

## Village of Lansing

MINUTES of a joint meeting of the Board of Trustees and Planning Board of the Village of Lansing held on Monday, October 23, 2017, in the Village Office.

PRESENT: Mayor Donald Hartill; Trustees, Ronny Hardaway, John O'Neil, Patricia O'Rourke and Gerry Monaghan; Clerk/Treasurer Jodi Dake; Attorney David Dubow, Planning Board Chair Mario Tomei, Planning Board members Mike Baker, Deborah Dawson, Carolyn Greenwald, Lisa Schleelein and Alternate Jim McCauley; 6 additional public were also in attendance at the meeting.

Mario Tomei called the Planning Board meeting to order at 7:02pm and opened the public comment period. Mayor Hartill called the Board of Trustees meeting to order. There were no comments.

Motion - To Close the Public Comment Period for the Planning Board

Planning Board member Dawson made a motion to close the public comment period. Baker seconded the motion. A vote was taken:

Mario Tomei-Aye  
Mike Baker-Aye  
Deborah Dawson-Aye

Carolyn Greenwald- Aye  
Lisa Schleelein-Aye

Motion - To Close the Public Comment Period for the Trustees

Trustee O'Rourke made a motion to close the public comment period. Trustee Monaghan seconded the motion. A vote was taken:

Mayor Donald Hartill-Aye  
Trustee John O'Neill-Aye  
Trustee Patricia O'Rourke-Aye

Trustee Ronny Hardaway- Aye  
Trustee Gerry Monaghan-Aye

The main reason for this evening's special meeting is to discuss the proposed mall Planned Development Area (PDA) and the Declaration of Easements, Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (ECCR).

Ken Farrall of CMC Engineering was present to represent Namdar Reality. A sample ECCR was sent out and questions were answered. To recap, it was explained that the Shops at Ithaca Mall want to subdivide parcels to revitalize the mall. Selling parcels allows for funding and other revitalization. Ken stated that the goal is to keep the mall going and be as successful as it can be. His clients purchase malls, revitalize and then

move on to the next one. They do it nationally all over the US. This is nothing new to them.

Hartill asked what has been the track record with the malls. Have they been revitalized in all cases or is it a mixed bag? Revitalization can happen in different ways. In Mastic, NY they had a strip mall where they sold a parcel to a bank and did a full facelift. It now has 100% occupancy. We just did one in Malone, NY that was a dark Kmart. They got a Farm and Home store as a chain tenant and people want to be there now. Once you fill the big spaces people get excited and want to be there. At Beaver Valley near Pittsburgh they brought in a Farm and Home store and a big chain restaurant. If you can create capital you can then fund improvements. They find that stores tend to close stores that they lease versus stores they own. There is no set menu. They look at what the needs are and what is available. They would like to subdivide a parcel off for an extended stay hotel. Studies have been done and this area is lacking extended stay options.

Hartill stated that Target is already a separate tax parcel. Ken stated that he thinks it is a leasing parcel. He is unsure if it has been physically deeded to Target but the land was subdivided and has a separate tax parcel number.

Ken stated that they have plans and means to do it here. They felt the PDA process would be the easiest and best thing to do with what they want to do.

Hartill asked what their track record was. Ken stated that he doesn't have a percentage. Due to competition they can't give specific names. He did say that a lot of the malls that they buy are in bankruptcy and none of them have gone dark. All have growth either internally or externally. Additional pad sites are usually created to bring in new tenants. Small stores tend to infill because big stores are staying.

Hartill asked if the internal shops at Beaver Valley were thriving. Ken stated that a Farm & Home store infilled where Sears was and a chain restaurant came in because they went through this process. Internal shops tend to stay if a mall is thriving.

Monaghan asked if they rely on tax credits. Ken didn't know the answer. He has never received an approval that was contingent on tax credits. However, he is the subdivision guy. This is a national group. Monaghan asked if they be open to innovative local solutions such as 30,000 sq. ft. of Health & Human Services. They are open to whatever will work for a community. If we can get a wide enough net of things that meet the PDA it would be good.

Tomei asked if they had approached the four parcels and the out parcel to see if they really want to buy. Ken was not sure, however, there was enough interest to start the subdivision process. Tomei asked if they know their risk with the infrastructure of this whole place. Ken stated that the parcels are willing to take on what is going on with all of the infrastructure.

Schleelein stated that she is trying to understand how this is going to work. Her main concern is that we already have large corner stores that are successful. How do we make this a destination of some nature? What happens when corner stores become their own and the middle doesn't succeed? Ken stated that the donut hole will be there. The mall currently has SPCA, bounce house and laser tag as tenants so they are already thinking outside of the box. It is going to continue.

When you lease, you have a common area maintenance agreement. Whether they own or lease, they have the same responsibility. All the parking lot and common area is still going to be there is they own or lease.

