this alternative generates approximately \$1,661,201 in property taxes, it places significantly greater demands on governmental services than the proposed project because of its residential population of 525 persons, including 150 school-aged children the majority of whom would attend the Brewster Central School District. Because of the residential component, it is anticipated that police calls may be greater than the proposed project, as well as fire and EMS services. There would be residential trash and recycling pick-up arranged by the Town, unlike the proposed project which would contract its own private carter. The proposed project, in comparison, would generate few additional demands for municipal services, while providing under a PILOT program or through incremental property taxes additional revenue generated by phased development of the property and its resultant increased assessed value.

Substantially fewer jobs are generated under this scenario, with the residential project essentially providing no full-time employment opportunities. The office/commercial component is estimated to employ 500 persons, compared with the estimated 665 jobs generated by the proposed project.

There would be use of the Town's recreational facilities by the resident population, unlike the proposed project. There would be no potential donation of Lot 5 to Putnam County in connection with the County's Tilly Foster Farm & Educational Institute, which is adjacent. Without this donated lot, Tilly Foster Farm would not have the potential to create a second means of access to the property via Pugsley Road and the Applicant's proposed project's traffic improvements at the intersection with NY 312, and would not have the opportunity to use the parcel for a small building that expands their mission.

This alternative does not meet the goals and objectives of the project Applicant because the market demand and project financing for this type of development is not as strong as for the proposed project.

3. As-of-Right Mixed-Use Development with Medical Office, Retail and Recreational Uses

This alternative is a mix of medical office, retail, and recreation uses (Figure IV-2).

As illustrated on Figure IV-2, 240,000 s.f. of medical office in a 2-story building with surface parking is proposed, as well as 200,000 s.f. of retail in a 1-story building with surface parking. Additionally, two indoor recreation buildings are proposed with surface parking, one 90,000 square feet and the other 120,000 square feet, along with three outdoor recreational turf fields. The hours of operation of the recreation portion of this alternative would be regulated by the Town under a conditional use permit.

This alternative is a mix of medical office, retail, and recreation uses (Figure IV-2), and presumes the same rezoning of the RC district portion of the property to OP-3, as with the proposed project. In the OP-3 district, offices are a principal permitted use, and retail and recreation are conditional uses.

Proposed impervious area is only slightly less at 54.7 acres compared with 57.2 acres of the proposed project, and open space of 273.3 acres is correspondingly slightly more than the 270.8 acres of the proposed project. Lot coverage at 16.6% is only slightly less than the 17.4% lot coverage of the proposed project.

Because of the outdoor playing fields, the building coverage at 4.5% is less than the 7.9% of the proposed project. Should the three outdoor playing fields be roofed, the building coverage would increase to 6.4% under this alternative. Likewise, the gross floor area of 890,000 s.f. is less than the 1,124,575 s.f. of the proposed project, although if the three outdoor playing fields are roofed, the gross floor area increases to 1,149,200 s.f., which is greater than the proposed project. The floor area ratio of 0.06 is lower than the 0.08 of the proposed project (but with all the fields roofed this increases to 0.08, the same as the proposed project).

As with the Proposed Action, this alternative is consistent with the Town's Comprehensive Plan Update (with Figure 7-1 of the CPU depicting the Campus at Fields Corners site within a potential commercial activity area), but with significantly greater traffic impacts.

The AM and PM weekday peak hour, and Saturday peak hour traffic trips, are 839, 1,688, and 2,392, respectively. This is an increase of 502, 1,328, and 2,246 trips compared with the 337, 360, and 146 trips of the proposed project.

The building heights of 45 feet are higher than that of the proposed project where the buildings would have a roof height of 40-42 feet.

Like the proposed project, this alternative would follow the Town's ridgeline guidelines. This alternative development would be within two ridgelines. This alternative may elect to remove the top of the ridgeline and set the buildings at a lower elevation, similar to the proposed project (see Figures III.C-1 and III.C-2), thus minimizing the impact to the viewshed. Or the project may not elect to do so, similar in concept to Figure III.C-2A, with the proposed buildings perched on top of the ridgeline at a greater height, with a correspondingly greater impact on the viewshed.

