

3.8 Community Services Comments and Responses

General Methodology

Comment 3.8-1 (Letter 18, April 22, 2011, Yonkers Dept. of Planning & Development):

DEIS narrative regarding police, fire and ambulance protection and services is based on a compilation from the previous DEIS's from 2005 and 2007 and interviews from departmental personnel. Please confirm the data is up to date and accurate.

***Response 3.8-1:** The fire department and police department have provided responses which are included in Appendix B of the FEIS. Where there may have been discrepancies, those discrepancies are noted in their comments or in the responses in this chapter. The ambulance data were gathered by phone interview and are up to date and accurate.*

Demography

Comment 3.8-2 (Letter 15, January 24, 2011, Syrette Dym, AICP, VHB - City Planning Consultant):

3.8.1- Has the applicant been discussing its plan to relocate existing tenants in on site buildings with the City of Yonkers Community Development Agency as referenced in the DEIS? Plans for this relocation should be discussed and agreed to procedures should be identified in the FEIS.

***Response 3.8-2:** The Applicant proposes to work voluntarily with the CDA for assistance in relocating tenants and this will be noted in the SEQRA findings statement. Should the City officials agree to the City's involvement in assisting in these relocations, the process will be defined as part of the special use permit approval process.*

Comment 3.8-3 (Letter 18, April 22, 2011, Yonkers Dept. of Planning & Development):

3.8-1 General comment. DEIS uses 2000 census figures; can the analysis be updated to use the 2010 census demographic figures?

***Response 3.8-3:** The 2010 demographic data are in the process of being released and only general demographic data are available at this time. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the City of Yonkers population in 2010 was 195,976 persons. The 2000 population for Yonkers was 196,086 persons. The City's population has decreased by less than 0.1 percent. In 2010, there were 80,389 housing units in Yonkers, of which 74,550 units, or 92.7 percent, were occupied. In 2000, there were 77,589 housing units, of which 74,351 were occupied (96 percent). Over the last decade, the City's housing stock has increased by 3,039 dwelling units. However, the occupancy rate has decreased. This may reflect the national economic recession's impact on the local housing market as well as other factors.*

Comment 3.8-4 (Letter 18, April 22, 2011, Yonkers Dept. of Planning & Development):

"The public schoolage children multiplier per dwelling unit was 0.37 public school students per dwelling unit". Please provide the source for this number and confirm if that is a citywide multiplier.

***Response 3.8-4:** The source is the U.S. Bureau of the Census for the year 2000, Census 2000 Summary File 4, Table PCT61. Yes, this is a Citywide multiplier.*

Comment 3.8-5 (Letter 18, April 22, 2011, Yonkers Dept. of Planning & Development): DEIS states that city wide there was [total] .48 students per dwelling unit, and in census tract 1.03 there is .74 public school students per dwelling unit. Compare apples to apples. i.e. public citywide to public census tract.

Response 3.8-5: *An apples to apples comparison is provided. In the first paragraph under Schoolage Children on p. 3.8-2 of the DEIS, Citywide, there were 0.48 students per dwelling units and 0.37 public school students per dwelling unit. In the second paragraph, in Census Tract 1.03, there were 0.8 students per dwelling unit and 0.74 public school students per dwelling unit.*

Comment 3.8-6 (Letter 18, April 22, 2011, Yonkers Dept. of Planning & Development): The public school multiplier section needs to be better explained. Page 3.8-2 states that citywide 0.48 students per dwelling unit produces a 0.37 public school age multiplier. Census tract 1.03 is 0.74 per student dwelling unit, yet the DEIS states that those multipliers are .07, .17, .27 and .45. Please explain how the multipliers were determined.

Response 3.8-6: *Data on p. 3.8-2 of the DEIS are from the 2000 U.S. Census and are applicable to all housing units Citywide or in Census Tract 1.03. The source of the other multipliers referenced in the comment are from Table 3.8-3. As noted in the table, the source of the data are the Rutgers University Center for Urban Policy Research (CUPR) Estimates of Occupants of New Housing. The Rutgers multipliers are differentiated by housing type, housing size, housing price, and housing tenure—four variables that have been found by CUPR to be associated with statistically significant differences. The multipliers are calculated for new housing, defined as units enumerated in the 2000 census and built from 1990-2000.*

Comment 3.8-7 Letter 18, April 22, 2011, Yonkers Dept. of Planning & Development): Page 3.8-1 For the record Yonkers disputes the last several estimates from the ACS. It appears that the Census used the exact same number of units in three consecutive years even though the city provided information that was wildly variant in each of the years.

Response 3.8-7: *Comment noted.*

Comment 3.8-8 (Letter 18, April 22, 2011, Yonkers Dept. of Planning & Development): Page 3.8-3 If there is no municipal, state or federal money in the relocation of the residents of the multifamily buildings why is the applicant proposing to work with the urban renewal agency on relocations?