O'Rourke asked if there will be both leases and owners. Ken stated that Planet Fitness will still be leased along with the small stores. Have the permitted uses of PDA already been worked out? It will not be done until it is decided whether the Village wants to allow this area to be a PDA.

Dawson asked if a major water pipe floods the neighborhood to the west of the mall and they want to sue for negligence, who would they go after? Ken stated that he is not an attorney. All entities carry insurance for stuff like that. Insurance is mandatory whether they own or lease. Dawson sees that the ECCR talks about covering physical harm but the ECCR doesn't talk about liability that would arise from this type of situation.

Greenwald stated that the mall has a current tax value of \$30 million. She asked what the value would be in two years. Ken couldn't tell her that other than it would be higher. Greenwald feels that he must have spoken to owners, they must know. She is concerned with infrastructure.

Robbs stated that he has heard from Namdar Realty and they have done soft marketing to see if this is possible. They haven't given any direct details. NAMDAR are very significant investors. They have 35-37 malls and they own and manage medical centers and clinics. They have a significant portfolio. They have the name to bring in bigger companies where the locals may not be able to. Robbs has researched this and he can't get any financial info on this.

Ken stated that when you own your store you tend to hold onto it versus leasing. Success is based on outside anchor stores drawing stores to the inside. McCauley asked if the mall is going to try to encourage through incentives. Ken stated as an example, if Michaels doesn't want to buy their store then they will go to another investor. Michaels then would send the lease check to the new owners. There are other investors out there. People coming to the mall won't know any difference.

Ken stated that some issues that can be resolved with a PDA are zero lot lines, allowing sign setbacks and not needing a variance.

Greenwald asked if they would still have to get permission for improvements. They would still need to get permits from the Village. Some of the ECCR restrictions can be stricter than the Village but can't over ride us. Ken explained that the ECCR is a canned document. Carolyn asked if this can document will be edited for Ithaca. Her vision is that if you have retail office and living places that would make for a walkable Village. However, there would have to do significant improvement to the infrastructure.

Ken stated that they are going in a direction that is outside the box. They are already at the mall. Some of the uses are other for interior spaces. They are thinking about medical, hardware, daycare, tire and auto to name a few potential uses. These are different uses not currently in the mall.

Tomei confirmed that the ECCR is between the owner of the mall and any store owner. Ken stated that generally the ECCR is signed by all the tenants. The village has no say in the ECCR.

Dawson stated that the fine tuning goes into the PDA and how you define the specific uses. McCauley reiterated that if the village doesn't allow something, it prevails over the ECCR.

Greenwald asked who would maintain the pipes underground. Robbs stated that ultimately, the mall is still responsible for anything that happens on their property. The initial mall was built in early 70's. Stormwater agreements will need to be in place. We can require a stormwater maintenance agreement. The who, how, when and why all need to be determined. Dubow is not sure the owner is willing to do that. Robbs stated that we know there have been two significant events that have happened there. Greenwald feels the best way to proceed is to work it out before the PDA. Monaghan stated that we know there is a problem on the west side of the property so maybe make this part of the PDA. Robbs can't say if the mall is at fault but it was designed in 1970. Brent Cross is in the process of finalizing a stormwater report. Dawson has heard that there is also a sewer issue there. Robbs stated that that would go to Brent Cross at the Village of Cayuga Heights since they own the sewer plant. Robbs reminded the Boards that if we are more restriction then it may not be feasible.

Previously questions were submitted to Robbs which he received answers on late Friday afternoon. He will share those with the Boards.

Robbs stated that the extended stay hotel they want to bring in wants to own their own parcel. From his research, they have been successful. Beaver Valley Mall looks like they have increased slightly but also a significant company came in. Robbs has done extensive research and hasn't found a lot of information on whether the revitalization has worked because it was only bought in the last few years. He has seen some red flags. The new investors may be able to bring in big names where others can't. It's hard to get information.

Dawson stated that we are damned if we do and damned if we don't.

Hardaway asked how much time the owners are willing to invest in this project to make it successful. Ken stated that this business is continually evolving. The goal is to get to 100%. They will find an investor, if not they will hold onto it.

Mayor Hartill thanked Ken for coming. The next step will be the Planning Board coming back with a recommendation to the Board of Trustees to go to the next step. The Trustees will have a public hearing to amend the Codification once all the details are worked out by the Planning Board. Dubow stated that first we have to figure out if this is going to be a PDA then we have to create that PDA.

The next step is for the Planning Board to discuss this. They will not be talking about it tonight. Tomei stated that now the Planning Board has to do the work. The Planning Board will discuss this at their next meeting on Nov 13<sup>th</sup>. Tomei told Ken he would not need to be there. Adam will contact Ken.

