

Full Environmental Assessment Form
Part 2 - Identification of Potential Project Impacts

Agency Use Only [If applicable]
 Project : PD#21, 1100 S. Goodman Street
 Date : 08-12-19

Part 2 is to be completed by the lead agency. Part 2 is designed to help the lead agency inventory all potential resources that could be affected by a proposed project or action. We recognize that the lead agency's reviewer(s) will not necessarily be environmental professionals. So, the questions are designed to walk a reviewer through the assessment process by providing a series of questions that can be answered using the information found in Part 1. To further assist the lead agency in completing Part 2, the form identifies the most relevant questions in Part 1 that will provide the information needed to answer the Part 2 question. When Part 2 is completed, the lead agency will have identified the relevant environmental areas that may be impacted by the proposed activity.

If the lead agency is a state agency **and** the action is in any Coastal Area, complete the Coastal Assessment Form before proceeding with this assessment.

Tips for completing Part 2:

- Review all of the information provided in Part 1.
- Review any application, maps, supporting materials and the Full EAF Workbook.
- Answer each of the 18 questions in Part 2.
- If you answer "Yes" to a numbered question, please complete all the questions that follow in that section.
- If you answer "No" to a numbered question, move on to the next numbered question.
- Check appropriate column to indicate the anticipated size of the impact.
- Proposed projects that would exceed a numeric threshold contained in a question should result in the reviewing agency checking the box "Moderate to large impact may occur."
- The reviewer is not expected to be an expert in environmental analysis.
- If you are not sure or undecided about the size of an impact, it may help to review the sub-questions for the general question and consult the workbook.
- When answering a question consider all components of the proposed activity, that is, the "whole action".
- Consider the possibility for long-term and cumulative impacts as well as direct impacts.
- Answer the question in a reasonable manner considering the scale and context of the project.

1. Impact on Land Proposed action may involve construction on, or physical alteration of, the land surface of the proposed site. (See Part 1. D.1) <i>If "Yes", answer questions a - j. If "No", move on to Section 2.</i>				<input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur		
a. The proposed action may involve construction on land where depth to water table is less than 3 feet.	E2d	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
b. The proposed action may involve construction on slopes of 15% or greater.	E2f	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
c. The proposed action may involve construction on land where bedrock is exposed, or generally within 5 feet of existing ground surface.	E2a	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
d. The proposed action may involve the excavation and removal of more than 1,000 tons of natural material.	D2a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
e. The proposed action may involve construction that continues for more than one year or in multiple phases.	D1e	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
f. The proposed action may result in increased erosion, whether from physical disturbance or vegetation removal (including from treatment by herbicides).	D2e, D2q	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
g. The proposed action is, or may be, located within a Coastal Erosion hazard area.	B1i	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
h. Other impacts: <u>no other impacts</u>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		

2. Impact on Geological Features The proposed action may result in the modification or destruction of, or inhibit access to, any unique or unusual land forms on the site (e.g., cliffs, dunes, minerals, fossils, caves). (See Part 1. E.2.g) <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <i>If "Yes", answer questions a - c. If "No", move on to Section 3.</i>			
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. Identify the specific land form(s) attached: _____ glacial moraine	E2g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may affect or is adjacent to a geological feature listed as a registered National Natural Landmark. Specific feature: _____	E3c	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Other impacts: no other impacts		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. Impacts on Surface Water The proposed action may affect one or more wetlands or other surface water bodies (e.g., streams, rivers, ponds or lakes). (See Part 1. D.2, E.2.h) <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <i>If "Yes", answer questions a - l. If "No", move on to Section 4.</i>			
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may create a new water body.	D2b, D1h	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may result in an increase or decrease of over 10% or more than a 10 acre increase or decrease in the surface area of any body of water.	D2b	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may involve dredging more than 100 cubic yards of material from a wetland or water body.	D2a	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may involve construction within or adjoining a freshwater or tidal wetland, or in the bed or banks of any other water body.	E2h	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may create turbidity in a waterbody, either from upland erosion, runoff or by disturbing bottom sediments.	D2a, D2h	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. The proposed action may include construction of one or more intake(s) for withdrawal of water from surface water.	D2c	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. The proposed action may include construction of one or more outfall(s) for discharge of wastewater to surface water(s).	D2d	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. The proposed action may cause soil erosion, or otherwise create a source of stormwater discharge that may lead to siltation or other degradation of receiving water bodies.	D2e	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. The proposed action may affect the water quality of any water bodies within or downstream of the site of the proposed action.	E2h	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. The proposed action may involve the application of pesticides or herbicides in or around any water body.	D2q, E2h	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. The proposed action may require the construction of new, or expansion of existing, wastewater treatment facilities.	D1a, D2d	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

1. Other impacts: No other impacts.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

4. Impact on groundwater The proposed action may result in new or additional use of ground water, or may have the potential to introduce contaminants to ground water or an aquifer. (See Part 1. D.2.a, D.2.c, D.2.d, D.2.p, D.2.q, D.2.t) If "Yes", answer questions a - h. If "No", move on to Section 5.			
		<input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may require new water supply wells, or create additional demand on supplies from existing water supply wells.	D2c	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Water supply demand from the proposed action may exceed safe and sustainable withdrawal capacity rate of the local supply or aquifer. Cite Source: _____	D2c	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may allow or result in residential uses in areas without water and sewer services.	D1a, D2c	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may include or require wastewater discharged to groundwater.	D2d, E2l	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may result in the construction of water supply wells in locations where groundwater is, or is suspected to be, contaminated.	D2c, E1f, E1g, E1h	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. The proposed action may require the bulk storage of petroleum or chemical products over ground water or an aquifer.	D2p, E2l	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. The proposed action may involve the commercial application of pesticides within 100 feet of potable drinking water or irrigation sources.	E2h, D2q, E2l, D2c	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Other impacts: <u>The NYSDEC EAF Mapper application lists the site as being over a primary and principal aquifer.</u>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5. Impact on Flooding The proposed action may result in development on lands subject to flooding. (See Part 1. E.2) If "Yes", answer questions a - g. If "No", move on to Section 6.			
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may result in development in a designated floodway.	E2i	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may result in development within a 100 year floodplain.	E2j	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may result in development within a 500 year floodplain.	E2k	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may result in, or require, modification of existing drainage patterns.	D2b, D2e	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may change flood water flows that contribute to flooding.	D2b, E2i, E2j, E2k	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. If there is a dam located on the site of the proposed action, is the dam in need of repair, or upgrade?	E1e	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

g. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
----------------------------------	--	--------------------------	--------------------------

6. Impacts on Air The proposed action may include a state regulated air emission source. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> YES (See Part 1. D.2.f., D.2.h, D.2.g) <i>If "Yes", answer questions a - f. If "No", move on to Section 7.</i>			
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. If the proposed action requires federal or state air emission permits, the action may also emit one or more greenhouse gases at or above the following levels:			
i. More than 1000 tons/year of carbon dioxide (CO ₂)	D2g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. More than 3.5 tons/year of nitrous oxide (N ₂ O)	D2g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. More than 1000 tons/year of carbon equivalent of perfluorocarbons (PFCs)	D2g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv. More than .045 tons/year of sulfur hexafluoride (SF ₆)	D2g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
v. More than 1000 tons/year of carbon dioxide equivalent of hydrochloroflourocarbons (HFCs) emissions	D2g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
vi. 43 tons/year or more of methane	D2h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may generate 10 tons/year or more of any one designated hazardous air pollutant, or 25 tons/year or more of any combination of such hazardous air pollutants.	D2g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may require a state air registration, or may produce an emissions rate of total contaminants that may exceed 5 lbs. per hour, or may include a heat source capable of producing more than 10 million BTU's per hour.	D2f, D2g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may reach 50% of any of the thresholds in "a" through "c", above.	D2g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may result in the combustion or thermal treatment of more than 1 ton of refuse per hour.	D2s	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

7. Impact on Plants and Animals The proposed action may result in a loss of flora or fauna. (See Part 1. E.2. m.-q.) <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <i>If "Yes", answer questions a - j. If "No", move on to Section 8.</i>			
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may cause reduction in population or loss of individuals of any threatened or endangered species, as listed by New York State or the Federal government, that use the site, or are found on, over, or near the site.	E2o	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may result in a reduction or degradation of any habitat used by any rare, threatened or endangered species, as listed by New York State or the federal government.	E2o	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may cause reduction in population, or loss of individuals, of any species of special concern or conservation need, as listed by New York State or the Federal government, that use the site, or are found on, over, or near the site.	E2p	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may result in a reduction or degradation of any habitat used by any species of special concern and conservation need, as listed by New York State or the Federal government.	E2p	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

e. The proposed action may diminish the capacity of a registered National Natural Landmark to support the biological community it was established to protect.	E3c	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. The proposed action may result in the removal of, or ground disturbance in, any portion of a designated significant natural community. Source: _____	E2n	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. The proposed action may substantially interfere with nesting/breeding, foraging, or over-wintering habitat for the predominant species that occupy or use the project site.	E2m	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. The proposed action requires the conversion of more than 10 acres of forest, grassland or any other regionally or locally important habitat. Habitat type & information source: _____	E1b	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Proposed action (commercial, industrial or recreational projects, only) involves use of herbicides or pesticides.	D2q	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Other impacts: <u>no other impacts</u>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. Impact on Agricultural Resources The proposed action may impact agricultural resources. (See Part 1. E.3.a. and b.) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> YES <i>If "Yes", answer questions a - h. If "No", move on to Section 9.</i>			
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may impact soil classified within soil group 1 through 4 of the NYS Land Classification System.	E2c, E3b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may sever, cross or otherwise limit access to agricultural land (includes cropland, hayfields, pasture, vineyard, orchard, etc).	E1a, E1b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may result in the excavation or compaction of the soil profile of active agricultural land.	E3b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may irreversibly convert agricultural land to non-agricultural uses, either more than 2.5 acres if located in an Agricultural District, or more than 10 acres if not within an Agricultural District.	E1b, E3a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may disrupt or prevent installation of an agricultural land management system.	E1 a, E1b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. The proposed action may result, directly or indirectly, in increased development potential or pressure on farmland.	C2c, C3, D2c, D2d	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. The proposed project is not consistent with the adopted municipal Farmland Protection Plan.	C2c	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Other impacts: _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

