

IV. **ALTERNATIVES**

A. **No Action (No Build)**

1. **Project Description**

The “No Action” alternative would involve no development of the 328-acre site, which would mean leaving the property vacant. This alternative does not meet the goals and objectives of the project Applicant or correlate with its reasonable investment backed expectations.

2. **Land Use and Zoning**

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.

There would be no proposed zoning text amendment to define a “logistics center” and make it a conditional use in the OP-3 district, and accordingly, no opportunity for the Town to take advantage of the significant economic benefits that this use offers. There would be no rezoning of a portion of the RC zone of the property to OP-3.

3. **Traffic**

As discussed in Section III.B “Traffic”, in order to project future traffic increases to the design year 2023, which represents the anticipated completion of the four proposed buildings, without the proposed project (No Build), the existing volumes were increased by a general growth rate of 1% per year compounded annually. Based on discussions with the Town’s Planning Consultant, the Applicant

incorporated the traffic volumes associated with the Prospect Hill development and Crossroads 312 development, as well as the reopening of the Prospect Hill Road Bridge over the Metro-North railroad tracks.

Additionally, the Applicant incorporated the traffic associated with the subject property's previous approval of 143 single family homes, which is approximately 110 trips during the Peak AM hour and 145 trips during the Peak PM hour on weekdays. The resulting volumes are known as 2023 No-Build volumes. While the previous application approved by the Town also acknowledged and anticipated the planned 237,000 s.f. of office/commercial space, the traffic related to the office/commercial uses have not been included in the study for a conservative analysis since Site Plan Approval had not been obtained for the planned office/commercial space. It is noted that the DEIS prepared for the residential/office/commercial project projected that the residential and office/commercial components would generate 539 trips during the peak AM hour and 565 trips during the peak PM hour on weekdays, which are significantly higher volumes when compared to the volumes associated with the current application.

4. Visual Resources

Without the proposed project, the site would essentially remain unchanged. The former farm fields which are now primarily brush would eventually become forested. 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.

5. Surface Water and Wetlands

Without the proposed project, the project site would remain undisturbed, and, in the absence of the mitigation and other measures proposed for the project would be subject to degradation, including through the spread of invasive species. There

would be no Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan with stormwater facilities having 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.

While there would be no minor permanent encroachments (0.05 acres) into the wetland at the existing on-site road crossing (improvements at the Barrett Road wetland crossing between Wetlands 4 and 5); and no minor encroachments into the adjacent areas, 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, there would be none of the mitigation proposed in connection with the project, which will enhance wetland functional values. There would be no mitigation to be provided through restoration of the upper portion of Wetland 4, an area that has been overgrown by invasive species which degrade the overall habitat value of the wetland. If left alone, it is likely that these species would continue to spread and would eventually eliminate the native species within this portion of the wetland.

6. Geology, Soils and Topography

Without the proposed project, there would no subsurface excavation and no impact to bedrock geology, which is unlikely in any event since bedrock is far below the surface in the areas proposed for excavation. Therefore, there would be not even be a slight potential for rock removal including via the low likelihood for blasting.

Soils would remain undisturbed without the proposed project.

Without the proposed project, there would be no change to the topographical features of the site including to Town regulated ridgeline protection areas within which would be sited the proposed buildings. There would be no impact to Town-

regulated slopes. Again, since the proposed project is largely not visible from off-site, the visual impacts of leaving the topographical features as is would be comparable to those posed by the proposed project.

7. Groundwater

Without the proposed project, the three on-site wells will remain in-place but will not be used. There would be no groundwater withdrawal, that in any case with the proposed project would be significantly less than the recharge to the groundwater during both normal and drought precipitation conditions.

8. Vegetation and Wildlife

Without the proposed project, the site would continue as it is today, with successional species and invasive species dominating and continuing to degrade the landscape as it reverts from abandoned agricultural land to mixed hardwood forest.

9. Economics

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.

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 at the local level. 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.

10. Community Services

Because no children are generated by the existing undeveloped site, and none from the proposed project, there would be no change in the number of children attending schools in the District whether the proposed project is developed or not. However, the District would not gain additional revenue from the project's proposed PILOT program.