Tomei told Ken that with the holidays there will probably be only one meeting in November and December. Ken understands. On Nov 13<sup>th</sup> we would know whether we think a PDA is a good idea or not. Not defining the PDA just deciding if we will create a PDA. Ken stated that in this time frame they will develop the language before the public hearing.

Dubow stated that part of creating the PDA is coming up with uses. Both boards may want to decide on uses.

Mayor Hartill made a motion to adjourn the Board of Trustees' meeting.

#### Motion to Adjourn

Trustee Monaghan moved to adjourn. Trustee O'Neill seconded the motion. A vote was taken:

Mayor Donald Hartill-Aye  
Trustee Gerry Monaghan-Aye  
Trustee Patricia O'Rourke-Aye

Trustee Ronny Hardaway-Aye  
Trustee John O'Neill-Aye

The Board of Trustees meeting was adjourned at 8:25 pm.

The Planning Board took a short break and started again at 8:37.

Mario stated that the next item was the continuation of the public hearing to consider Special Permit #4056. Park Grove Realty, LLC has proposed to construct 14 10-unit townhome buildings for a total of 140 dwelling units with all associated road and utility infrastructure on tax parcel no. 45.1-1-51.12 which is approximately 19.46 acres and

currently undeveloped special permit review is required pursuant to Section 145-41 High Density Residential District of the Village of Lansing Code.

Tomei brought the Board up to date with what they had done so far. The Planning Board asked for a full EAF form. The Board completed this and we made some correction. We then met with Jess, Andy and Tom to start the Part II of the EAF and everything was done except for the traffic section. Park Grove had Passero Associates do a Traffic Impact Study (TIS). Fisher Associates reviewed the TIS that was completed by Passero Associates, dated October 2017. After doing a developmental review of the proposed Bomax Drive Apartment complex development, it was Fisher's opinion that the Traffic Impact Study adequately represents the traffic impacts of the proposed development and that the proposed development will not have a significant impact on traffic operations at study area intersections.

Dawson asked for clarification in wording in the Fisher letter under the Traffic Volumes. The correct values were used in the analysis. The typo in the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph was clarified to show that a capacity analysis was done.

Tomei would like to be reassured that the board would encourage the construction vehicles to enter the work site by using Warren Road to Bomax. It will be added as condition L so that construction traffic will not go through the Lansing Trails neighborhood. There were no additional questions on the study.

Tomei went back to #13 on page 8 and answered the question stating there is a no impact. Dubow stated that we had a 3<sup>rd</sup> party review so there would be no concern. It was suggested that the Fisher Associates study be included as part of the SEQR review. Dawson suggested that we add wording that states it is a preliminary review since we are waiting for the final report from Fisher.

Tomei stated the Planning Board has completed EAF Part 1 and 2. The next step is to consider the following resolution:

**VILLAGE OF LANSING PLANNING BOARD RESOLUTION FOR SEQR  
REVIEW OF SPECIAL PERMIT NO. 4056 ADOPTED ON OCTOBER 23, 2017**

Motion made by: Deborah Dawson

Motion seconded by: Lisa Schleelein

**WHEREAS:**

- A. This matter involves consideration of the following proposed action: Special Permit 4056 for proposal by Park Grove Realty LLC. to construct 14 10-unit townhome buildings for a total of 140 dwelling units with all associated road and utility infrastructure on tax parcel 45.1-1-51.12 which is approximately

19.46 acres and currently undeveloped; and

- B. On October 23, 2017 the Village of Lansing Planning Board, in performing the lead agency function for its independent and uncoordinated environmental review in accordance with Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law - the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQR"), (i) determined that the proposed action provided for herein is an Unlisted Action in accordance with SEQR; (ii) thoroughly reviewed the Full Environmental Assessment Form (the "Full EAF"), Part I, and any and all other documents prepared and submitted with respect to this proposed action and its environmental review [including any Visual Environmental Assessment Form deemed required, and comments and recommendations, if any, provided by the Tompkins County Department of Planning in accordance with General Municipal Law Sections 239-l and -m]; (iii) completed its thorough analysis of the potential relevant areas of environmental concern to determine if the proposed action may have a significant adverse impact on the environment, including the criteria identified in 6 NYCRR Section 617.7(c); and (iv) completed the Full EAF, Part II); and

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED AS FOLLOWS:**

1. The Village of Lansing Planning Board, based upon (i) its thorough review of the Full EAF, Part I, and any and all other documents prepared and submitted with respect to this proposed action and its environmental review [including any Visual Environmental Assessment Form deemed required, and comments and recommendations, if any, provided by the Tompkins County Department of Planning in accordance with General Municipal Law Sections 239-l and -m], (ii) its thorough review of the potential relevant areas of environmental concern to determine if the proposed action may have a significant adverse impact on the environment, including the criteria identified in 6 NYCRR Section 617.7(c), and (iii) its completion of the Full EAF, Part II, including the findings noted thereon (which findings are incorporated herein as if set forth at length), hereby makes a negative determination of environmental significance ("**NEGATIVE DECLARATION**") in accordance with SEQR for the above referenced proposed action, and determines that an Environmental Impact Statement will not be required; and
2. The Responsible Officer of the Village of Lansing Planning Board is hereby authorized and directed to complete and sign as required the Full EAF, Part III, confirming the foregoing **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, which fully completed and signed Full EAF shall be attached to and made a part of this Resolution.