9. Impact on Aesthetic Resources The land use of the proposed action are obviously different from, or are in sharp contrast to, current land use patterns between the proposed project and a scenic or aesthetic resource. (Part 1. E.1.a, E.1.b, E.3.h.) <i>If "Yes", answer questions a - g. If "No", go to Section 10.</i>			
		<input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. Proposed action may be visible from any officially designated federal, state, or local scenic or aesthetic resource.	E3h	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may result in the obstruction, elimination or significant screening of one or more officially designated scenic views.	E3h, C2b	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may be visible from publicly accessible vantage points: i. Seasonally (e.g., screened by summer foliage, but visible during other seasons) ii. Year round	E3h	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
d. The situation or activity in which viewers are engaged while viewing the proposed action is: i. Routine travel by residents, including travel to and from work ii. Recreational or tourism based activities	E3h E2q, E1c	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may cause a diminishment of the public enjoyment and appreciation of the designated aesthetic resource.	E3h	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. There are similar projects visible within the following distance of the proposed project: 0-1/2 mile 1/2 -3 mile 3-5 mile 5+ mile	D1a, E1a, D1f, D1g	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Other impacts: <u>no other impacts</u>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

10. Impact on Historic and Archeological Resources The proposed action may occur in or adjacent to a historic or archaeological resource. (Part 1. E.3.e, f. and g.) <i>If "Yes", answer questions a - e. If "No", go to Section 11.</i>			
		<input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may occur wholly or partially within, or substantially contiguous to, any buildings, archaeological site or district which is listed on or has been nominated by the NYS Board of Historic Preservation for inclusion on the State or National Register of Historic Places.	E3e	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may occur wholly or partially within, or substantially contiguous to, an area designated as sensitive for archaeological sites on the NY State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) archaeological site inventory.	E3f	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may occur wholly or partially within, or substantially contiguous to, an archaeological site not included on the NY SHPO inventory. Source: _____	E3g	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

d. Other impacts: <u>no other impacts</u>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If any of the above (a-d) are answered "Moderate to large impact may occur", continue with the following questions to help support conclusions in Part 3:			
i. The proposed action may result in the destruction or alteration of all or part of the site or property.	E3e, E3g, E3f	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. The proposed action may result in the alteration of the property's setting or integrity.	E3e, E3f, E3g, E1a, E1b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. The proposed action may result in the introduction of visual elements which are out of character with the site or property, or may alter its setting.	E3e, E3f, E3g, E3h, C2, C3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

11. Impact on Open Space and Recreation The proposed action may result in a loss of recreational opportunities or a reduction of an open space resource as designated in any adopted municipal open space plan. (See Part 1. C.2.c, E.1.c., E.2.q.) If "Yes", answer questions a - e. If "No", go to Section 12.			
		<input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may result in an impairment of natural functions, or "ecosystem services", provided by an undeveloped area, including but not limited to stormwater storage, nutrient cycling, wildlife habitat.	D2e, E1b, E2h, E2m, E2o, E2n, E2p	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may result in the loss of a current or future recreational resource.	C2a, E1c, C2c, E2q	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may eliminate open space or recreational resource in an area with few such resources.	C2a, C2c, E1c, E2q	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may result in loss of an area now used informally by the community as an open space resource.	C2c, E1c	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Other impacts: <u>No other impacts.</u>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

12. Impact on Critical Environmental Areas The proposed action may be located within or adjacent to a critical environmental area (CEA). (See Part 1. E.3.d) If "Yes", answer questions a - c. If "No", go to Section 13.			
		<input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may result in a reduction in the quantity of the resource or characteristic which was the basis for designation of the CEA.	E3d	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may result in a reduction in the quality of the resource or characteristic which was the basis for designation of the CEA.	E3d	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Other impacts: <u>no other impacts</u>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

13. Impact on Transportation

The proposed action may result in a change to existing transportation systems.

☐ NO☒ YES

(See Part 1. D.2.j)

If "Yes", answer questions a - f. If "No", go to Section 14.

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. Projected traffic increase may exceed capacity of existing road network.	D2j	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may result in the construction of paved parking area for 500 or more vehicles.	D2j	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action will degrade existing transit access.	D2j	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action will degrade existing pedestrian or bicycle accommodations.	D2j	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may alter the present pattern of movement of people or goods.	D2j	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Other impacts: no		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

14. Impact on Energy

The proposed action may cause an increase in the use of any form of energy.

☒ NO☐ YES

(See Part 1. D.2.k)

If "Yes", answer questions a - e. If "No", go to Section 15.

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action will require a new, or an upgrade to an existing, substation.	D2k	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action will require the creation or extension of an energy transmission or supply system to serve more than 50 single or two-family residences or to serve a commercial or industrial use.	D1f, D1q, D2k	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may utilize more than 2,500 MWhrs per year of electricity.	D2k	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may involve heating and/or cooling of more than 100,000 square feet of building area when completed.	D1g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Other Impacts:			

15. Impact on Noise, Odor, and Light

The proposed action may result in an increase in noise, odors, or outdoor lighting.

☒ NO☐ YES

(See Part 1. D.2.m., n., and o.)

If "Yes", answer questions a - f. If "No", go to Section 16.

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may produce sound above noise levels established by local regulation.	D2m	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may result in blasting within 1,500 feet of any residence, hospital, school, licensed day care center, or nursing home.	D2m, E1d	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may result in routine odors for more than one hour per day.	D2o	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

d. The proposed action may result in light shining onto adjoining properties.	D2n	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may result in lighting creating sky-glow brighter than existing area conditions.	D2n, E1a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

16. Impact on Human Health

The proposed action may have an impact on human health from exposure to new or existing sources of contaminants. (See Part 1.D.2.q., E.1. d. f. g. and h.)

☒ NO

☐ YES

If "Yes", answer questions a - m. If "No", go to Section 17.

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action is located within 1500 feet of a school, hospital, licensed day care center, group home, nursing home or retirement community.	E1d	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The site of the proposed action is currently undergoing remediation.	E1g, E1h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. There is a completed emergency spill remediation, or a completed environmental site remediation on, or adjacent to, the site of the proposed action.	E1g, E1h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The site of the action is subject to an institutional control limiting the use of the property (e.g., easement or deed restriction).	E1g, E1h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may affect institutional control measures that were put in place to ensure that the site remains protective of the environment and human health.	E1g, E1h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. The proposed action has adequate control measures in place to ensure that future generation, treatment and/or disposal of hazardous wastes will be protective of the environment and human health.	D2t	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. The proposed action involves construction or modification of a solid waste management facility.	D2q, E1f	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. The proposed action may result in the unearthing of solid or hazardous waste.	D2q, E1f	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. The proposed action may result in an increase in the rate of disposal, or processing, of solid waste.	D2r, D2s	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. The proposed action may result in excavation or other disturbance within 2000 feet of a site used for the disposal of solid or hazardous waste.	E1f, E1g E1h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. The proposed action may result in the migration of explosive gases from a landfill site to adjacent off site structures.	E1f, E1g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l. The proposed action may result in the release of contaminated leachate from the project site.	D2s, E1f, D2r	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m. Other impacts: _____ _____			

17. Consistency with Community Plans

The proposed action is not consistent with adopted land use plans.

(See Part 1. C.1, C.2. and C.3.)

If "Yes", answer questions a - h. If "No", go to Section 18.☐ NO☒ YES

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action's land use components may be different from, or in sharp contrast to, current surrounding land use pattern(s).	C2, C3, D1a E1a, E1b	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action will cause the permanent population of the city, town or village in which the project is located to grow by more than 5%.	C2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action is inconsistent with local land use plans or zoning regulations.	C2, C2, C3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action is inconsistent with any County plans, or other regional land use plans.	C2, C2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may cause a change in the density of development that is not supported by existing infrastructure or is distant from existing infrastructure.	C3, D1c, D1d, D1f, D1d, E1b	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. The proposed action is located in an area characterized by low density development that will require new or expanded public infrastructure.	C4, D2c, D2d D2j	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. The proposed action may induce secondary development impacts (e.g., residential or commercial development not included in the proposed action)	C2a	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Other: <u>No other impact.</u>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

18. Consistency with Community Character

The proposed project is inconsistent with the existing community character.