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 from thence 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.

Without the proposed project, the project site would not be expected to generate the minimal incremental increased need for police protection services because it would remain in its current undeveloped condition. Police protection services would not benefit from any incremental PILOT program revenues.

In addition, the project site would not be expected to generate a minimal incremental increased need for fire and EMS services because it would remain in its current undeveloped condition. 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. Emergency services, including the Fire District, would not benefit from any incremental PILOT program revenues.

Because no trash/recycling is generated by the existing undeveloped site, and none would be collected by the Town post-development because of the commercial nature of the project, there would be no change in existing conditions whether the proposed project is developed or not.

II. Utilities

Without the proposed project, the three on-site wells will remain in-place but would not be used. There would be no groundwater withdrawal, that in any case with the proposed project would be significantly less than the recharge to the groundwater during both normal and drought precipitation conditions. There would be no construction of a subsurface sewage disposal system (SSDS) to accommodate the proposed project. No electric or natural gas would be provided to the property.

12. Cultural Resources

There would be no impact to cultural resources whether or not the proposed project is developed.

13. Noise

If the project is not constructed, the site would remain in its current condition, and no new noise sources would be added to the site. There would be no construction equipment, no truck activity, and no HVAC equipment located on site, with noise levels in conformance with the Town's Noise Ordinance. However, there would be continued growth of traffic on the roads in the area, due in part to development that will occur on other sites.

14. Construction

Without the proposed project, the site would remain in its currently undeveloped condition. There would be no temporary construction impacts, and none of the benefits resulting from the construction of the proposed project.

15. Air Quality

Without the proposed project, air quality conditions on and adjacent to the project site are anticipated to remain similar to the existing conditions.

16. Hazardous Materials

The property has no Recognized Environmental Conditions (REC's) with or without the proposed project.

B. Previously Approved Residential, with Planned Commercial/Office

I. Project Description

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 compared with 328 acres of the proposed project. 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, had been approved/constructed on the remaining portion of the site, the environmental impacts would have been significantly greater.

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.

2. Land Use and Zoning

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.

Phase I impervious area is less at 31.7 acres compared with 57.2 acres of the proposed project, reflective of the development of only the 185.2 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 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.

3. Traffic

This 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.

4. Visual Resources

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.

Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would likely follow the Town's ridgeline guidelines if constructed today. (The ridgeline protection guidelines are not mentioned in the DEIS of this alternative, and were not in place at the time.) The commercial portion of the site and some of the single-family homes would be situated on a ridgeline. The Phase 2 portion of the project would have impacted another ridgeline. This alternative (with redesign) may have removed 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, like the instant project. 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 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.

5. Surface Water and Wetlands

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.

6. Geology, Soils and Topography

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 of the proposed project on 328 acres. The proposed project only disturbs 40.6% of the 328 acres.

As with the proposed project, earthwork would be balanced such that no excess material would need to be exported off of the site, and no material would need to be brought into the site as fill.

7. Groundwater

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.

8. Vegetation and Wildlife

With similar proposed site disturbance, impacts to vegetation and wildlife would be anticipated to be similar to the proposed project. Impacts would be greater if and when the Phase 2 portion of the project had been constructed.

9. Economics

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. The proposed project on the other hand 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.

10. Community Services

This alternative would place 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 because of the residential population that lives on the site.

There would be residential trash and recycling pick-up arranged by the Town, unlike the proposed project which would contract its own private carter.

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

11. Utilities

Water demand would be greater under this alternative as discussed under the Groundwater section, at 78,010 gallons per day (gpd) compared with the 29,000 of the proposed project. This also is greater than the 20,000 gpd sanitary demand of the proposed project (with 9,000 gpd of water of the proposed project being used for irrigation, and thus not counted towards sanitary demand, because this water infiltrates into the ground and does not enter the sanitary system).

A new Wastewater Treatment Plant was proposed to serve the site, and discharge into Beaver Brook.