Response 3.8-8: *The CDA has substantial experience with this relocation process and it is the Applicant's view that this may make the relocation process easier for the City residents so affected. It is the Applicant's preference to work with this agency.*

Comment 3.8-9 (Letter 18, April 22, 2011, Yonkers Dept. of Planning & Development): Page 3.8-3 the Planning Bureau provided the Board of Education consultants with information that lead to a new school children estimates. It should be available now.

Response 3.8-9: *Statistical Forecasting LLC prepared a Demographic Study for the Yonkers Public Schools in February 2011 - the report is available for review at the school district's website:*

[Http://www.yonkerspublicschools.org/about/docs/data/demographic-study/demographic-study-report-02-16-11.pdf](http://www.yonkerspublicschools.org/about/docs/data/demographic-study/demographic-study-report-02-16-11.pdf).

The demographic report indicated that the projected number of children from new residential units, 2,455, is relatively high. For this and other reasons, the baseline enrollment projections for the Yonkers Public Schools were not modified to account for additional children from new housing developments. The consultant did not prepare any multipliers as part of their analyses.

Comment 3.8-10 (Letter 18, April 22, 2011, Yonkers Dept. of Planning & Development):

Page 3.8-3 Yonkers has a large number of its children, upwards of 40% of the school age population in private, parochial and other religious schools but the analysis did not mention any of these in the analysis. What is the expected impact of the project on school age children in private as well as public schools?

Response 3.8-10: *The Yonkers City School district recently commissioned a demographic study which provides an estimate of children in private and parochial schools - the report is available for review at the school district's website:*

<http://www.yonkerspublicschools.org/about/docs/data/demographic-study/demographic-study-report-02-16-11.pdf>

According to Table 3 of that report, the percentage of non-public school students in the Yonkers School District represented between 18.4 to 22 percent of the total student population from 2005 to 2011. The percentage of children in non-public schools has been declining. The DEIS utilized public school student multipliers to estimate the number of schoolage children that would be generated - see Table 3.8-4 of the DEIS. It is anticipated that a portion of the Project's school age children will attend private or parochial schools. Given that public school multipliers were used for the project student impacts, the trends in private school enrollment should not affect the projected number of school age children and their potential impacts to the District.

Police Protection

Comment 3.8-11 (Letter 3, January 22, 2011, P.O. Roberta West, Yonkers Police Department): Because the development will be almost entirely residential in nature, the YPD does not anticipate an adverse impact on police services to the area. YPD's crime database reveals that of the 10,255 crimes reported in the City in 2009, only 14 were reported on Buena Vista Avenue in the vicinity of the development and 33 were reported on Hudson Street. These numbers are low, but they belie the impression visitors must get from the blighted look of the existing buildings.

Response 3.8-11: *Comment noted.*

Comment 3.8-12 (Letter 3, January 22, 2011, P.O. Roberta West, Yonkers Police Department): Many businesses, including high end restaurants, are thriving within a block or two of the site, but this particular intersection seems abandoned and desolate and therefore dangerous...This situation most likely leads to less business activity in the neighborhood and to

an increase in vulnerability to street and property crimes. Almost any new development would be an improvement.

***Response 3.8-12:** Comment noted. The proposed new apartment building will eliminate the existing abandoned buildings on the western side of Buena Vista Avenue, and the new building and the increased residential activity associated therewith are expected to enliven and restore the conditions along Buena Vista Avenue to a more thriving neighborhood.*

Comment 3.8-13 (Letter 3, January 22, 2011, P.O. Roberta West, Yonkers Police Department): This development will increase the number of residents in the Third Precinct already the most congested quadrant of the City, so the number of calls for police, fire, and ambulance service may slightly increase. It may also increase vehicular traffic. The improvement to the block that this development will bring, however, should increase pedestrian traffic and could lower the amount of criminal activity in the entire area, so the YPD does not anticipate much of an increase in police service calls.

***Response 3.8-13:** Comment noted.*

Comment 3.8-14 (Letter 3, January 22, 2011, P.O. Roberta West, Yonkers Police Department): The mechanical parking garage seems to be a particularly safe way for residents and their visitors to keep their cars in the area as people will not be able to wander through isolated floors where the cars are actually parked. There will be a waiting area visible from the building's lobby and the cars will be brought to the people.

***Response 3.8-14:** Comment noted.*

Comment 3.8-15 (Letter 3, January 22, 2011, P.O. Roberta West, Yonkers Police Department): Surveillance cameras and a manned lobby, which is not open to the general public, should keep motorists relatively safe. The YPD should be consulted in the placement and style of surveillance cameras at the site so images can be compatible with existing technology and perhaps accessible to the YPD.