(See Part 1. C.2, C.3, D.2, E.3)

If "Yes", answer questions a - g. If "No", proceed to Part 3.☐ NO☒ YES

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may replace or eliminate existing facilities, structures, or areas of historic importance to the community.	E3e, E3f, E3g	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may create a demand for additional community services (e.g. schools, police and fire)	C4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may displace affordable or low-income housing in an area where there is a shortage of such housing.	C2, C3, D1f D1g, E1a	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may interfere with the use or enjoyment of officially recognized or designated public resources.	C2, E3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action is inconsistent with the predominant architectural scale and character.	C2, C3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Proposed action is inconsistent with the character of the existing natural landscape.	C2, C3 E1a, E1b E2g, E2h	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Other impacts: <u>No other impact.</u>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

PRINT FULL FORM

CITY OF ROCHESTER, NEW YORK
County of Monroe
NOTICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

Issued in accordance with Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law and Chapter 48 of the Rochester Municipal Code.

NEGATIVE DECLARATION: The proposed action is one which will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

ACTION:

Classification: Type I
Description: Adoption of Planned Development District, Subdivision approval; Preservation Board Certificate of Appropriateness review and approval; Site Plan Review approval, demolition, site preparation, easements, agreements, utility extensions or relocations, funding, and Airport Referral.

PROJECT:

Title: The Vistas at Highland
Location: 1100 South Goodman Street
Applicant: Angelo Ingrassia, ROC Goodman LLC
Description: Rezone 22.42 acres from Institutional Planned Development District – Colgate Divinity School, to Planned Development District #21 - Colgate (PD#21). The PD will facilitate the reuse of five existing buildings, and the construction of a four-story 52 unit multifamily building (no underground parking), and a four-story 52 unit multifamily building with 32 underground parking spaces (12 additional spaces onsite, 273 spaces total). Proposal includes the subdivision of one parcel into six parcels.

REASON(S) FOR DETERMINATION

Project Documentation

A Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF) Part 1, dated July 26, 2019, was prepared by the applicant and submitted to the City of Rochester requesting establishment of a Planned Development District and Site Plan Approval. The City of Rochester Manager of Zoning (Manager) sought and received lead agency status to conduct a coordinated environmental review for this project.

The application is accompanied by drawings, plans and documents consisting of a Schematic Plan Set, Resubdivision Map, Architectural Renderings, Planned Development District Regulations and Map, Construction Management Plan, Mass Earthwork Summary, Geotechnical Report, Traffic Impact Study, Water Distribution Report, Tree Summary, Drainage Report, Cross Sections, Neighboring Views, Shadow Study, Lighting Calculation Summary, Rochester Preservation Board Staff Report, Rochester Preservation Board

Comments, City Planning Commission Staff Report, City Planning Commission Recommendation, Rochester Project Review Committee Comments, Rochester Environmental Commission Comments, Department of Environmental Service (DES) review comments and note.

Project Scope

The proposal is to amend the City Zoning Code text and map to establish a 22.42 acre Planned Development District (PD) to be designated as PD #21 The Vistas at Highland. The PD site consists of the campus of the Colgate Rochester Divinity School, which has been designated a Local Landmark and which also is part of a City-designated Critical Environmental Area that encompasses the slopes and crests of a series of glacial formations that extend from Mount Hope Cemetery, through Highland Park, the PD-21 site, and Pinnacle and Cobbs Hills. The amendments will facilitate development of a mixed use campus that will reuse the five existing buildings, construct two four-story multifamily buildings (depicted as Buildings 100 and 200) with 52 dwelling units each, increase the total number of parking spaces by 23 for a total of 273, and establish an approximately 10-acre easement area to preserve the large sloping front lawn on the southern portion of the site, and a subdivision to create six parcels.

Due to the site's designation as a Local Landmark, any exterior alterations to the campus' historic buildings or landscape (other than the area around the 1950s vintage Andrews and Saunders Halls) and the construction of Buildings 100 and 200 will require prior detailed review and the granting of a Certificate of Appropriateness by the Rochester Preservation Board pursuant to Zoning Code §120-194.

Project Review

Prior to the submittal of applications to the City, the applicant submitted draft plans and consulted with neighbors, community leaders and representatives of the Landmark Society of Western New York (Landmark Society). Through numerous meetings over several months, the review prompted the applicant to go through three iterations of the project. This informal, preliminary review prompted substantial changes to the project prior to its submission to the City.

Once it was submitted to the City, project designs and information were made available and referred to the following City, County and outside agencies:

- Rochester Environmental Commission (REC). The REC, which advises the Manager of Zoning on applications that are categorized as Type 1 Actions, reviewed the proposal at their July 18, 2019 meeting. The REC's review focused on: impacts related to parking, tree removal, public access to site, traffic, earthwork, wildlife, transit access, and historic resources. The REC determined that, based on the application,

Environmental Assessment Form, and information provided, the proposal is not likely to cause significant adverse impacts to the environment and made a recommendation to the Manager of Zoning for the issuance of a Negative Declaration.

- **Project Review Committee (PRC).** The City's PRC, which consists of City Staff and design professionals from the public, advises the Manager of Zoning on applications requiring Major Site Plan Review and approval. PRC reviewed the proposal at their June 18th and July 9th, 2019 meetings, and its comments and recommendations are part of the record. At the June meeting, PRC commended the applicant on their commitment to the protection of the historic buildings, site, and views, especially the preservation of the front lawn. They commented that the density of the project was appropriate, but had recommendations for revisions which included moving building 100 and reducing its scale in order to: reduce the impact on the neighbors to the north; reduce the number of trees to be removed; and shift the buildings further from the northern steep slope. The applicant was able to incorporate these recommendations into the redesign of the proposal and returned to PRC in July. In July, the PRC members concluded that the changes addressed their concerns and recommended approval.
- **Department of Environmental Services (DES) Review.** The City's DES staff reviewed the project and had a number of concerns related to the initial drawings including the grading details, the extent of regrading and need for an extensive retaining wall system and the effect on the property and rear slope, the extent of tree removal, the impact of moving the entry driveway, and the impact on the glacial moraine due to building and parking placement. The applicant addressed DES's concerns in subsequent redesigns. DES will require that final drainage plans be developed to ensure that all stormwater is addressed onsite. The applicant has also agreed to a DES request that a new sidewalk be incorporated into the plans to extend south from the property entrance to Highland Avenue. DES's Water Bureau reviewed the project proposal and had no significant concerns.
- **City Planning Office.** The City Planning Office staff reviewed for sufficiency the project plan, including the revisions, particularly the plans involving the reuse and preservation of the historic campus, the additional residential units, the proposed uses of the existing buildings, and the conservation easement. They recommended that the applicant pay closer attention to pedestrian circulation, which was addressed into subsequent designs.
- **Plan Review Team.** The City's Plan Review team, which focused on building codes, reviewed the proposal and had concerns with the initial location of the proposed property lines. The applicant revised the subdivision plan to address these concerns.

- Rochester Fire Department (RFD). The RFD reviewed the initial proposal and expressed concerns with the size of the proposed Fire Apparatus Access lanes. The applicant addressed these concerns in the redesign.
- Rochester Gas & Electric (RG&E). RG&E reviewed the proposed gas and electric demands for the proposal and confirmed that there is sufficient capacity to supply gas and electric to the project site.
- Public Input. There was a significant amount of neighborhood and public interest in this project. The applicant consulted with neighbors and interested agencies throughout the entire development process and hosted or attended at least ten meetings with either neighbors, the general public or stakeholder groups. The public input is documented in the record.
- General Municipal Law Section 239-M Review. The proposal was referred to Monroe County Department of Planning and Development in accordance with General Municipal Law Section 239-m. Comments were received from Monroe County Department of Health, Monroe County Department of Environmental Services, Division of Pure Water, Monroe County Department of Transportation, NYS Department of Environmental Conservation, NYS Department of Transportation (see attached). Those comments are documented in the record. These agencies did not identify significant adverse environmental impacts or any other significant concerns with the proposal.
- Monroe County Parks Department (MC Parks). MC Parks, the operator of Highland Park, reviewed the proposal and supports the conservation easement on the south lawn. MC Parks recommends and requests that future plans maintain the aesthetic intent of Alling S. Deforest who designed the landscape for the property. This property has been designated as a Local Landmark, so changes to the existing landscaping and new landscaping are subject to review and approval by the Rochester Preservation Board (RPB) under Zoning Code criteria that will require consideration of the intent of Alling S. Deforest's landscape design.
- Monroe County Pure Waters (MCPW). MCPW reviewed this project as part of the 239m review process and stated that final plans would need to be submitted for review and approval as part of the final permitting process. Further discussion with MCPW confirmed that there were no potential significant adverse impacts involved with modifications and additions to the supply system at the site.
- Greater Rochester International Airport Referral. The property is partially within the Airport Overlay District, which is intended to prevent the establishment of flight or safety hazards within the vicinity of the Airport. In accordance with the Overlay District rules, a referral form was submitted to the County to ensure there are no significant impacts

from this proposal. Zoning Code §120-98. The review concluded that the height of the new structures will be less than the height of the site's existing structures, particularly Strong Hall, and therefore no additional review was required. If the proposal changes, or cranes were to be used at the site, further review would be required.

- Monroe County Department of Transportation (MCDOT). MCDOT is the City's transportation engineer. In addition to their 239-m review, they conducted an in-depth review of this project, including the initial and revised Multi-modal Transportation Impact Assessment. MCDOT will require the applicant to maintain and trim trees near the entrance on South Goodman Street to improve site lines. In addition, MCDOT will require the applicant to conduct another traffic study of the subject intersection upon full build out of the project to determine whether a traffic signal at the intersection of South Goodman Street and Elmwood Avenue would be justified. The applicant will contribute financially if a traffic light is warranted (see Part 3 Impact on Transportation for more information).