12. Cultural Resources

The survey conducted by Historical Perspectives, Inc. (HPI) Campus at Field Corners Area of Potential Effect (APE) in 2005, including 1189 shovel tests, identified no precontact resources. Documentary research also found that the site had only a low potential for historical period cultural resources. So as with

the proposed project, this alternative would pose no significant adverse impacts to cultural resources.

13. Noise

Noise impacts were not studied in the 1992 DEIS of this alternative, although construction noise would presumably have been similar to the proposed project, and construction would likewise have followed the Town's Noise Ordinance.

14. Construction

Construction impacts of this (Phase 1) alternative would be similar based on the similar proposed level of disturbance compared with the proposed project (134.1 acres versus 133.2 acres). However, impacts would have occurred over a longer timeframe and to a greater extent if the Phase 2 portion of this alternative had been constructed.

15. Air Quality

Air quality impacts were not studied in the DEIS of this alternative, but presumably, like the proposed project, would not have been significant.

16. Hazardous Materials

The property has no Recognized Environmental Conditions (REC's) which would impact this alternative.

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

I. Project Description

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 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.

2. Land Use and Zoning

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.

3. Traffic

Traffic is significantly higher under this alternative. 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.

4. Visual Resources

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.

5. Surface Water and Wetlands

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.

6. Geology, Soils and Topography

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

7. Groundwater

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.

8. Vegetation and Wildlife

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.

9. Economics

As explained in footnote #5 of the below table, 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.

10. Community Services

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.

11. Utilities

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. This also is greater than the 20,000 gpd sanitary demand of the proposed project (with 9,000 gpd of water of the proposed project being used for irrigation, and thus not counted towards sanitary demand).

12. Cultural Resources

Because this alternative is sited in approximately the same general area as the proposed project, as with the proposed project, this alternative would pose no significant adverse impacts to cultural resources.

13. Noise

Like the proposed project, the alternative would be subject to the Town's Noise Ordinance, including the proposed recreational use with specified hours of operation.

14. Construction

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).

15. Air Quality

Air quality impacts would likely not be significant, similar to the proposed project.

16. Hazardous Materials

The property has no Recognized Environmental Conditions (REC's) which would impact either this alternative or the proposed project.

D. 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.

**Table IV-1
Comparison of Alternatives**

DEIS Analysis Area	Proposed Project	A. No Action	B. Previously Approved Residential, with Planned Commercial/Office	C. As-of-Right Mixed-Use Development
Project Description	Four logistics center buildings comprising a total of 1,124,575 s.f.	Existing vacant site to remain.	143 single-family homes, plus 237,000 s.f. of commercial/office.	240,000 s.f. of medical office; 200,000 s.f. of retail; 2 indoor recreation buildings (90,000 s.f., 120,000 s.f.); 3 outdoor recreational turf fields.
Property Zoning	OP-3	OP-3 and RC	OP-3	OP-3
Site Acreage	328.0	328.0	185.2 ⁽¹⁾	328.0
Area of Site Disturbance (Acres)	133.2 (40.6% of site)	0	134.1 ⁽¹⁾ (72.4%) ⁽¹⁾	150.7
Impervious Area (Acres)	57.2	0	31.7 ⁽¹⁾	54.7
Open Space (Acres)	270.8	328.0	153.5 ⁽²⁾	273.3
Lot Coverage (%)	17.4	0	17.1 ⁽²⁾	16.6
Building Coverage (%)	7.9	0	6.3 ⁽²⁾	4.5

DEIS Analysis Area	Proposed Project	No Action	B. Previously Approved Residential, with Planned Commercial/Office	C. As-of-Right Mixed-Use Development
Gross Floor Area (S.F.)	1,124,575	0	999,410 ⁽¹⁾	890,000
Floor Area Ratio	0.08	0	0.12 ⁽²⁾	0.06
Maximum Building Height (Feet)	40-42	0	± 45	± 45
Wetland Disturbance (Acres)	0.05	0	0.11 ⁽¹⁾	0.04
Wetland Buffer Disturb. (Acres)	7.81	0	24.57 ⁽¹⁾	5.80
Water Demand (GPD)	29,000 ⁽⁴⁾	0	78,010 ⁽¹⁾	88,000
Sewage Generation (GPD)	20,000	0	78,010 ⁽¹⁾	88,000
Annual Tax Generation	Multiples above current taxes paid	\$141,616	\$1,661,201 ⁽¹⁾	(5)
# Residential Units	0	0	143 Single-Family Homes	0
Total Population	0	0	525	0
School Age Children Population	0	0	150	0
Trip Generation (AM/PM/Saturday Peak Hour)	337 AM/360 PM/146 Peak Sat. ⁽⁷⁾	0/0/0	539 AM/565 PM ⁽⁶⁾	839 AM/1,688 PM/2,392 Peak Saturday ⁽⁸⁾
Employment (# Jobs)	665	0	500 ⁽¹⁾	850