***Response 3.8-15:** The Applicant will install surveillance equipment within the parking garage and will consult with the YPD so that images can be compatible with existing technology and accessible to the YPD.*

Comment 3.8-16 (Letter 3, January 22, 2011, P.O. Roberta West, Yonkers Police Department): The YPD is presently involved with our community service providers in the formation of a re-entry coalition. This coalition's mission will be to reduce the recidivism among ex-convicts who now reside in Yonkers....it is the hope of the YPD that developer's participation will ultimately lead to a future reduction in crime to the City.

***Response 3.8-16:** Comment noted. The applicant is willing to work with the YPD with regard to this program.*

Comment 3.8-17 (Letter 15, January 24, 2011, Syrette Dym, AICP, VHB - City Planning Consultant): *Police Protection* - Figure 3.8-2 does not indicate the location of the Police Department headquarters at 104 South Broadway as referenced.

Response 3.8-17: *Police Headquarters are at the Cacace Justice Center which is shown in DEIS Figure 3.8-2 at 104 South Broadway. The Figure is provided in this FEIS as Figure 3.8-1.*

Comment 3.8-18 (Letter 15, January 24, 2011, Syrette Dym, AICP, VHB - City Planning Consultant): Page 3.8-8 - The DEIS states that based on a population of 49,000 persons in the 4th Precinct in which the project site lies, the number of crimes is approximately 0.02 incidents per person. How does this compare to other precincts in the city?

Response 3.8-18: *Per the response from P.O. Roberta West, "the development will be almost entirely residential in nature, the YPD does not anticipate an adverse impact on police services to the area. YPD's crime database reveals that of the 10,255 crimes reported in the City in 2009, only 14 were reported on Buena Vista Avenue in the vicinity of the development and 33 were reported on Hudson Street. These numbers are low..." Written comments are provided in Appendix B of the FEIS.*

Comment 3.8-19 (Letter 15, January 24, 2011, Syrette Dym, AICP, VHB - City Planning Consultant): If discussions regarding the installation of surveillance cameras that are connected to the City police department's surveillance system have not yet taken place, the applicant should initiate such discussion and identify the position of the Police Department regarding installation of these cameras in the FEIS. It is stated that the \$211,535 to be generated in taxes to the City by the project will defray any costs to the Police Department by the project. While the marginal costs may not warrant specific pieces of new equipment or hiring of an officer, please state the average annual salary of police officer and additional overhead costs for understanding how cumulative impacts of this and other area projects might provide funding for cumulative additional needed community services.

Response 3.8-19: *Refer to Comment 3.8-15 and Response 3.8-15 regarding surveillance equipment. Refer to Comment 3.8-18 regarding no need for increase in police service calls.*

Comment 3.8-20 (Letter 18, April 22, 2011, Yonkers Dept. of Planning & Development): Page 3.8-8 The applicant does not propose to install any surveillance in the automated garage. What is the state of the art? What do other such facilities provide? Body heat or movement sensors would be more appropriate instead of expecting the police to monitor a private facility.

Response 3.8-20: *Refer to Comment 3.8-15 regarding surveillance equipment. With the exception of maintenance personnel, there is no need to utilize body heat movement sensors as the portion of the garage where the vehicles are stored will not be accessible to the general public. Surveillance equipment would be installed to monitor the exterior of the property. The surveillance equipment will be for on-site security by the Buena Vista Teutonia staff. There is no assumption that the Yonkers Police Department will assume responsibility to monitor security cameras at the facility, although the applicant will consult with the YPD to ensure that the equipment is compatible with the YPD equipment.*

Fire Protection

Comment 3.8-21 (Letter 4, February 25, 2011, Deputy Fire Chief John Flynn, Yonkers Fire Department): p. 1-20 - The relocation of Fire Department Headquarters to a new location on New Main St should not be presumed. At this time, the existing Fire Department Headquarters

located on New School St. is in a state of disrepair and the length of time it will remain viable as a Fire Department facility is in question. There is a plan to relocate Fire Department HQ to a New Main St. location, however, we have no assurances that this will happen prior to completion of this proposed project. This relocation should not be assumed for the purposes of this DEIS. References to a new Fire Department Headquarters is referenced in numerous plans throughout this DEIS and these references should be removed.

Response 3.8-21: *Comment noted. The Deputy Fire Chief did not indicate that there would be any issue operating from the existing headquarters. He has indicated "While this project will not in and of itself overwhelm the existing resources of the YFD, each of these projects should not be looked at in a vacuum. A significant portion of the additional revenues which are generated by this project should be set aside to fund fire protection service in the city." How the tax revenues are utilized will be determined by the City Council.*

Comment 3.8-22 (Letter 4, February 25, 2011, Deputy Fire Chief John Flynn, Yonkers Fire Department): ...Using the more appropriate number of 15,000 incidents annually, and basing our calculation on a building population of 791 persons, we would estimate the number of fire department emergency incidents at this building to be 62 annually. It should be also noted that a typical emergency response can require the response of only one apparatus (emergency medical, stuck occupied elevator, etc.) or oftentimes numerous apparatus (report of fire or gas leak, etc.). Therefore, fire department emergency responses to this building on an annual basis would be estimated to be 186 (63 incidents multiplied by an average of 3 apparatus per incident). These figures do not include fire department resources which will be necessary in the areas of plans review, ongoing inspections, and fire and emergency training and preplanning specific to this structure, all of which will further increase the workload of the YFD as a result of the construction of this building.