The 0.04 acres of wetland disturbance under this alternative is essentially the same as the 0.05 acres of the proposed project. The wetland buffer disturbance of 5.80 acres is somewhat less than the 7.81 acres of the proposed project.

The proposed disturbance area of 150.7 acres is greater than the 132.4 acres of disturbance of the proposed project.

The water demand of the alternative is significantly higher at 88,000 gallons per day (gpd) compared with the 29,000 of the proposed project.

With greater proposed site disturbance of 150.7 acres compared with the 133.2 acres of the proposed project, impacts to vegetation and wildlife are anticipated to be greater.

As explained in footnote #5 of the Table IV-1 of Chapter IV. "Alternatives", under the assumption that this alternative would be taxed in a similar method using IDA sponsored PILOT programs, it would generate proportionately less additional annual revenue to the Town's property tax base than the proposed project, or approximately 79% of the revenue based on a gross floor area of approximately 79% of the proposed project.

Estimated employment of 850 persons is greater than the estimated 665 jobs generated by the proposed project, due to the proposed retail and medical office uses.

This alternative could place a greater demand on community services, including police services in connection with its retail component and EMS in connection with its medical component.

The water demand of the alternative is significantly higher at 88,000 gallons per day (gpd) compared with the 29,000 of the proposed project.

Construction impacts of this alternative would be greater based on the larger proposed area of disturbance versus the proposed project (150.7 acres versus 133.2 acres).

This alternative does not meet the goals and objectives of the project Applicant because, based on its observation and assessment of market conditions in the area, the market demand and project financing for this type of development is not as strong as for the proposed project.

4. **Keeping Barrett Road a Town Road Rather Than Making it a Private Road**

This alternative would maintain Barrett Road as a Town road rather than making it a private road, with the Town having the responsibility to maintain the roadway, including snow plowing and repair, with the proposed development in place. Thus, the Town would incur additional costs it would otherwise not have to bear. Barrett Road is a dead end road that only serves the subject property. All abutting property has other forms of ingress and egress and are not served by Barrett Road.

F. List of Involved and Interested Agencies, Required Approvals/Permits, and Interested Parties

The list of involved and interested agencies, required permits and approvals, and interested parties is provided below.

Table I-1
Project Reviews and Approvals Required

Involved Agency	Type of Approval/Review
Southeast Town Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zoning Text and Map Amendments: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Define "logistics center" under Section 138-4(b); 2. Allow logistics centers as a Conditional Use in the Town; 3. Make logistics centers a permitted Conditional Use in the OP-3 District; 4. Rezone tax lot Section 45, Block 1, Lot 4 in the OP-3 District on the zoning map. 5. Demapping of Barrett Road.
Southeast Planning Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site Plan Approval • Conditional Use Permit • Subdivision Approval • Local Wetland Permit
Southeast Architectural Review Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARB Review
Putnam County Planning Department	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GML 239 Review
Putnam County Department of Health (PCDOH)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commercial Subsurface Treatment System Approval • Realty Subdivision • Non-Transient, Non-Community Public Water Supply
New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan Review • Commercial Subsurface Treatment System Review
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Article 24 Freshwater Wetlands Permit • SPDES Stormwater Permit • 401 Water Quality Certification
New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highway Work Permit • Access Highway Extension Approval
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nationwide Permit # 39 (Wetlands)
Town of Southeast Highway Department	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permit for modifications to Pugsley Road
Town of Southeast Architectural Review Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Architectural Review

Interested Parties

- Town of Patterson
- Putnam County Sheriff's Department
- NY State Police, Troop K, Zone 2, Brewster Barracks
- Brewster Fire Department

p:\2014\I4012\admin\deis\deis\deis with redlined completeness responses 05-2018\i. executive summary.docx