Determination of Significance

Based on the information provided in the application and FEAF; written documentation received from involved and referral agencies; a review of all written public comments; advice received from the Rochester Environmental Commission, the Project Review Committee and the Site Plan Review Committee; recommendations from the Rochester Preservation Board and City Planning Commission; and months of extensive staff review, all it is hereby determined that the proposal presents no adverse environmental impacts. This Determination is informed by a Part 3 Evaluation of the Magnitude and Importance of Project Impacts that details the review and analysis of potential impacts and mitigation measures that have been incorporated into the project to reduce or eliminate adverse environmental impacts.

LEAD AGENCY: Zina Lagonegro, Manager of Zoning

AGENCY CONTACT: Jill Wiedrick, Senior City Planner, Bureau of Buildings and Zoning, 30 Church Street, Room 125B, Rochester, NY 14614 (585) 428-6914

DATE ISSUED: August 12, 2019

This declaration and supporting information is on file and available for public inspection with the Bureau of Buildings and Zoning, Room 125B, City Hall, 30 Church Street, Rochester, NY 14614.

FILE REFERENCE NUMBER(S):

Environmental Determination
1100 South Goodman Street
SP-26-18-19
August 12, 2019
Page 6

SP-026-18-19, M-01-19-20, T-01-19-20, and A-001-19-20

DISTRIBUTION: Mayor of the City of Rochester
Rochester City Council/City Clerk
Commissioner of Neighborhood and Business Development
County Executive
The County of Monroe Industrial Development Agency (Imagine
Monroe)
Environmental Notice Bulletin

FULL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM

PART 3 - EVALUATION OF THE MAGNITUDE AND IMPORTANCE OF PROJECT IMPACTS and DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE

**The Vistas at Highland
1100 - 1120 South Goodman Street
August 12, 2019**

Part 3 of this Full Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) provides the reasons in support of the determination of significance for the above captioned proposed action. It starts with an evaluation of every question in Part 2 where an impact has been identified as potentially moderate to large or where there is a need to explain why a particular element of the proposed action may or will not result in a significant adverse environmental impact. This Part has been prepared by the Lead Agency to summarize the Lead Agency's "hard look" evaluations of whether those impacts identified as potentially moderate to large in the EAF Part 2 will require an environmental impact statement to further assess the proposed action or whether available information is sufficient to conclude that the proposed action will not have a significant adverse environmental impact.

EVALUATION OF THE MAGNITUDE AND IMPORTANCE OF PROJECT IMPACTS

The § references are to the sections of Part 2 EAF that identify the potential impact.

A. Impact on Land (§1)

Slopes greater than 15% (§1.b)

The presence of slopes greater than 15% on the site does not present a significant potential impact because the action is designed to avoid disturbing them. The site is primarily composed of slopes that are less than 15% (56%). Although 44% of the site is composed of slopes that are 15% or greater, these areas are heavily wooded and protected from disturbance by setbacks and/or a preservation easement specified in the Planned Development District ("PDD") regulations and development concept plan for the action.

Excavation and removal of natural material (§1.d)

This impact is not significant. Over the course of construction (18 months) the removal of 6,584 tons of natural material will occur. The total area to be excavated is 3.8 acres. The maximum depth to be excavated for Building 100 is 1 foot. The maximum depth to be excavated for Building 200 is 10 feet from the first floor elevations.

The proposed development plan includes a regrading design and incorporates retaining walls to provide a balanced mass earthwork design. Significant cuts on the site are located at the locations of Buildings 100 and 200, as well as the parking lot areas. Significant fills on the site occur at the parking lot serving Saunders House and Andrews House, the parking lot expansion at the southeast corner of the site and the parking lot expansion adjacent to Montgomery House.

Erosion and sediment control (§§1.f, 3.h)

The action's erosion and sedimentation impacts during construction will not be significant. Given the relatively small magnitudes of excavation and disturbance on the site (i.e., excavation of 3.8 acres and disturbance of 5.2 out of 22.4 acres, maximum depth of 10 feet), the potential erosion

and sediment impacts of the action can be mitigated to insignificance by implementing the control measures that are described in the Drainage Report prepared by Costich Engineer. These measures consist of temporary stabilization measures that include sedimentation basins, siltation fence, inlet protection for existing inlets, filter fabric drop inlet protection of new inlets, stone filter check dam(s) and a stabilized construction entrance. The implementation of the soil erosion and sedimentation control measures will be enforced by means of a Site Preparation Permit that is required by City of Rochester Code, Chapter 39, Article IV, Site Preparation and Stormwater Pollution Prevention.

Removal of trees (§1.f)

This impact is not significant. A total of 86 trees will be removed from the site. The majority of trees being removed (63) have trunk caliper diameters between 1" and 12". A total of 23 trees will be removed that are between 13" and 48", with 8 trees larger than a 2' caliper. The applicant has reduced the footprint and relocated Building 100 to eliminate the need to remove a significant number of trees from the top of the glacial moraine and down the slope toward Highland Parkway. The action's schematic plans and other documentation indicate that, of the trees on top of the moraine that will need to be removed to make room for the relocated Building 100, most are leaning, some have structural issues, and they are not significant in size. The plan leaves intact most of the trees located along the top of the glacial moraine and extending down the slope toward Highland Parkway, which provides a significant tree canopy to screen this project from the residential area to the north.

Temporary Construction Activities (§1.e)

This impact is mitigated to insignificance by restrictions on the hours of construction activities and other controls specified in the applicant's Construction Management Plan. The proposed development involves construction that will continue for more than one year and in multiple phases.

Construction will take place over the course of 18 months. Typical construction will occur between the hours of 7:30am to 5:30pm, Monday through Friday, and on Saturday, between the hours of 7:30am to 3:30pm. If expanded construction hours are needed that would not meet the City's Chapter 75 Noise Code and the applicant would be required to request a waiver from the Noise Code requirements.

The applicant's Construction Management Plan provides specifications to address the following:

- Noise control
- Hours of construction and hours of construction deliveries
- Truck routes
- Trash and debris removal plan
- Traffic and parking control
- Communications (with neighborhood liaison or committee)
- Emergency Contacts/Numbers
- Dust control
- Public street cleaning and repair
- Erosion control
- Tree protection plan
- Temporary fire protection measure
- Fire/emergency equipment access
- Project signage
- Construction staging plan

Geotechnical evaluation (§§1.d, 1.f, 2.a)

A geotechnical evaluation has been completed by Terracon Consultants-NY, Inc. and demonstrates that the action's two new buildings can be constructed soundly while factoring in that much of the property's subsurface consists of glacial kame moraine deposits of sand and silt. The applicant will abide by the evaluation's earthwork recommendations for demolition, site preparation, existing fill, fill material types, fill compaction requirements, utility trench backfill, grading and drainage, construction considerations, and observations and testing.

It should be noted that the geotechnical report was completed based on the first iteration of plans that included below grade parking beneath both buildings and a larger Building 100 located mostly on a currently unbuilt area of the site. Now that the action design has changed to eliminate the underground parking and reduce and relocate Building 100 to a current parking lot, the geotechnical evaluation is viewed as a 'worst case scenario' that provides enough information regarding subsurface conditions to deduce that the current design will not pose significant impacts to the land.

The action's potential impacts on the glacial moraine as a Critical Environmental Area are evaluated in a later section of this Determination.

Land impact mitigation measures incorporated in project:

- Development is limited to a 3.957 acre portion of the property that was previously disturbed. No construction will occur that will impact the northern portion of the property where there are steep slopes. The PDD regulations and development concept plan provide for the dedication of 10.118 acres in perpetuity as a preservation easement for the front lawn area on the southern portion of the site.
- Slopes that are greater than 15% will not be disturbed during construction.
- The geotechnical evaluation affirms that the two new buildings can be constructed soundly on the glacial moraine. Further, the reduction in the footprint of Building 100 and its relocation to an area currently devoted to a surface parking lot further mitigates this concern.
- This property is served by a public combined sanitary/storm sewer system. Therefore, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan in accordance with New York State Stormwater Regulations is not required. Nevertheless, the applicant has presented erosion and sediment control plans and procedures that are detailed in the overall Grading and Erosion Control Plan, including but not limited to, the creation of a stabilized construction entrance, installation of silt fences, hydro seeding and inlet protection for the approximately 5.2 acre portion of the site that will be disturbed during site development. These measures will be enforced by means of the City's Site Preparation Permit regime in order to provide for the proper management of runoff from the site.
- A professional arborist evaluated the proposal. The initial drawing proposed the removal of 208 trees. The relocation of Building 100, proposed to be placed in the location of an existing parking lot, has significantly reduced the number of trees to be removed. In addition, the revised drawings preserve some stately trees that border the grand entrance way and especially the very large Sycamore by Saunders Hall. The proposed new landscaping complements the existing terrain. The arborist determined that the revised

drawings adequately satisfy concerns regarding woodland preservation, tree safety, and visual integrity.

- Rochester Preservation Board has review authority over landscaping to assure that any alterations and additions are appropriate to the historic and cultural setting of the campus..

Importance of Impacts to Land:

The site plan and design of the action provides appropriate protection and management of the land during construction related activities, and preserves and protects existing trees, the steep slopes and the glacial moraine during and after construction activities. Therefore, the impact of the action on land is not significant.