Response 3.8-22: *Comment noted. See Response 3.8-21 above.*

Comment 3.8-23 (Letter 4, February 25, 2011, Deputy Fire Chief John Flynn, Yonkers Fire Department): Fire Department employs approximately 440 persons.

Response 3.8-23: *Comment noted. According to the adopted 2011 City budget, fire personnel totals 419 persons.*

Comment 3.8-24 (Letter 4, February 25, 2011, Deputy Fire Chief John Flynn, Yonkers Fire Department): The Fire Training Division, "which is staffed solely by one Lieutenant"..should be stated...The Fire Prevention Division is responsible for plans review and ongoing inspection of buildings under construction. Currently, with only one trained and certified plan reviewer on staff we are running far behind in our plans review. This project as well as other developments anticipated to break ground elsewhere in the city in coming months and years, will add to our already overwhelming workload.

Response 3.8-24: *Comment noted.*

Comment 3.8-25 (Letter 4, February 25, 2011, Deputy Fire Chief John Flynn, Yonkers Fire Department): The YFD is proposing the installation of Automated External Defibrillators (AED's) on every 4th floor of this building although this is not required by code. Response times to the upper floors of high-rise buildings can be delayed and the installation of these devices in the hallways would increase the odds of cardiac arrest survival of occupants.

Response 3.8-25: *The installation of AEDs is not required by Code. The Applicant proposes to install voluntarily three AEDs within the building in close proximity to the elevator/stairway areas. One would be located on the first floor near the concierge desk, a second would be located at the top floor of the building, and the third would be located approximately midway up the structure, on the 13th floor. Tenants, upon signing a lease, would be apprised of the location of the AEDs and sign will be posted in the elevator and stairwells noting the location of the AEDs. The final locations will be determined in consultation with the fire department.*

Comment 3.8-26 (Letter 4, February 25, 2011, Deputy Fire Chief John Flynn, Yonkers Fire Department): It should be noted that despite significant completed development projects in the city in recent years the Fire Department has not been provided with any additional resources to deal with the increased threat. While this project will not in and of itself overwhelm the existing resources of the YFD, each of these projects should not be looked at in a vacuum. The cumulative effects of the development in the City of Yonkers will necessitate additional fire department resources. A significant portion of the additional revenues which are generated by this project should be set aside to fund fire protection service in the city.

Response 3.8-26: *Comment noted. The project will generate surplus revenues that may be used to fund fire protection services. As provided in the DEIS Section 3.9 Fiscal Analysis, the project is anticipated to generate approximately \$211,535 in annual taxes to the City. As described in Response 3.8-34 below, these funds can be directed to fire department resources, whether that be personnel or equipment. The need for such funding will be determined annually by the City Council through its budgetary process.*

Comment 3.8-27 (Letter 4, February 25, 2011, Deputy Fire Chief John Flynn, Yonkers Fire Department): If this proposed building is located in a seismic zone C, D, E, or F, a second independent source of water will be required.

Response 3.8-27: *Comment noted. The building is located in the "C" zone. The project will meet all required code requirements.*

Comment 3.8-28 (Letter 9, February 24, 2011, Patricia Dow, Majority Leader, Yonkers City Council): Community Facilities (Page 1-20) - Can the City of Yonkers Fire Department adequately and sufficiently, handle responding to fires and medical emergencies for this proposed height?

Response 3.8-28: *See comments from Deputy Fire Chief John Flynn in Appendix B. As per Comment 3.8-25, he indicates that the project will not in and of itself overwhelm the existing resources of the YFD. However, he recommends that a significant portion of the additional revenues generated by the project be set aside to fund fire protection services. Any decisions regarding funding is made annually by the Yonkers City Council as part of the City budgetary process.*

Comment 3.8-29 (Letter 9, February 24, 2011, Patricia Dow, Majority Leader, Yonkers City Council): Community Facilities (Page 1-21) - How much does the developer anticipate the revenue to be as it pertains to funding of the Fire Protection as mentioned in the second line of this paragraph?

Response 3.8-29: *The new apartment building will generate \$211,535 annually to the City of Yonkers. The City Council will determine the extent to which any surplus funds are used to augment the fire department's current revenues as part of its budgetary review and approval process.*

Comment 3.8-30 (Letter 15, January 24, 2011, Syrette Dym, AICP, VHB - City Planning Consultant): It is stated that the distance to fire service will be reduced when fire headquarters is relocated to New Main Street and Nepperhan Avenue from its current location at 5-7 School Street. What is not explained is what the status of this new Fire Station is and whether its construction is tied to development of the SFC project. Please explain the time frame for the new fire headquarters and its relationship to development of the SFC project, if any.