The vote on the foregoing motion was as follows:

AYES: Baker, Dawson, Greenwald, Tomei, Schleelein

NAYS: none

The motion was declared to be carried. Tomei stated that Part 3 has no adverse effects. He and Robbs will sign.

**MOTION- TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING**

Moved by Mike Baker, seconded by: Carolyn Greenwald

The vote on the foregoing motion was as follows:

AYES: Baker, Dawson, Greenwald, Tomei, Schleelein

NAYS: none

Tomei read the required special permit general conditions as follows:

- (1) It will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety or general welfare.*
- (2) It will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the vicinity or neighborhood.*
- (3) It will not impede the orderly development of the vicinity or neighborhood and is appropriate in appearance and in harmony with the existing or intended character of the vicinity or neighborhood.*
- (4) The street system and off-street parking facilities can handle the expected traffic in a safe and efficient manner.*
- (5) Natural surface water drainage ways are not adversely affected.*
- (6) Water and sewerage or waste disposal facilities are adequate.*
- (7) The general environmental quality of the proposal, in terms of site planning, architectural design and landscaping, is compatible with the character of the neighborhood.*
- (8) Lot area, access, parking and loading facilities are sufficient for the proposed use.*
- (9) The requested use or facility conforms in all other respects to the applicable regulations of the district in which it is located.*
- (10) The applicant has shown that steps will be taken where necessary to meet all performance standards and all other applicable general regulations.*

**MOTION- THAT ALL GENERAL CONDITIONS STATED ABOVE  
HAVE BEEN MET SUBJECT TO ANY CONDITIONS THAT THE  
BOARD MAY IMPOSE ON THEAPPLICANT AS PART OF ANY  
APPROVAL GRANTED**



Moved by Schleelein, seconded by Dawson;

The vote on the foregoing motion was as follows:

AYES: Baker, Dawson, Greenwald, Tomei, Schleelein

NAYS: none

The motion was declared to be carried.

Dubow stated that there is not a stay so we can proceed with a resolution to accept Special Permit #4056. Dawson recommended it say received preliminary independent report from Fisher. The final independent report will come by mail. The resolution reflects an amended to condition G. and adding condition L.

**VILLAGE OF LANSING PLANNING BOARD RESOLUTION FOR SPECIAL  
PERMIT NO. 4056 ADOPTED ON OCTOBER 23, 2017**

Motion made by: Lisa Schleelein

Motion seconded by: Deborah Dawson

**WHEREAS:**

- A. This matter involves consideration of the following proposed action: Special Permit 4056 Park Grove Realty for proposal by Park Grove Realty LLC. to construct 14 10-unit townhome buildings for a total of 140 dwelling units with all associated road and utility infrastructure on tax parcel 45.1-1-51.12 which is approximately 19.46 acres and currently undeveloped; and
- B. Prior hereto, preliminary review and preparation was undertaken by both the applicant and the Village regarding the proposed project, related matters and materials, preparation of suggested revisions, preliminary review, review of Planning Board meeting records, preliminary application materials, and environmental review matters in accordance with Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law - the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQR"); and
- C. Prior hereto, additional application materials and SEQR matters for the proposed action were presented by the applicant and its consultants for preliminary review by the Village of Lansing Planning Board, at which time such materials were preliminarily evaluated, questions were posed and responses offered, and public comments were permitted, after which the Board determined that a public hearing thereon should be scheduled,