PART 3 - EVALUATION OF THE MAGNITUDE AND IMPORTANCE OF PROJECT IMPACTS (CON'D)

B. Impact on a Geological Feature and Critical Environmental Area (§2.a)

The City's Environmental Review Ordinance (Chapter 48) identifies a number of environmentally sensitive areas in the City that are classified as Critical Environmental Areas (CEA) in order to be consistent with language in the New York State Environmental Review Act (SEQR). This action is located within a CEA that encompasses the slopes and crests of the following glacial formations: Cobbs Hill, Pinnacle Hill, and the lesser hills, comprised of kames, kettles and eskers, generally situated north of Highland Avenue, and extending from Mount Hope Cemetery eastward through Highland Park, the action site, Pinnacle Hill and Cobbs Hill.

North of where the proposed Building 100 is to be constructed, the topography of the site is very steep. The surficial geology of the grounds consist of glacial kame moraine deposits, detailed in the geotechnical report to be native, poorly-graded sand with silt and silty sand that is loose to medium-dense.

A large portion of the CEA has been developed with residential structures. The significance of this CEA is related to the physical attributes of 1100 South Goodman Street in terms of its glacial formation.

The proposed development does not affect, nor is it adjacent to a geological feature listed as a registered National Natural Landmark.

This site is not virgin land. This property was previously disturbed and developed, as evidenced by the five buildings, three of which are historic, and the surrounding cleared, landscaped, parking and driveway areas.

Mitigation Measures Incorporated in Project

- Building 100 is shifted south to ensure that fewer trees along the top of the glacial ridge would be removed and less area would be excavated.
- The maximum depth to be excavated for Building 100 is 1 foot. The maximum depth to be excavated for Building 200 is 10 feet from the first floor elevations.
- The grading cut volume has been significantly reduced from 44,100 tons to 21,700 tons; the fill volume has been reduced from 10,080 tons to 7,700 tons; and the net cut from 33,880 tons to 13,860 tons to 6,584 tons.
- The underground parking that was initially proposed under Building 100 has been removed.
- The preservation easement for the south lawn, building setbacks, and preservation of most of the heavily wooded areas along the site's north, west and east lot lines will allow for an orderly transition from residential areas to the site's north, east and south, and to the historic Highland Park to the west.

Importance of Impact on a Geological Feature and Critical Environmental Area

Based on the fact that this site has been previously disturbed and developed, the location of the new buildings and parking area are proposed to be located in a primarily previously disturbed area, a significant portion of the site will be preserved and protected in perpetuity. This proposal will not have a significant adverse impact on the glacial geological feature and CEA.

PART 3 - EVALUATION OF THE MAGNITUDE AND IMPORTANCE OF PROJECT IMPACTS (CON'D)

C. Impacts on Surface Water (§3.h)

Soil Erosion and Stormwater Discharge Impacts from Construction (§§ 1.d, 1.e, 1.f and 3.h)

As described in Section A of this Evaluation, construction, excavation, and tree removal activities during the re-development of the site may cause soil erosion and the discharge of additional stormwater sediments. These impacts would be mitigated to insignificance by the control measures described in Section A.

Increase in Stormwater Discharge due to Increase in Impervious Surface (§3.h)

The action would increase by approximately one acre the portion of the site that is covered by buildings, driveways, parking and other impervious surfaces. The site will continue to be served by a public combined sanitary/storm sewer system. The construction plans and the Drainage Report prepared by Costich Engineering and the applicant's schematic plans provides for stormwater drainage improvements and a stormwater management facility (retention pond) that will prevent an increase in the discharge of stormwater contaminants to surface water.

Surface water impact mitigation measures incorporated in action:

- Soil erosion and sedimentation control measures during construction consist of temporary stabilization measures that include sedimentation basins, siltation fence, inlet protection for existing inlets, filter fabric drop inlet protection of new inlets, stone filter check dam(s) and a stabilized construction entrances. The implementation of these soil erosion and sedimentation control measures will be enforced by means of a Site Preparation Permit that is required by the City of Rochester Code, Chapter 39, Article IV, Site Preparation and Stormwater Pollution Prevention.
- For post-construction stormwater management, the Drainage Report provides for the use of green infrastructure to manage the volume of stormwater, with methods including redirecting roof-top runoff and impervious surfaces toward pervious landscaped areas and creating vegetated filter strips to handle the sheet runoff from parking lots and other paved areas. The increase in stormwater runoff from the newly impervious surfaces also will be managed in the stormwater management facility, which will also provide water quality volume treatment before leaving the site.

PART 3 - EVALUATION OF THE MAGNITUDE AND IMPORTANCE OF PROJECT IMPACTS (CON'D)

D. Impact on Groundwater (§4)

The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) EAF Mapper application indicates there is a primary and/or principal aquifer located beneath this site. NYSDEC defines primary aquifers as "highly productive aquifer presently utilized as sources of water supply by major municipal water supply systems" and principal aquifers "aquifers known to be highly productive or whose geology suggests abundant potential water supply, but which are not intensively used as sources of water supply by major municipal systems at the present time". Regardless of the designation, no aquifers in the area are used as a potable water source for the City of Rochester or surrounding municipalities.

The action does not have the potential to impact the quality of groundwater aquifers beneath the site. The site is currently used for religious, educational, gathering space, residential and office uses. The permissible uses provided for in the PDD regulations are residential, independent living facilities, lodging, office, schools, places of worship and banquet and conference facilities. None of the new uses have the potential to introduce the storage or management of any additional hazardous substances or large volumes of any substances into the groundwater. The site will remain connected to the public sewers. The action will increase by approximately one acre the portion of the site that is covered by buildings, driveways, parking and other impervious surfaces. The site plan provides for stormwater drainage improvements and a stormwater management facility that will prevent the additional stormwater run-off from discharging contaminants into the groundwater aquifer.

Mitigation Measures Incorporated in Project

None

Importance of Groundwater Impact

Not significant.

PART 3 - EVALUATION OF THE MAGNITUDE AND IMPORTANCE OF PROJECT IMPACTS (CON'D)

E. Impact on Plants and Animals (\$7)

The proposed development is located on a previously disturbed site. The NYSDEC EAF Mapper application did not identify any rare or endangered plants or animals near the site, and the area is not considered a NYSDEC Bird Conservation Area.

The existing trees on the site, particularly those clustered along the site's north, west and east lot lines, will enhance the aesthetics and the historic and cultural integrity of the site, prevent soil erosion, and provide a habitat for birds and other wildlife. A select number of trees will be removed per an Arborist's report, but there will not be any clear-cutting of existing trees. There are no anticipated impacts on animals. Nugent Lawn and Tree Experts, a licensed arborist, has prepared a tree inventory, and a sketch plan showing the trees that will be removed. A total of 86 trees will be removed from the site.

Mitigation Measures Incorporated in Project

- The initial proposal contemplated the removal of a total of 208 trees. Through design changes, including the relocation of Building 100, the number of trees that will be removed has been reduced dramatically.
- The majority of trees being removed (63) have trunk caliper diameters between 1" and 12". A total of 23 trees will be removed that are between 13" and 48", with 8 trees larger than a 2' caliper. Prior to the relocation of Building 100, the removal of a significant number of trees was proposed on top of and down the slope towards Highland Parkway.
- The applicant's landscape plan details the planting of approximately 50 trees and several shrubs.
- The site's prior designation as a Local Landmark means that the removal, modification or addition of any landscaping will require the review and approval of the Rochester Preservation Board in accordance with set standards of aesthetic appropriateness.
- The preservation easement for the south lawn, building setbacks, and preservation of most of the heavily wooded areas along the site's north, west and east lot lines will allow for an orderly transition from residential areas to the site's north, east and south, and to the historic Highland Park to the west.

Importance of Impact on Plants and Animals

As detailed above, there is no impact to rare animals and plants. The size and number of trees proposed to be removed has been reduced. Most of the trees that will be removed are leaning, some have structural issues and they are not significant in size. The majority of trees along the wooded slope on the northern portion of the property will remain. Therefore, the impacts of the development on plants is not significant.

PART 3 - EVALUATION OF THE MAGNITUDE AND IMPORTANCE OF PROJECT IMPACTS (CON'D)

F. Impact on Aesthetic Resources (§9)

The project site is not within the viewshed of any officially designated federal or state scenic or aesthetic resource. It is within the viewshed of Highland Park, which is part of the same CEA that is listed in part due to the vistas provided from the elevated glacial features and, therefore, could be considered a locally designated scenic/aesthetic viewpoint. The views of this historic campus, buildings and landscape are important to the public, regardless of whether those views are from Highland Park. From a City and Regional standpoint, the primary views of the campus by the public are from the south and southwest which include the historic south lawn landscape and the prominent facades of Strong Hall, Trevor Hall, and Montgomery House. Hundreds of thousands of people view the property each year whether driving or walking down Highland Avenue or South Goodman Street, or while visiting Highland Park (each year an estimated half million people visit to attend the 10 day Lilac Festival).

The applicant has developed a project that retains the existing historic buildings and landscape onsite and that prioritizes the preservation of the public views of these community assets. Initial plans were revised multiple times in response to concerns from the public, Landmark Society of WNY, the City's Project Review Committee, the Rochester Preservation Board, and the City Planning Commission to create a proposal that will have the least adverse aesthetic impact practicable, and which is consistent with establishing the development density needed to ensure that the restoration and maintenance of the existing buildings and historic landscape is financially viable.