Response 3.8-30: *The SFC project was approved by the Yonkers City Council. As part of the approval, the SFC developer agreed to construct an approximately 50,000 square foot building to serve as the City of Yonkers Fire Department Headquarters. The expanded facility must have a minimum of 6 equipment bays. As per the SFC Findings statement adopted by the City Council, the City Council required the Applicant to construct a facility with the following specifications: the first floor of the building will contain a minimum 65'-0" site apron, 6-bay apparatus floor, operations storage, kitchen, day room, and house watch. The second story of the building will provide the living quarters for the officers and personnel, an exercise room, locker rooms and lavatory/shower facilities, and additional storage rooms. The second floor will also provide approximately 2,500 square feet of space for Uniformed Fire Officers Association union offices. The third floor will contain a fire prevention office, headquarters staff office, training classroom, business office, and EMS storage and supplies. The new Fire Department Headquarters will be owned by the City.*

In terms of timing of the new facility's construction, the new fire headquarters are to be constructed by month 18 after construction of the River Center project commences, and 12 months from the commencement of construction. Its completion is to be assured through the issuance of a performance bond guaranteeing its construction.

It is noted that the SFC project has been undergoing revisions as of this writing; the foregoing is based on the approvals presently in place.

Comment 3.8-31 (Letter 15, January 24, 2011, Syrette Dym, AICP, VHB - City Planning Consultant): It is stated that the 1,206 fire incidents in 2006 and that all incidents were assumed to represent a residential rather than commercial structure. The calculation for future anticipated fire incidents is then made based on numbers of persons. It would seem that, since the incidents relate to numbers of residential structures that the basis should be all structures if known, or at a minimum, all housing units in 2000. If this is the case, then the 1,206 fire incidents in 2000 occurred out of 77,589 housing units which would translate into 6.5 incidents for the proposed 412 units proposed.

Response 3.8-31: *Refer to Comment 3.8-21 regarding the number of incidents that the fire department estimates will occur at the new apartment building.*

Comment 3.8-32 (Letter 15, January 24, 2011, Syrette Dym, AICP, VHB - City Planning Consultant): It is indicated that a single new hydrant is proposed on the west side of Buena Vista Avenue. Who would be responsible for funding and installing this hydrant?

Response 3.8-32: *The Applicant will be responsible for installing the hydrant.*

Comment 3.8-33 (Letter 15, January 24, 2011, Syrette Dym, AICP, VHB - City Planning Consultant): It is stated that the Water Bureau and Fire Department will continue to assess existing hydrants and other fire protection infrastructure in the vicinity. When is this assessment earmarked to be complete? Please provide its conclusions in the FEIS.

Response 3.8-33: *The Applicant will confer with the Water Bureau and Fire Department to finalize the location of fire hydrants or on-site connections during the Planning Board's site plan review process.*

Comment 3.8-34 (Letter 15, January 24, 2011, Syrette Dym, AICP, VHB - City Planning Consultant): The \$211,535 is stated as property taxes to be generated, in this case to the City. This figure is cited as the resource for funding any and all costs to the City that might be incurred by the project. While no single item may rise above a marginal cost due to this project alone, it would be helpful to know that at such time that additional fire protection personnel or equipment may be warranted due to this or other new development projects in the area, including the SFC project, what the average salary of a Yonkers firefighter and average annual overhead costs are to relate to the taxes to be generated to the City.

Response 3.8-34: *As per the City of Yonkers 2011 adopted budget, the funds appropriated to wages, contractual benefits, overtime, holiday pay, and other wage related items totaled \$49,142,999. The budget also indicated that the fire personnel totaled 419 persons. The average wages would be \$117,286 per fire personnel. The fire department's total budget is \$50,372,012. The majority of the budget is dedicated to salary, wages and benefits. However, only 32 percent of the City's total budget is paid through property taxes - the City receives state aid and other funding sources. Much of this funding is general and not targeted revenues. The actual amount of property tax revenues needed to fund the average wage for one firefighter is likely substantially less than \$117,286 annually. For an order of magnitude example, approximately \$37,500 of the average cost of a firefighter would be funded through property taxes if the 32 percent estimate paid through property taxes is used.*

Comment 3.8-35 (Letter 15, January 24, 2011, Syrette Dym, AICP, VHB - City Planning Consultant): Given the delay in projected development of the SFC project, there should be some recognition of the impacts, if any, of the potential for headquarters remaining at its 5-7 School Street address at such time this project is developed.