and such public hearing was thereupon properly scheduled for July 25 2017; and

- D. Thereafter, On July 25, 2017, the Village of Lansing Planning Board opened the public hearing for the initial purpose of (i) eliciting public comment on environmental issues regarding this proposed action, and (ii) reviewing and evaluating the materials and information presented by and on behalf of the applicant in support of this proposed action, and such public hearing has remained open until this current date; and
- E. On August 29, 2017, the Village of Lansing Planning Board, in performing the lead agency function for its independent and uncoordinated environmental review in accordance with Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law - the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQR"), (i) thoroughly reviewed the Full Environmental Assessment Form (the "Full EAF"), Part 1, any and all other information documents prepared and submitted with respect to the proposed action and its intended environmental review, and thereupon completed its fully reviewed the Part 1, including corrections and recommendation from the Village of Lansing Planning Board for the completion of Part 1; and
- F. On September 11, 2017, the Village of Lansing Planning Board, again in performing the lead agency function for its independent and uncoordinated environmental review in accordance with Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law - the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQR"), (i) thoroughly reviewed the Full Environmental Assessment Form (the "Full EAF"), Parts 2 and 3, any and all other documents prepared and submitted with respect to the proposed action and its environmental review [including any Visual Environmental Assessment Form deemed required, comments and recommendations, if any, provided by the Tompkins County Department of Planning in accordance with General Municipal Law Sections 239-l and -m]; (ii) reviewed environmental related comments from the public; (iii) agreed to obtain an additional third party (Fisher Associates) to further review, evaluate, and provide independent input and recommendations regarding traffic matters; and
- G. On October 23, 2017, the Village of Lansing Planning Board (i) formally received the independent report from Fisher Associates, and thereafter reviewed and completed the supplemental traffic study and its continuing thorough analysis of the potential relevant areas of environmental concern to determine if the proposed action may have a significant adverse impact

on the environment, including the criteria identified in 6 NYCRR Section 617.7(c); and (ii) completed the Full EAF, Part 2 and Part 3; and (iii) made a negative determination of environmental significance (“Negative Declaration”) in accordance with SEQR for the proposed action and determined that an Environmental Impact Statement would not be required; whereupon, having completed the SEQR review and having made its SEQR determination, it was established that the special permit application could be completed; and

- H. On October 23, 2017, the Village of Lansing Planning Board thereafter continued the pending public hearing on the proposed action and further reviewed and analyzed (i) the materials and information presented by and on behalf of the applicant in support of the proposed action, including any additional information and materials related to environmental issues, if any, which the Board deemed necessary or appropriate for its review, (ii) all other information and materials rightfully before the Board [including comments and recommendations, if any, provided by the Tompkins County Department of Planning in accordance with General Municipal Law Sections 239-l and -m], (iii) all issues raised during the public hearing and/or otherwise raised in the course of the Board’s deliberations, and (iv) possible modifications and/or conditions that might be imposed in conjunction with any special permit approval to be granted, whereupon, the public hearing was closed; and
- I. On October 23, 2017, in accordance with Section 7-725-b of the Village Law of the State of New York and Sections 145-59, 145-60, 145-60.1 and 145-61 of the Village of Lansing Code, the Village of Lansing Planning Board, in the course of its further deliberations, reviewed and took into consideration (i) the general conditions required for all special permits (Village of Lansing Code Section 145-59E), (ii) any applicable conditions required for certain special permit uses (Village of Lansing Code Section 145-60, and (iii) any applicable conditions required for uses within a Combining District (Village of Lansing Code Section 145-61);

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED AS FOLLOWS:**

- 1. The Village of Lansing Planning Board hereby finds (subject to the conditions and requirements, if any, set forth below) that the proposed action meets (i) all general conditions required for all special permits (Village of Lansing Code Section 145-59E), (ii) any applicable conditions required for certain special permit uses (Village of Lansing Code Section 145-60), and (iii) any applicable conditions required for uses within a Combining District (Village of Lansing Code Section 145-61); and

2. It is hereby determined by the Village of Lansing Planning Board that Special Permit No. 4056 is **GRANTED AND APPROVED**, subject to the following conditions and requirements:
- A. Soil and Erosion control measures shall be implemented and coordinated as required, and approved by either the Village of Lansing Code Enforcement Officer and/or the Village of Lansing Engineer.
  - B. Prior to a building permit being issued, a final lighting plan shall be submitted to and approved by Village of Lansing Lighting Commission prior to installation.
  - C. Landscaping plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning Board prior to installation.
  - D. Prior to a building permit being issued, approval by the Village of Lansing Engineer and Village of Lansing Storm Water Officer of, but not limited to, site work, storm water management and infrastructure plans, and implementation thereof. Drainage easements for potential impact from the stormwater management facilities on neighboring parcels shall be obtained, provided to the Village for approval by the Village Engineer, Stormwater Officer and Attorney, and thereafter recorded at the Tompkins County Clerk's Office.
  - E. Prior to a building permit being issued, approval by the Superintendent of Public Works for the proposed curb-cut and sidewalk connections on Bomax Drive.
  - F. Required permits, approvals, consents and other authorizations from all applicable Federal, State, County and local governmental and regulatory agencies shall be obtained, maintained and complied with for all permitted improvements, operations and activities as authorized by this special permit approval, and such improvements, operations and activities shall at all times comply with all

applicable Federal, State, County and local laws, codes, rules and regulations.