DEIS Analysis Area	Proposed Project	A. No Action	B. Previously Approved Residential, with Planned Commercial/Office	C. As-of-Right Mixed-Use Development
Land Use and Zoning	Zoning text amendment for logistics center conditional use, and rezoning a portion of the site's RC zone to OP-3.	Site would remain vacant. No change to existing zoning.	No change to site's existing zoning.	Same rezoning of the RC district portion of the property to OP-3, as with the proposed project.
Traffic	337 AM/360 PM/146 Saturday peak trips ⁽⁷⁾ .	110 AM/145 PM peak trips ⁽⁹⁾ .	539 AM/565 PM peak trips ⁽⁶⁾ .	839 AM/1,688 PM/2,392 Saturday peak trips ⁽⁸⁾ .
Visual Resources	40-42 foot building heights; views minimized by designing building finished floor elevations below existing ridgeline grade; protecting existing mature trees; using neutral building colors; extensive landscaping; deep setbacks from road and lot lines.	No change from existing conditions.	45 foot building heights; buildings were to have been located on top of ridgelines with no finished floor elevations below existing ridgeline grades, resulting in potentially greater visual impacts.	45 foot building heights; may or may not design building finished floor elevations below existing ridgeline grade, resulting in greater visual impacts; otherwise conform to ridgeline guidelines.

DEIS Analysis Area	Proposed Project	No Action	B. Previously Approved Residential, with Planned Commercial/Office	C. As-of-Right Mixed-Use Development
Surface Water and Wetlands	0.05 acre wetland disturbance for road improvements; 7.81 acres of wetland buffer disturbance.	No change from existing conditions.	0.11 acre wetland disturbance; 24.57 acres of wetland buffer disturbance.	0.04 acre wetland disturbance; 5.80 acres of wetland buffer disturbance.
Geology, Soils and Topography	133.2 acres of site disturbance; balanced earthwork;	No change from existing conditions.	134.1 acres of site disturbance; balanced earthwork.	150.7 acres of site disturbance.
Groundwater	29,000 gpd water demand.	No change from existing conditions.	78,010 gpd water demand.	88,000 gpd water demand.
Vegetation and Wildlife	No significant impacts, including none to bog turtle habitat or Northern long-eared bats.	No change from existing conditions.	Potentially no significant impacts, including none to bog turtle habitat or potentially to Northern long-eared bats.	Potentially greater impact with greater proposed site disturbance (150.7 acres versus 133.2 of proposed project); no impacts to bog turtle habitat or potentially to Northern long-eared bats.

DEIS Analysis Area	Proposed Project	No Action	B. Previously Approved Residential, with Planned Commercial/Office	C. As-of-Right Mixed-Use Development
Economics	Seeking PILOT program, with benefit of additional revenue to community as property’s assessment increases with proposed phased development; 665 permanent direct jobs.	No change from existing conditions.	\$1,205,420 in property taxes, but significant impact to schools with 150 school-aged children to attend school district; estimated 500 direct jobs.	Would seek PILOT program, but with 79% of floor area of proposed project, revenues likely would be less.
Community Services	Positive impact to schools with increased PILOT revenue; minimal impact to other municipal services; donation of land for County’s Tilly Foster Farm.	No change from existing conditions.	Potential negative impact to schools with 150 school-age children; residential population uses more community services; no donation of land for County’s Tilly Foster Farm.	Positive impact to schools with increased PILOT revenue; minimal impact to other municipal services.