Response 3.8-35: *Comment noted. Construction of the new fire headquarters building is dependent on the construction of the SFC development project - the SFC developer is responsible for constructing the new headquarters. To the extent that the SFC project is delayed or fails to progress, the new fire headquarters will not advance. The fire department, in its comments, did not indicate there would be any issue with regard to the fire department remaining at its current headquarters.*

Comment 3.8-36 (Letter 15, January 24, 2011, Syrette Dym, AICP, VHB - City Planning Consultant): Page 3.8-10 - The DEIS states that there were a total of 1,206 fire incidents in 2000 and that it conservatively assumes all incidents involved residential structures. Instead of developing a multiplier of incidents per structure and dividing 1,206 by either total structures or units in the city, the number of incidents is divided by population. It would appear that a better

measure would be to recalculate this based on structures, if available, or units and then apply it to the proposed building.

Response 3.8-36: *Refer to Comment 3.8-21 regarding the number of incidents that the fire department estimates will occur at the new apartment building.*

Comment 3.8-37 (Letter 15, January 24, 2011, Syrette Dym, AICP, VHB - City Planning Consultant): The FEIS should provide information on the work with the Water Bureau and Fire Department regarding assessment of existing hydrants and the adequacy of other fire protection infrastructure in the vicinity to determine any needed upgrades or modifications. Additional project mitigation may be determined.

Response 3.8-37: *The Water Bureau and Fire Department have reviewed the plans and have not noted any additional measures which should be incorporated in the plans. The Applicant will confer with the Water Bureau and Fire Department to finalize the location of fire hydrants or on-site connections during the Planning Board's site plan review process.*

Comment 3.8-38 (Letter 18, April 22, 2011, Yonkers Dept. of Planning & Development): Discuss firefighter equipment needed and what COYFD has to provide services for a 25 story residential structure.

Response 3.8-38: *The fire department has commented on the application - see Appendix B of the FEIS.*

Comment 3.8-39 (Letter 18, April 22, 2011, Yonkers Dept. of Planning & Development): Page 3.8-11 Fire services. Are there any special water and fire needs specific to the farm? Will there be potentially flammable fertilizer used in the farm to create the hydroponic solution? Will the fertilizer be stored in a manner that will avoid potential problems? There was no discussion of fire departments issues, if any, with high rise buildings and fire suppression.

Response 3.8-39: *Some on-site storage of fertilizer is anticipated to occur within the greenhouse. However, these fertilizers are different from typical soil application fertilizers and are not usually flammable. According to Bright Farm representatives, there are no special water needs in regards to fire suppression. Nutrient supply for hydroponic operations is nutrient salts in powder form. The salts are stored in labeled safety containers and stored in cabinets/rooms and very few are corrosive or flammable. Alternatively, liquid fertilizers may be used, further reducing fire hazard concerns. The proposed structure will be required to meet NYS Fire Code requirements.*

Ambulance Service and Hospital Facilities

No comments.

Public Schools

Comment 3.8-40 (Letter 15, January 24, 2011, Syrette Dym, AICP, VHB - City Planning Consultant): 3.8.5 - Public Schools - As indicated in the DEIS, the findings of the school capacity study that was to be available in December 2010 should be assessed and analyzed as part of the FEIS. Additionally, based on that information, further discussions with the school

district should be held and feedback from the school district regarding projected project generation of public school children should be incorporated in the FEIS.

Response 3.8-40: *The school district received the DEIS and did not issue written comments. John Carr, the Executive Director of the Yonkers City School District School Facilities Management department, provided a building capacity review study prepared by Kaeyer, Garment & Davidson Architects & Engineers, P.C., in 2010. The report is available for review at the school district's website:*

<http://www.yonkerspublicschools.org/about/docs/data/demographic-study/demographic-study-report-02-16-11.pdf>

The review calculated the capacity of each school building using three different methods: State Education Department (SED) capacity, functional capacity, and unadjusted maximum capacity. The SED capacity used class sizes and room use rates based on NY State Education Department standards. The functional capacity used target class sizes and full programs as desired by the school district, and the unadjusted maximum capacity used maximum class sizes and more full utilization of all spaces. The following are the districtwide results of the study:

<u>Enrollment as Percent of Capacity</u>		
2010 Enrollment:	25,121	----
SED Capacity :	26,119	97 percent
Functional Capacity:	21,396	118 percent
Maximum Capacity:	29,313	86 percent

The study notes that space is most problematic for grades K-8. Of the total 56 public schoolage children that would be generated, 34 students would be in grades K-8 using the same source for multipliers used in the DEIS. The projected students from the Buena Vista Teutonia project represent 0.14 percent of the 2010 enrollment. According to the study, the capacity review will be refined further as the next phase of the study effort is advanced.

Recreation

Comment 3.8-41 (Letter 18, April 22, 2011, Yonkers Dept. of Planning & Development):

Page 3.8-20 The old Croton Aqueduct Trailway extends 26 miles, not 41. The South County Trailway will be constructed on the bed of the Old Put line by Westchester County, not the Old Put will be constructed by the County.