The applicant has proposed a retention pond on the front lawn in order to help address drainage onsite. The retention pond will not block views of the building or landscape. No concerns were raised from the City Planning Commission, Rochester Preservation Board or any of the staff/public committees reviewing this project.

Renderings and photo simulations have been provided from various points surrounding the campus. Due to the preservation of the front lawn and proposed location of new development, the majority of the existing views of the historic buildings and landscape from Highland Avenue and South Goodman Street will remain unchanged for the public to enjoy. Building 200 will be partially within view from some surrounding areas including Highland Avenue from the easternmost point of the site at David Road, Summit Drive, Greenview Drive, and Highland Parkway. Building 100 will be partially within view from a portion of South Goodman Street from the northwestern portion of the site, and partially from Highland Parkway, especially in the winter. However, there is a significant elevation change between the homes on Highland Parkway and the proposed Building 100, which will be set back approximately 100 ft from the northern property line and partially screened by the hundreds of trees located on the northern edge of the site. A number of trees will be removed to accommodate the development, but the majority will remain (see *Impact on Plants and Animals*).

The Zoning Code requires that no lighting shall produce a strong, dazzling light.

The intent of this review was not to ensure that new construction would not be visible from all points on the surrounding properties, but rather to determine whether the entire project, including

all of the improvements to protect the prominent public views, and historic landscape and buildings, would have a significant impact on the historic resources on and off site, and whether the prominent public views of the historic buildings and site would be compromised.

Aesthetic Mitigation Measures Incorporated in Project

- The applicant consulted with the Landmark Society, neighbors, City staff and public boards to make design changes to reduce aesthetic impact to the project on the public and community as a whole.
- The applicant agreed to protect the historic south lawn along Highland Avenue and South Goodman Street through the language of the PDD regulations and a perpetual restrictive covenant to the Landmark Society, which forbids construction or any uses in this 10.118 acre area; commitments that will protect the lawn and views in perpetuity.
- The PDD's development concept plan and setback restrictions place the new buildings on the northern portion of the site and away from the edges of the property in part to preserve the prominent public views of the historic buildings and landscape.
- The height of Buildings 100 and 200 were reduced from five stories to four stories and Building 100 was reduced from 373' long to 230' long and 71' wide to 68' wide in response to neighbor concerns that the buildings were too large and they dominated the existing historic buildings onsite, particularly Strong Hall. This change reduces the extent of the building that will be visible by residents of Highland Parkway, Greenview Dr, and South Goodman St when looking up the hill to the site through the tree cover.
- The locations of Buildings 100 and 200 were shifted multiple times further away from the northern and eastern lot lines, respectively, in response to neighbors' concerns, and based on analysis of shadow impacts and the view of the buildings from the nearby residential neighbors.
- The roofs of Buildings 100 and 200 were changed from flat to peaked roofs to complement the existing buildings on the campus.
- The applicant considered the possibility of reducing the heights of Buildings 100 and 200 further by removing another floor, but this was determined to be financially infeasible. The new construction of apartments on this site will generate the income needed to renovate and maintain the historic buildings onsite and maintain the historic landscape.

Importance of Aesthetic Impact

The applicant has adjusted the project design to protect the views of this historic site including its buildings and historic landscape. The conservation easement will protect the prominent public views of the property in perpetuity, and careful site planning and site revisions based on public input will ensure that the impact on aesthetic resources is not significant.

PART 3 - EVALUATION OF THE MAGNITUDE AND IMPORTANCE OF PROJECT IMPACTS (CON'D)

G. Impact on Historic and Archaeological Resources (§10)

In 2017, the NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic ("OPRHP") determined that the site is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, noting that the Divinity School campus, initially built in two stages in 1932 and 1936, is the work of locally prominent landscape architect Alling S. DeForest and nationally prominent New York City based architect James Gamble Rogers, and is distinctive because of its Collegiate Gothic and Tudor Revival architecture and its landscape architecture.

In response, a coalition of residents from the neighborhoods, the Landmark Society of WNY, the Highland Park Conservancy, and Bero Architecture applied for Local Landmark status for the property. The coalition and proposal were created in response to a previous developer attempting to purchase the property who was planning construction on the historic front lawn. A local landmark designation application was submitted documenting the importance of the buildings, cohesive campus design and historic landscape. The proposal was modified to omit a small portion in the northeast portion of the site where the two dormitory buildings were constructed in the 1950's and 1960's (Andrews House and Saunders House) and a separate parcel at 117-125 Highland Parkway, which was formerly a part of the campus but had been subdivided off and sold years before. The modified proposal was approved by the City Planning Commission and the Rochester Preservation Board (RPB).

The Landmark Designation requires that any proposed changes to the site, or building exteriors within the designation area, or changes within the interior of the Chapel, will require review and approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness by the RPB. In July 2019, the RPB reviewed the Planned Development District text and development concept plan as part of their conceptual review. After a new zoning designation is created for the site, the proposed new construction will need to go through the City's Site Plan Review Process, and RPB will ultimately have approval authority over the design of the proposed buildings. During their public review meeting, the RPB members stated and the developer acknowledged that the designs of the new buildings and landscaping will have to complement and be compatible with the Collegiate Gothic and Tudor Revival design and campus feel of the site.

Directly to the west and south of the property is Rochester's first municipal park, Highland Park. The portions of the park that were original to the Frederick Law Olmsted design, are within a local Preservation District (Mt. Hope-Highland Historic District) and are listed on the State and National Register of Historic Places. A significant portion of the Colgate property, primarily Montgomery Hall, Strong Hall, and the historic landscape of the south lawn and wooded western edge of the site are viewable from parts of Highland Park.

None of the houses surrounding the site are listed on the State and National Register, but a large portion of the Highland Park Neighborhood, including the houses on Highland Parkway and Greenview Drive to the north of the site are *National Register Eligible*.

Renderings and photo simulations have been provided from various points surrounding the campus. Due to the preservation of the front lawn and proposed location of new development, the majority of the existing views of the historic buildings and landscape from Highland Avenue

and South Goodman Street will remain unchanged for the public to enjoy. Building 200 will be partially within view from some surrounding areas including Highland Avenue from the easternmost point of the site at David Road, Summit Drive, Greenview Drive, and Highland Parkway. Building 100 will be partially within view from a portion of South Goodman Street from the northwest, and partially from Highland Parkway, especially in the winter. However, there is a significant elevation change between the homes on Highland Parkway and the proposed Building 100, which will be set back approximately 100 ft from the northern property line and partially screened by the hundreds of trees located on the northern border of the site. A number of trees will be removed, but the majority will remain (see impact on Plants and Animals).

The intent of this review was not to ensure that new construction would not be visible from all points on the surrounding properties, but rather to determine whether the entire project, factoring in the conceptual designs present and the historic landscape and building protections provided by the site's Local Landmark status and RPB review, would have a significant adverse impact on the Historic resources on and off site, and whether the prominent public views of the historic buildings and site, and within the site, would be compromised.

Mitigation Measures Incorporated in Project

- The applicant considered feedback from Landmark Society, neighbors, City staff and public boards to make design changes to ensure that the proposal did not have a significant impact on the existing campus and buildings, or the public's views.
- The applicant initially considered proposing development on the south lawn, but quickly abandoned that concept after hearing significant concerns from neighbors and stakeholders regarding the effect on the historic lawn and public views of the buildings.
- The applicant agreed to protect the historic south lawn along Highland Avenue and a portion along South Goodman Street through strict use restrictions in the Planned Development District regulations.
- In addition to the zoning restrictions proposed for the south lawn, the applicant is adding another more permanent level of protection, through the creation of a preservation easement to ensure that the historic front lawn will never be developed and will be preserved in perpetuity.
- The concept development plan proposes new buildings in locations on the northern portion of the site away from the borders of the property in part to preserve the prominent public views of the historic buildings and landscape.
- Original designs included significant changes to the location of the site entrance. The development concept plan was revised to retain the existing historic entrance.
- The site was designed to utilize one main access point (the existing Campus Drive) onto South Goodman Street rather than creating a new entrance on Highland that would require cutting into the south lawn and significant regrading.

- The height of Buildings 100 and 200 were reduced from five stories to four stories and Building 100 was reduced from 373' long to 230' long and 71' wide to 68' wide so as not to dominate the existing historic buildings onsite. This was done in response to neighbor concerns that the buildings were too large.
- The roofs of Buildings 100 and 200 were changed from flat to peaked roofs to complement the historic buildings on campus.
- The applicant considered the possibility of reducing the heights of Buildings 100 and 200 further by removing another floor, but this was determined to be financially infeasible. The new construction of apartments on this site will generate the income needed to renovate and maintain the historic buildings onsite and maintain the historic landscape.
- In July, the proposal was submitted to the Rochester Preservation Board (RPB) for concept review. RPB had a number of recommendations, many of which the developer was able to incorporate into the site design prior to review by the City Planning Commission. Design changes included: shifting Building 100 to align with the historic axis of the other buildings onsite; reducing the amount of parking in front of Building 100 and adding greenspace to enhance the campus "quad" feel. In addition, the parking lot design was adjusted to retain additional trees and to reduce the amount of site disturbance and excavation.