DEIS Analysis Area	Proposed Project	No Action	B. Previously Approved Residential, with Planned Commercial/Office	C. As-of-Right Mixed-Use Development
Utilities	On-site wells for 29,000 gpd water demand; onsite subsurface sewage disposal system; electric and natural gas extensions.	No change from existing conditions.	On-site wells for 78,010 gpd water demand; Wastewater Treatment Plant to serve site.	On-site wells for 88,000 gpd water demand; onsite subsurface sewage disposal system; electric and natural gas extensions.
Cultural Resources	No impact.	No change from existing conditions.	No impact.	No impact.
Noise	No significant impact, conform with Town's Noise Ordinance	No change from existing conditions.	No significant impact, conform with Town's Noise Ordinance	No significant impact, conform with Town's Noise Ordinance
Construction	Temporary impacts mitigated by SWPPP; conformance with Town's Noise Ordinance; conformance with NAAQS air quality standards for construction.	No change from existing conditions.	Similar impacts to proposed project, with longer timeframe if Phase 2 portion of alternative had been constructed.	Greater impacts due to larger proposed area of disturbance (150.7 acres versus 133.2 of proposed project)

DEIS Analysis Area	Proposed Project	No Action	B. Previously Approved Residential, with Planned Commercial/Office	C. As-of-Right Mixed-Use Development
Air Quality	No significant adverse impacts.	No change from existing conditions.	Likely no significant adverse impacts.	Likely no significant adverse impacts.
Hazardous Materials	No REC's present on the site.	No change from existing conditions.	No REC's present on the site.	No REC's present on the site.

- (1) This represents the Phase I development proposed on a portion of the site (185.2 acres). A Phase 2 was envisioned as encompassing the remaining available site acreage, with resultant greater impacts.
- (2) Calculated for the Phase I 185.2 acre portion of the property.
- (3) Includes 20.08 acres of Town wetland buffer disturbance, which local regulation was not in effect at the time of the application.
- (4) Includes estimated 9,000 gpd used for irrigation.
- (5) Based on a gross floor area of approximately 79% of the proposed project, this alternative is proposed to have a PILOT program that generates approximately 79% of the taxes generated by the proposed project.
- (6) No traffic study was conducted for the change in the residential component from 327 residential units to 143 single-family homes, and thus the 1992 traffic study trips were utilized.
- (7) Trip Generation is based on ITE (Institute of Transportation Engineers) Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition. Development volumes for 1,124,575 s.f. of warehouse (ITE Code 150) is based on the trip generation average rates provided by ITE.
- (8) Trip Generation is based on ITE Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition. Development volumes for 200,000 s.f. of shopping center (ITE Code 820) is based on trip generation equations provided by ITE.
AM: $\ln(T) = 0.61\ln(X) + 2.24$ **PM:** $\ln(T) = 0.67\ln(X) + 3.31$ **Saturday:** $\ln(T) = 0.65\ln(X) + 3.78$
 Development volumes for 240,000 s.f. of Medical-Dental Office Building (ITE Code 720) is based on the trip generation equation provided by ITE for the peak weekday PM hour and the trip generation average rates for peak weekday AM & Saturday hours.

AM: 2.39/1,000 SF **PM:** $\ln(T) = 0.90\ln(X) + 1.53$ **Saturday:** 8.96/1,000 SF

Development volumes for 90,000 s.f. Multipurpose Recreational Facility (ITE Code 435) is based on trip generation average rates provided by ITE.

AM: 0.24/1,000 SF **PM:** 0.25/1,000 SF **Saturday:** 0.29/1,000 SF

Development volumes for a 4 outdoor field Soccer Complex (ITE Code 488) is based on trip generation average rates provided by ITE.

AM: 1.12/Field **PM:** 17.70/Field **Saturday:** 30.34/Field

The total development volumes depicted on the table above is equal to the sum of the volumes for Shopping Center, Medical-Dental Office Building, Multipurpose Recreational Facility, and Soccer Complex.

(9) For approved 143 single-family homes.