Response 3.8-41: *Comment noted. The trail is 26 miles; the aqueduct is 41 miles.*

Comment 3.8-42 (Letter 18, April 22, 2011, Yonkers Dept. of Planning & Development):

Page 3.8-20 The applicant notes that there will be 56 school age children generated by the project and knows that there are school age children in their other neighborhood project yet considers that there is no recreation impact while not showing any playground space or equipment for these children. Where will these children recreate in the immediate environs of the site, closer than ½ mile? What is the national standard for school age children and to appropriate places by distance?

Response 3.8-42: Buena Vista Park is located approximately 550 feet, or 1/10-mile, from the project site. The facility has a playground and benches. Cerrato Park is located 0.4 miles walking distance from the project site and has playgrounds, benches, basketball courts, handball courts and showers. Lastly, O'Boyle Park is also located 0.4 miles walking distance from the project site. The park has basketball courts, playgrounds, kickball diamond, and benches. Based on a review of the National Recreation and Park Association standards listed in Table 3.8-8 of the DEIS, a mini-park is located in close proximity to the proposed apartment building and within the recommended 1/4-mile distance. Two neighborhood parks are located within the recommended 1/4-1/2 mile distance. In terms of safety, O'Boyle Park is located south of the site at the end of Buena Vista Avenue and children would not be required to cross any major arterials, e.g., Riverdale Avenue, to access it. Lastly, Cerrato Park also meets the needs of a neighborhood park, although access to it is less favorable than O'Boyle Park due to the need to cross Riverdale Avenue for access.

Comment 3.8-43 (Letter 18, April 22, 2011, Yonkers Dept. of Planning & Development): Page 3.8-15 Schools. Yonkers High School building also houses the 6 – 8 grade Yonkers Middle High School program.

Response 3.8-43: Comment noted.

Solid Waste

Comment 3.8-44 (Letter 2, February 17, 2011, Kenneth Greehan, Manager of Recycling and Refuse City of Yonkers Department of Public Works): The City of Yonkers Department of Public Works (DPW) would provide twice a week pickup for solid waste only, and once a week pickup for recycling (commingles, paper). There is no provision for pickup of bulk (metal or non-metal) as indicated in Section 3.8.7 Solid Waste Disposal. There is also no provision for the pickup of leaves or yard waste.

Response 3.8-44: Comment noted. The source for statements regarding the pickup of bulk materials, leaves and yard waste were obtained from the department's website - see <http://www.yonkersny.gov/Index.aspx?page=704>. Pickup of bulk materials, leaves and solid waste is conducted for single family dwellings. Bulk metal and non-metal would be picked up by a private carrier.

Comment 3.8-45 (Letter 2, February 17, 2011, Kenneth Greehan, Manager of Recycling and Refuse City of Yonkers Department of Public Works): According to the Trash Site Plan provided, it is unclear if sufficient area and overhead clearance is provided for DPW roll off trucks to access the waste and recycling containers, i.e., the "Auto Court" designation on the Trash Site Plan. As it is drawn, this may block truck access.

Response 3.8-45: As per a discussion with Mr. Greehan, the specific concern is with regard to the height of the pedestrian overhang that connects the apartment building with the automated garage. If the refuse disposal vehicles are required to pick-up the containers at any point beyond this overhang, the DPW has requested that the minimum height of the overhang be established to safely accommodate the height of DPW vehicles - Mr. Greehan estimates that the minimum height should be 20 feet. The height of the overhang will be designed to meet DPW's needs. The details will be addressed during site plan review.

Comment 3.8-46 (Letter 2, February 17, 2011, Kenneth Greehan, Manager of Recycling and Refuse City of Yonkers Department of Public Works): According to the Trash Site Plan provided, it is unclear if sufficient area is provided for one (1) 40-yard waste container, as well as one (1) baffled roll off container for recyclable materials.

Response 3.8-46: *Based on discussions with Mr. Greehan, the DPW has requested that the new apartment building be capable of storing a roll off container for municipal solid waste ("msw"), and a baffled roll off container for recyclable materials. If the applicant provides on-site compaction, a 30-yard container would be sufficient to store on-site municipal solid waste. Based on experiences at other apartment buildings, Mr. Greehan has indicated that a 15 yard roll-off container would be adequate for recyclable materials. The container will be baffled to separate paper products and cans/plastics/glass. Sufficient area will be provided on site to accommodate both containers at the first floor level of the apartment building - the building has adequate area to accommodate the containers. The details and size of the space will be finalized during site plan review. Also, sufficient vertical clearance will be provided to ensure the roll off containers can be loaded onto the refuse vehicle.*

Comment 3.8-47 (Letter 2, February 17, 2011, Kenneth Greehan, Manager of Recycling and Refuse City of Yonkers Department of Public Works): It is unclear as to whether or not sufficient area or areas would be provided for residents to source separate their waste and recyclable materials. The DEIS states in 3.8.7.2 that "Refuse generated by each apartment will be thrown into a chute accessible on each level of the apartment building." This may be insufficiently conducive to meeting source separation mandates.