Importance of Historical/Archeological Resources Impact

While the campus will change to some degree with the development of two new buildings, the impact will not be significant, as the majority of the site, buildings, and landscapes will be preserved. The property's landmark status will ensure that any new construction will go through an in depth review and approval process by the Rochester Preservation Board to ensure designs are appropriate for the campus. The preservation of the south lawn, and focusing new development away from the western property line will also ensure that the proposal will not have a significant impact on the views of the buildings and site, or on Highland Park users. Therefore, the action's impact on historic and archeological resources is not significant.

PART 3 - EVALUATION OF THE MAGNITUDE AND IMPORTANCE OF PROJECT IMPACTS (CON'D)

H. Impact on Open Space and Recreation (§11.d)

The current site, is privately owned. It is not listed in any adopted local, state or Federal open space plan. It is not designated as open space in the City's current Comprehensive Plan and it is not used by the City or County for any public recreational activities. It is not used for hunting or trapping. Nevertheless, it is sometimes used informally as an open space resource by some members of the community to admire landscape and buildings, or to walk their dogs. It is anticipated that as the property changes ownership and shifts from a school campus to a more residential and mixed use property, fewer people will informally visit the site. The neighborhood and surrounding area already has public access to some of the best public greenspace, natural landscapes, parkland, and recreation space in the entire City and County nearby. Directly across the street to the west and south, is historic Highland Park which consists of 148 acres of manicured landscapes, greenspace, an arboretum, walking trails, and informal sports fields. In addition, directly adjacent to Highland Park is Mt. Hope Cemetery (193 acres) which has acted as public greenspace since its inception in 1838, prior to public parks. To the east of the site, approximately 1400 ft is Persimmon Park; an approximately 10 acre forested park. A few blocks north of the property there is a small neighborhood park (Ellwanger and Barry Park) that has playground equipment for residents and their children to enjoy. In addition, the Highland Crossing trail is under construction and will pass just one block to the south of this property. The trail will consist of a pedestrian and bike path connecting from Brighton Town Park through Highland Park to the Genesee River Trail.

The draft Comprehensive Plan (Rochester 2034) identifies the possibility for a future multi-use trail that could cross this property. The Comprehensive Plan is still in draft form and has not been adopted and is therefore not yet the plan for the City of Rochester. However, this information has been presented to the applicant, in which he has stated that he is open to future discussion regarding potential trail connections through the site. The placement of buildings and structures in the PDD development concept plan for this action would not preclude the future placement of a multi-use trail across the property.

Mitigation Measures Incorporated in Project

- The south lawn greenspace and landscaping along Highland Avenue and a portion along South Goodman Street will be preserved as a no-build area through strict use restrictions in the PDD regulations and the filing of a perpetual preservation easement.
- The PDD development concept plan places new buildings in locations on the northern portion of the site away from the borders of the property in part to preserve the wooded areas, greenspace and landscape.
- The site was designed to utilize one main access point onto South Goodman Street rather than creating a new entrance on Highland Avenue that would require cutting into the south lawn and significant regrading.

Importance of Open Space Impact

While people have informally used this private property for walking, there is a plethora of open space and parkland to the north, south, east, and west (approx. 350 acres total). The majority of greenspace onsite will be persevered through the design of the development concept plan and conservation easement. Therefore, the impact on open space and recreation is not significant.

PART 3 - EVALUATION OF THE MAGNITUDE AND IMPORTANCE OF PROJECT IMPACTS (CON'D)

I. Impact on Transportation (§13.e)

The action will alter the present pattern of the movement of people by changing the numbers and purposes of people who live, work and visit the site. Changes and additions to the uses of the site will impact parking demand and traffic. SRF Associates submitted a shared parking evaluation for this project based on the ITE Parking Generation, 5th Edition and the Urban Land Institute's (ULI) Shared Parking Model, 2nd Edition. The evaluation determined that a minimum of 241 shared parking spaces would be required to accommodate 132 residential units, 40,000 sf office space, a 29 room hotel, and a 190 guest banquet facility (each with different peak parking times). The applicant is proposing 273 spaces onsite (including 32 underground spaces dedicated to apartment residents) to accommodate the rare occasions when parking demand could exceed the projected need.

SRF Associates also submitted a Multi-modal Transportation Impact Assessment to evaluate and forecast traffic impacts related to the project including the proposed new apartment buildings and changes to the uses of the existing buildings. The analysis was based on traffic counts, field observations, signal timing data, and projected traffic volumes for the proposed uses and size of the project.

The initial analysis was completed in May and reviewed by Monroe County Department of Transportation (MCDOT), who serve as the City's traffic engineers. MCDOT commented on two parts of the report and a concern with traffic at the intersection of South Goodman Street and Elmwood Avenue (one block south of the site). In response, the developer reduced the number of dwelling units and SRF Associates revised the Transportation Impact Assessment and responded to the initial MCDOT comments. The revised Assessment reflects the projected traffic impacts of the revised project and evaluates in greater depth the action's potential impacts on the Goodman/Elmwood intersection and whether those impacts would prompt the need for a traffic signal.

SRF Associates concluded that "the minor projected traffic impacts resulting from full development of the proposed project during both peak hours can be adequately accommodated by the existing transportation network". The study recommends improving site lines from the entrance driveway through better maintenance of brush and foliage within the site lines. The developer has agreed to do so. The study concludes that based on gaps in the traffic on Elmwood Avenue, and the projected traffic volumes from the development, that the existing transportation network could accommodate the proposal without the addition of a traffic signal at Goodman/Elmwood. This conclusion is based in part on the assumption that drivers on South Goodman Street will learn to turn left on Highland Avenue when volumes cause delay at the intersection of Goodman and Elmwood.

MCDOT reviewed the revised study and agreed that tree trimming and maintenance will be needed to improve and maintain adequate site distances at the entrance to the site. MCDOT still has concerns with the potential need for a traffic signal at Goodman/Elmwood in the future with the completion of action herein and other area projects that are either planned or under construction. Nevertheless, MCDOT determined that a light at Elmwood/Goodman intersection is not needed at this time, due in part to the fact the evaluation of the future traffic

impacts of the action when combined with two large projects at 1201 Elmwood Ave and 1925 South Clinton Avenue are too speculative to accurately assess at this time. MCDOT will require the applicant to conduct another traffic study of the subject intersection upon full build out of project to determine actual traffic impacts, which MCDOT will review to determine whether a traffic signal is justified at that time. The follow up traffic study will be made a condition of the Site Plan Approval(s) that will be required to commence construction of the project.

If the future traffic study reveals conditions that warrant a traffic signal at Goodman/Elmwood, MCDOT will use the traffic counts to determine the developer's fair share of the financial cost of the new signal. The applicant has committed to contribute a fair share of the costs of signalizing the intersection, if MCDOT determines that the signals are necessary.

Transportation Impact Mitigation Measures Incorporated in Project

- Pedestrian connections and crosswalks were added to the PDD development concept plan to improve onsite pedestrian circulation.
- The site was designed to accommodate all of the shared parking via surface parking spaces, and an additional 32 private spaces will be added underground within Building 200 to accommodate rare occasions when parking demand could exceed the projected need.
- The proposed number of dwelling units in Buildings 100 and 200 were reduced from 130 units to 104 units, and the transportation impact assessment was updated to illustrate the reduced impact on traffic.
- Per MCDOT's recommendation, the applicant and subsequent owners will be required to trim and maintain the driveway at South Goodman Street to improved and maintain sight distances.
- At full build-out, the applicant has committed to conduct a traffic study of the intersection of Goodman and Elmwood to determine the real effects of this development on the intersection instead of using speculative predictions of the impacts of a number of planned and potential developments. If a signal is warranted at that time, the applicant has committed to contribute financially to a new signal based on the impact of this development.

Importance of Transportation Impact

Based on the: reduction of dwelling units; shared parking analysis and provision of additional spaces; the results of the multi-modal transportation impact assessment; the conclusions and recommendations from Monroe County DOT; and the applicants subsequent agreement to meet MCDOT requests; the impact on transportation will not be significant.

PART 3 - EVALUATION OF THE MAGNITUDE AND IMPORTANCE OF PROJECT IMPACTS (CON'D)

J. Impact on Noise, Odor, and Light (§15)

Noise, Odor and Temporary Construction Activities

The applicant has provided details regarding construction work and phasing. Typical construction activities will occur between the hours of 7:30am to 5:30pm, Monday through Friday and 7:30am to 3:30pm, Saturday. If expanded construction hours are needed that would not meet the regulations contained in the Noise Code the applicant would be required to request a waiver of the Noise Code's limitations on construction hours.

Light

A lighting calculations summary has been submitted. Site Lighting to provide safety and security will be installed in parking areas, pedestrian walkways, and building entrances. The light source will be LED and all fixtures will be designed to minimize point source visibility and light spill onto surrounding properties.

The Zoning Code requires that no lighting shall produce a strong, dazzling light; Illumination shall not be used for the purpose of advertising or attracting attention to the principal use; lighting fixtures shall be designed, sized and located so as not to cast direct rays of excessive brightness upon adjoining premises or cause glare hazardous to pedestrians or person using adjacent public streets; parking lots used after sundown shall be lighted to give protection to persons using the lot and the light source shall cast down; and all parking lots shall be required to provide lighting from dusk to dawn that meets the Illumination Engineers Society of North America (IESNA) standards.

Mitigation Measures Incorporated in Project

Noise

No mitigation needed.

Light

- Site has been designed to eliminate spill-over light as described above.

Importance of Noise and Light Impact

Not significant.