- G. Prior to a building permit being issued, a maintenance agreement shall be submitted to and approved by the Village Attorney, Village Engineer, and Village Stormwater Management Officer pertaining to the stormwater facilities.
- H. Prior to a building permit being issued, water consumption proposed for the occupancy of the new building shall be provided to the Village of Cayuga Heights and the Village of Lansing for the issuance of the required sewer permits prior to the issuance of the building permit.
- I. A Clean set of final plans shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning Board and Code Enforcement Officer.
- J. Prior to a building permit being issued approval from the Superintendent of Public Works, Village Engineer and the Code Enforcement Officer. Plans for the construction of all roadways to be built to Village specifications.
- K. Prior to a building permit being issued approval from the Superintendent of Public Works the Village Engineer and Code Enforcement Officer. Plans for a sidewalk to be added along Bomax Drive.
- L. Prior to a building permit being issued Park Grove Reality will make agreement with all contractors and subcontractors to utilize Bomax road to Warren road for all construction traffic. (No construction traffic is to travel westerly through Lansing Trails Development.)

The vote on the foregoing motion was as follows:

AYES: Baker, Dawson, Greenwald, Tomei, Schleelein

NAYS: none

The contractor stated that they will now start construction drawings and work on the conditions.

Mario canceled the October 31<sup>st</sup> Planning Board Meeting due to a lack of a quorum. Tomei stated that he would also be gone for the November 13, 2017 meeting.

Dubow explained that a PDA is basically outside of zoning. You have the authority to include other conditions. It's something unique so provisions can be different. Greenwald would like issues such as light and noise pollution, water and sewer to be addressed. A main concern is the infrastructure under the property. The Village also needs to make sure they can take over Graham Rd West to resolve that long standing issue. Dubow stated that specifics will be done after it is decided that a PDA is a good idea. Then there will be a document stating what the PDA is intending to do.

At their November 13<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Planning Board will decide if the PDA is a good idea. Then they will recommend to the Board of Trustees to change to a PDA with a draft of what this PDA is going to look like. The Trustees are the lead agency. There needs to be a justification and a purpose. The Planning Board will work on a list of conditions and uses for the PDA.

Mario suggested that the Planning Board look at the two PDA's that we already have and review them.

Motion - To Adjourn the Planning Board Meeting

Moved by Dawson, seconded by Baker;

The vote on the foregoing motion was as follows:

AYES: Baker, Dawson, Greenwald, Tomei, Schleelein

NAYS: none

The Planning Board adjourned at 9:35pm.

Jodi Dake

Clerk/Treasurer

**Full Environmental Assessment Form**  
**Part 1 - Project and Setting**

**Instructions for Completing Part 1**

**Part 1 is to be completed by the applicant or project sponsor.** Responses become part of the application for approval or funding, are subject to public review, and may be subject to further verification.

Complete Part 1 based on information currently available. If additional research or investigation would be needed to fully respond to any item, please answer as thoroughly as possible based on current information; indicate whether missing information does not exist, or is not reasonably available to the sponsor; and, when possible, generally describe work or studies which would be necessary to update or fully develop that information.

Applicants/sponsors must complete all items in Sections A & B. In Sections C, D & E, most items contain an initial question that must be answered either "Yes" or "No". If the answer to the initial question is "Yes", complete the sub-questions that follow. If the answer to the initial question is "No", proceed to the next question. Section F allows the project sponsor to identify and attach any additional information. Section G requires the name and signature of the project sponsor to verify that the information contained in Part 1 is accurate and complete.

**A. Project and Sponsor Information.**

Name of Action or Project: Bomax Drive Apartments		
Project Location (describe, and attach a general location map): Bomax Drive, Village of Lansing, NY 14850		
Brief Description of Proposed Action (include purpose or need): The project consists of the development of 140 residential units on 19.46 ± acres of land situated on the south side of Bomax Drive between Warren Road and Nor Way. The tax map identification number of the parcel is 45.1-1-51.12. There will be 14 two-story buildings with 10 residential units each. The development will be privately funded and contain a mixture of high-end one, two, and three bedroom rental units. Site amenities will include a 3,500 ± square foot (SF) clubhouse with a fenced-in pool area. Additionally, a dog park, community garden, bocce court, and walking trail will be provided as recreational opportunities for residents. Public water and sewer access is available and have sufficient capacity to support the development. Electric will be provided by New York State Gas & Electric (NYSEG). Heat will be provided to the units via a mix of heat pumps with propane back-ups. The propane will be stored on site in underground storage tanks.		
Name of Applicant/Sponsor: Park Grove Realty, LLC		Telephone: (585) 481-6091 E-Mail:
Address: 46 Prince St		
City/PO: Rochester	State: NY	Zip Code: 14607
Project Contact (if not same as sponsor; give name and title/role): Andy Bodewes		Telephone: (585) 434-5220 E-Mail: abodewes@parkgrovelc.com
Address: 46 Prince St		
City/PO: Rochester	State: NY	Zip Code: 14607
Property Owner (if not same as sponsor): Cornell University		Telephone: (607) 266-7872 E-Mail:
Address: 15 Thornwood Drive		
City/PO: Ithaca	State: NY	Zip Code: 14850

## B. Government Approvals

### B. Government Approvals, Funding, or Sponsorship. ("Funding" includes grants, loans, tax relief, and any other forms of financial assistance.)