Response 3.8-47: *The revised "typical floor plan" which is presented in Section 1.0 of this FEIS illustrates a "trash" room which will be located on each floor of the building. Two chutes would be provided for municipal solid waste and non-paper recyclables. A paper bin would be provided in each trash room to store paper products, and maintenance employees would be responsible for bringing these recyclables down to the ground level. It is noted that a vent stack is also shown within the trash room of the typical floor plan. The details will be finalized during site plan review in consultation with the Yonkers DPW.*

Comment 3.8-48 (Letter 6, February 25, 2011, Edward Burroughs, AICP, Commissioner, Westchester Co. Department of Planning): Provisions for recycling. While the plans for the apartment building identify a 580 square foot room for trash storage, the plans do not show an area for the storage and source separation of recyclables. Starting in June 2011, County recycling law will be expanded, to require plastics numbers 1 through 7 to be recycled instead of being put into the waste stream. (Currently, only plastics with numbers 1 and 2 are recycled.) The expansion of the recycling program will likely require a larger area for source separation and storage, particularly given that the City of Yonkers currently picks up co-mingled recyclables only once every two weeks. We recommend that the City require the applicant to determine how much space will be needed for this storage and to indicate a storage area on future plans for this project.

Response 3.8-48: *Refer to Response 3.8-45 regarding the trash rooms on each floor of the building. Refuse will be stored on the first floor. In consultation with DPW officials, a 15 yard baffled roll off container is proposed to handle the on-site storage of recyclables which will provide sufficient storage to handle expansion of the Westchester County recyclable program, i.e., plastic numbers 1 through 7.*

Comment 3.8-49 (Letter 15, January 24, 2011, Syrette Dym, AICP, VHB - City Planning Consultant): 3.8.7 - Solid Waste Disposal - Page 3.8-24 - While refuse will be thrown into the identified chute on each floor, the DEIS does not indicate how recyclable material will be collected. Please indicate how this will be done and where it will be stored.

Response 3.8-49: See Responses 3.8-44 and 3.8-45.

Comment 3.8-50 (Letter 18, April 22, 2011, Yonkers Dept. of Planning & Development): Refuse, the proposed project will rely on city services to collect refuse and recyclable. Please confirm that discussions with DPW have resulted in an agreed upon non-sidewalk method of trash and recyclables collection.

Response 3.8-50: *Discussions have been held with the DPW to come up with a plan for waste removal¹. There will be no sidewalk refuse or recyclable pick-up. Specific details will be finalized during site plan review.*

Comment 3.8-51 (Letter 18, April 22, 2011, Yonkers Dept. of Planning & Development): 3.8-24 DEIS cites Urban Land Institute's 1994 Development Impact Handbook as a source for per household rate for solid waste generation. That source is 17 years old. Is there a more up to date source that can be used?

Response 3.8-51: *According to the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation ("NYSDEC") publication Beyond Waste - A Sustainable Material Management Strategy for New York State (adopted 12/27/10), the NYSDEC estimates that in 2008, New Yorkers generated an average of 5.15 pounds per day of municipal solid waste. The publication also notes that the EPA estimates that the average is 4.6 pounds per day. The DEIS estimated that the per capita waste generation would be 3.5 pounds of waste per day. Waste generation would be approximately 35 percent more using New York estimates. This increased estimate has been taken into consideration in discussions with the City DPW.*

Comment 3.8-52 (Letter 18, April 22, 2011, Yonkers Dept. of Planning & Development): Page 3.8-25 Community Services – waste services. Weak discussion of the problems. Will the compactor/recycling space be adequate for two week storage of recyclables? Has DPW been consulted about going on site with compaction or roll on pick up of trash from the site? Turning radii are not the only factor about compatibility with City of Yonkers equipment; have vertical clearances been investigated? Will the site be sized to accommodate the County change to recycling of all plastic types?

Response 3.8-52: *According to the Mr. Greehan, recyclables are picked up once per week. At start-up, if it appears that the on-site container has sufficient storage space, the City may determine that pick-ups can occur every other week. Municipal solid waste will be picked up two times per week. The DPW will either go on-site with compaction, or will pick-up solid waste that has already been compacted. The details will be finalized during site plan review. Concerns regarding vertical clearances are discussed in Response 3.8-43. The 15 yard roll off baffled container will be adequate to address the additional recyclable storage necessary to accommodate expansion of the County's recycling program.*

¹ The most recent discussion has been held with Kenneth Greehan, Manager of Recycling and Refuse, Yonkers DPW, June 2011.