PART 3 - EVALUATION OF THE MAGNITUDE AND IMPORTANCE OF PROJECT IMPACTS (CON'D)

K. Consistency with Community Plans and Community Character (§§ 17 and 18)

The proposed development is not significantly different from or in sharp contrast to current surrounding land use patterns. Residential properties are adjacent to the north, east and south (across Highland Avenue) sides of the site. Although this site was historically a school campus, the school had portions that were residential in nature, as evidenced by Saunders House and Andrews House.

The proposed development calls for an addition of 104 dwelling units to the property, complementing the use of Saunders House and Andrews House, which have a total of 28 units. The residential units are proposed to be a mix of one and two bedroom apartments. A total of 132 units will not increase the City's population by more than 5% (i.e., 10,528 people).

The proposed development is consistent with local land use plans and zoning. The Comprehensive Plan includes the Zoning Code. The present Zoning Code provides no relevant goals, standards and objective for the campus. The site had been zoned as an Institutional Planned Development district (IPD) in the 1975 Zoning Code. However, the IPD designation was not carried over into the present Zoning Code that went into effect in 2003, nor did the 2003 Zoning Map redesignate the site into one of the new zoning district designations that now apply.

The PD #21 amendments are in harmony with goals and objectives of the Rochester 2010: Renaissance Plan campaigns, specifically:

Campaign One: Involved Citizens.

Goal: Citizens, institutions, businesses and government will demonstrate a sense of responsibility and accountability through their individual actions and their relationships with each other and the community at large.

Goal: Create an ongoing community planning and development review process that actively involves our citizens, anticipates emerging land use trends, appropriately weighs and considers competing land use and development interests as well as local and regional perspectives and results in fair and equitable decisions.

Goal: Citizens, businesses, institutions and neighborhoods will be informed and will adequately listen to and communicate with each other about opportunities, issues and concerns facing our community.

Campaign Four: Environmental Stewardship.

Goal: Encourage, undertake and review development and activities in a way that protects and sustains our varied ecosystems and neighborhood environments.

Campaign Nine: Healthy Urban Neighborhoods.

Policy: It is the policy of our City to support unique, vital, interconnected urban neighborhoods which provide a variety of housing choice, accessible goods and services in a village-like setting,

pedestrian-friendly environments, appropriate transit and parking facilities and access to park, recreation, environmental and cultural amenities.

Goal: Create appropriate and affordable housing choices/opportunities for all citizens through a housing system that promotes and supports new construction and rehabilitation, is responsive to market opportunities and encourages owner occupancy and affordable units for all incomes.

Goal: Support a land use development pattern in our City that balances reasonable property use rights with our community's expectation of protection from negative impacts generated by nearby uses or activities.

The PD #21 regulations are in harmony with the Comprehensive Plan's policy of promoting a variety of housing choices by providing for the construction of 104 new multifamily dwelling units and by permitting as of right single-family and multifamily dwellings as well as independent living facilities.

Campaign Eleven: Arts and Culture.

Goal: Promote, enhance and protect our City's historic, cultural and educational resources as unique assets that contribute to our City's vitality and sense of place.

Discerning the appropriate balance between the applicant's reasonable property use rights with the community's interests also is informed by site's status as a Local Landmark. The former Colgate Rochester Crozier Divinity School Campus, built initially in two stages in 1932 and 1936, is the work of locally prominent landscape architect Alling S. DeForest and nationally prominent New York City based architect James Gamble Rogers. It was specifically sited to complement the adjacent Highland Park, which DeForest helped design. The State Historic Preservation Office has deemed the property eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places and, in 2017, the City Preservation Board and City Planning Commission designated the campus (with the exception of the area occupied by the 1950s era Saunders House and Andrews House) to be a Local Landmark due to its Collegiate Gothic and Tudor Revival architecture and its landscaping, which embody the distinctive characteristics of a type and period of construction and representative of the work of design masters.

Existing structures and areas of historic importance to the community will not be replaced or eliminated. As detailed, the proposed development will maintain the existing historic buildings on site, ensuring their continued use and maintenance. In addition, a preservation easement will ensure that the front lawn, an important feature to the community will continue in perpetuity.

Although the development concept plan sets forth the basic locations, bulk and heights of new buildings, the community will continue to have a say in how the details of the site are developed. The development of the new residential buildings will require incremental development and major site plan review by the City's Manager of Zoning with public notice and referral to the City's Project Review Committee pursuant to Zoning Code §§ 120-126B, 120-188J and 120-191D. In addition, the input of the community and the Rochester Preservation Board on the preservation of the site's historic and cultural assets as a Local Landmark will be required as part of the Certificate of Appropriateness review process that will be required pursuant to Zoning

Code §120-194 for the construction of Buildings 100 and 200 and for any exterior alterations to the campus' historic buildings or landscapes (other than the area around the 1950s vintage Andrews and Saunders halls).

Although this site has been used as and viewed as a public amenity, it is important to remember that it is private property. The public will continue to have use of Highland Park, directly across the street from this site, for passive and active recreation.

Neighbors have expressed concern regarding shadows that will be cast from the proposed buildings. The applicant submitted a shadow study that evaluated the shadows through the entire calendar year. Shadow length is longer during the winter months than during the summer due to the lower position of the sun in the horizon. This study evaluated shadow length for the months of January, March, May, July, September, and November at 0800, 1200, 1600 and 1800 Eastern Standard Time.

Mitigation Measures Incorporated in Project

- The amendments provide for an alternative development pattern that could not be developed under the site's present IPD zoning nor under a conventional residential or commercial zoning district category. It is in harmony with the objectives and goals of the *Rochester 2010: Renaissance Plan*. The preservation easement for the south lawn, building setbacks, and preservation of most of the heavily wooded areas along the site's north, west and east lot lines will allow for an orderly transition from residential areas to the site's north east and south to historic Highland Park to the west. The zoning text and plan provide for a diversification of uses and variation in the relationship of uses, structures, open spaces and height of structures in one cohesive development that is designed to maintain the collegiate campus feel of the site. The amendments provide unique standards for site and building design, particularly as they relate to overcoming constraints and preserving desirable characteristics (i.e., such as the site's glacial topography and Local Landmark status) that are unique to the site.
- The proposed plan is compatible with the present zoning and conforming uses of nearby properties and with the character of the adjoining residential neighborhoods and public park. The proposal for PD #21 conforms with and complements the character of the area, providing a carefully designed transition between the existing Colgate campus, proposed new buildings, and the adjacent residential neighborhood. PDs are intended to and this particular one is designed to accommodate the site's unique circumstances as a 83-year-old, hilltop, educational campus. The project design has gone through several iterations in response to concerns about preserving the south lawn and northern forested slopes. This process has resulted in a better design, especially with regard to building heights, setbacks, and parking placement, that is compatible with nearby properties and the character of the neighborhood.
- The compatibility with the adjoining areas will be maintained as the development concept plan is fleshed out in the future. All developments in a Planned Development District requires Site Plan Review. Site Plan Review offers the opportunity for public input. This will ensure that the neighborhood has the chance to comment on any proposal prior to action by the Manager of Zoning.

- The proposal limits development to a 3.957 acre portion of the property that was previously disturbed. The applicant has chosen to dedicate 10.118 acres in perpetuity a preservation easement for the front lawn area.
- The reduction in height, scale, mass and location of Building 100 reduced the impacts related to views and shadowing. It's reduction in height prevents it from interfering with the prominence of historic Strong Hall. After Building 100's height and length was reduced in order to mitigate shadow effects on the adjoining residential area along Highland Parkway to the north, a shadow study revealed that the impact would be minimal, given the existing trees that would be retained.
- The applicant agreed to protect the historic south lawn along Highland Avenue and South Goodman Street, not only through the Planned Development District regulations, which do not allow construction or any uses in this area, but through the creation of a 10.118 acre conservation easement which will protect lawn and views in perpetuity.

Importance of Impact on Community Character and Plans

The proposed development is compatible with the existing architectural scale and character of the area, and will not negatively affect the existing natural landscape. As detailed above, the proposal is consistent with adopted land use plans and is consistent with the existing community character.

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

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

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

Reasons Supporting This Determination:

To complete this section:

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

See Attached Negative Declaration and detailed Part 3.

Determination of Significance - Type 1 and Unlisted Actions

SEQR Status: ☒ Type 1 ☐ Unlisted

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

Upon review of the information recorded on this EAF, as noted, plus this additional support information

See attached Negative Declaration

and considering both the magnitude and importance of each identified potential impact, it is the conclusion of the
Manager of Zoning, City of Rochester as lead agency that:

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

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

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

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

Name of Action: The Vistas at Highland

Name of Lead Agency: Manager of Zoning, City of Rochester

Name of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency: Zina Lagonegro, AICP, EIT

Title of Responsible Officer: Manager of Zoning

Signature of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency:

Date: 8/12/19

Signature of Preparer (if different from Responsible Officer)

Date: 8/9/19

For Further Information:

Contact Person: Jill Wiedrick

Address: 30 Church St, Rochester, NY 14620

Telephone Number: 585-428-6914

E-mail: jill.wiedrick@cityofrochester.gov

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

Chief Executive Officer of the political subdivision in which the action will be principally located (e.g., Town / City / Village of)

Other involved agencies (if any)

Applicant (if any)

Environmental Notice Bulletin: <http://www.dec.ny.gov/enb/enb.html>

PRINT FULL FORM