Government Entity	If Yes: Identify Agency and Approval(s) Required	Application Date (Actual or projected)
a. City Council, Town Board, <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No or Village Board of Trustees		
b. City, Town or Village <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Planning Board or Commission	Village Planning Board - Special Use Permit	4/26/17
c. City Council, Town or <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Village Zoning Board of Appeals		
d. Other local agencies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Bolton Point Municipal Water Systems, Village of Lansing Sewer Dept. Water & Sewer Approval	4/26/17
e. County agencies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Tompkins County Department of Health Backflow, Water and Sewer Approval	4/26/17
f. Regional agencies <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No		
g. State agencies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	NYS Department of Environmental Conservation SPDES Permit	4/26/17
h. Federal agencies <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No		
i. Coastal Resources.		
i. Is the project site within a Coastal Area, or the waterfront area of a Designated Inland Waterway?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
ii. Is the project site located in a community with an approved Local Waterfront Revitalization Program?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
iii. Is the project site within a Coastal Erosion Hazard Area?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## C. Planning and Zoning

### C.1. Planning and zoning actions.

Will administrative or legislative adoption, or amendment of a plan, local law, ordinance, rule or regulation be the only approval(s) which must be granted to enable the proposed action to proceed? ☐ Yes ☒ No

- If Yes, complete sections C, F and G.
- If No, proceed to question C.2 and complete all remaining sections and questions in Part I

### C.2. Adopted land use plans.

a. Do any municipally- adopted (city, town, village or county) comprehensive land use plan(s) include the site where the proposed action would be located? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, does the comprehensive plan include specific recommendations for the site where the proposed action would be located? ☐ Yes ☒ No

b. Is the site of the proposed action within any local or regional special planning district (for example: Greenway Brownfield Opportunity Area (BOA); designated State or Federal heritage area; watershed management plan; or other?) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, identify the plan(s):

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

c. Is the proposed action located wholly or partially within an area listed in an adopted municipal open space plan. ☐ Yes ☒ No  
or an adopted municipal farmland protection plan?

If Yes, identify the plan(s):

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_



<b>C.3. Zoning</b>	
a. Is the site of the proposed action located in a municipality with an adopted zoning law or ordinance. If Yes, what is the zoning classification(s) including any applicable overlay district? <u>High Density Residential - Multiunit Residential Housing is an allowable use with a Special Use Permit</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
b. Is the use permitted or allowed by a special or conditional use permit?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
c. Is a zoning change requested as part of the proposed action? If Yes, i. What is the proposed new zoning for the site? _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>C.4. Existing community services.</b>	
a. In what school district is the project site located? <u>Ithaca City School District</u>	
b. What police or other public protection forces serve the project site? <u>Tompkins County Sheriff's Office</u>	
c. Which fire protection and emergency medical services serve the project site? <u>Tompkins County Fire Control</u>	
d. What parks serve the project site? <u>N/A</u>	

#### D. Project Details

<b>D.1. Proposed and Potential Development</b>	
a. What is the general nature of the proposed action (e.g., residential, industrial, commercial, recreational; if mixed, include all components)? <u>Residential</u>	
b. a. Total acreage of the site of the proposed action?	<u>19.46</u> acres
b. Total acreage to be physically disturbed?	<u>16.50</u> acres
c. Total acreage (project site and any contiguous properties) owned or controlled by the applicant or project sponsor?	<u>19.46</u> acres
c. Is the proposed action an expansion of an existing project or use? <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</span>	
i. If Yes, what is the approximate percentage of the proposed expansion and identify the units (e.g., acres, miles, housing units, square feet)? % _____ Units: _____	
d. Is the proposed action a subdivision, or does it include a subdivision? <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</span>	
If Yes, i. Purpose or type of subdivision? (e.g., residential, industrial, commercial; if mixed, specify types) _____	
ii. Is a cluster/conservation layout proposed? <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</span>	
iii. Number of lots proposed? _____	
iv. Minimum and maximum proposed lot sizes? Minimum _____ Maximum _____	
e. Will proposed action be constructed in multiple phases? <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</span>	
i. If No, anticipated period of construction: <u>18</u> months	
ii. If Yes:	
• Total number of phases anticipated _____	
• Anticipated commencement date of phase I (including demolition) _____ month _____ year	
• Anticipated completion date of final phase _____ month _____ year	
• Generally describe connections or relationships among phases, including any contingencies where progress of one phase may determine timing or duration of future phases: _____	

f. Does the project include new residential uses? ☒ Yes ☐ No  
If Yes, show numbers of units proposed.

	<u>One Family</u>	<u>Two Family</u>	<u>Three Family</u>	<u>Multiple Family (four or more)</u>
Initial Phase				140
At completion of all phases				140

g. Does the proposed action include new non-residential construction (including expansions)? ☐ Yes ☒ No  
If Yes,

i. Total number of structures \_\_\_\_\_  
ii. Dimensions (in feet) of largest proposed structure: \_\_\_\_\_ height; \_\_\_\_\_ width; and \_\_\_\_\_ length  
iii. Approximate extent of building space to be heated or cooled: \_\_\_\_\_ square feet

h. Does the proposed action include construction or other activities that will result in the impoundment of any liquids, such as creation of a water supply, reservoir, pond, lake, waste lagoon or other storage? ☒ Yes ☐ No  
If Yes,

i. Purpose of the impoundment: Stormwater Management  
ii. If a water impoundment, the principal source of the water: ☐ Ground water ☐ Surface water streams ☒ Other specify: Stormwater Runoff from impervious surfaces  
iii. If other than water, identify the type of impounded/contained liquids and their source. \_\_\_\_\_  
iv. Approximate size of the proposed impoundment. Volume: 0.293 million gallons; surface area: 1 acres  
v. Dimensions of the proposed dam or impounding structure: 4 height; 1.315 length  
vi. Construction method/materials for the proposed dam or impounding structure (e.g., earth fill, rock, wood, concrete): Earth Fill

**D.2. Project Operations**

a. Does the proposed action include any excavation, mining, or dredging, during construction, operations, or both? ☐ Yes ☒ No  
(Not including general site preparation, grading or installation of utilities or foundations where all excavated materials will remain onsite)  
If Yes:

i. What is the purpose of the excavation or dredging? \_\_\_\_\_  
ii. How much material (including rock, earth, sediments, etc.) is proposed to be removed from the site?  
• Volume (specify tons or cubic yards): \_\_\_\_\_  
• Over what duration of time? \_\_\_\_\_  
iii. Describe nature and characteristics of materials to be excavated or dredged, and plans to use, manage or dispose of them. \_\_\_\_\_  
iv. Will there be onsite dewatering or processing of excavated materials? ☐ Yes ☐ No  
If yes, describe. \_\_\_\_\_  
v. What is the total area to be dredged or excavated? \_\_\_\_\_ acres  
vi. What is the maximum area to be worked at any one time? \_\_\_\_\_ acres  
vii. What would be the maximum depth of excavation or dredging? \_\_\_\_\_ feet  
viii. Will the excavation require blasting? ☐ Yes ☐ No  
ix. Summarize site reclamation goals and plan: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

b. Would the proposed action cause or result in alteration of, increase or decrease in size of, or encroachment into any existing wetland, waterbody, shoreline, beach or adjacent area? ☐ Yes ☒ No  
If Yes:

i. Identify the wetland or waterbody which would be affected (by name, water index number, wetland map number or geographic description): \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

ii. Describe how the proposed action would affect that waterbody or wetland, e.g. excavation, fill, placement of structures, or alteration of channels, banks and shorelines. Indicate extent of activities, alterations and additions in square feet or acres:

iii. Will proposed action cause or result in disturbance to bottom sediments?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, describe:

iv. Will proposed action cause or result in the destruction or removal of aquatic vegetation?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes:

- acres of aquatic vegetation proposed to be removed: \_\_\_\_\_
- expected acreage of aquatic vegetation remaining after project completion: \_\_\_\_\_
- purpose of proposed removal (e.g. beach clearing, invasive species control, boat access): \_\_\_\_\_
- proposed method of plant removal: \_\_\_\_\_
- if chemical/herbicide treatment will be used, specify product(s): \_\_\_\_\_

v. Describe any proposed reclamation/mitigation following disturbance: \_\_\_\_\_

c. Will the proposed action use, or create a new demand for water?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If Yes:

i. Total anticipated water usage/demand per day: \_\_\_\_\_ 38 500 gallons/day

ii. Will the proposed action obtain water from an existing public water supply?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If Yes:

- Name of district or service area: Bolton Point Municipal Water System
- Does the existing public water supply have capacity to serve the proposal? ☒ Yes ☐ No
- Is the project site in the existing district? ☒ Yes ☐ No
- Is expansion of the district needed? ☐ Yes ☒ No
- Do existing lines serve the project site? ☐ Yes ☒ No

iii. Will line extension within an existing district be necessary to supply the project?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If Yes:

- Describe extensions or capacity expansions proposed to serve this project: \_\_\_\_\_  
An 8" PVC watermain is proposed to extend to and serve the development
- Source(s) of supply for the district: Bolton Point Municipal Water System

iv. Is a new water supply district or service area proposed to be formed to serve the project site?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes:

- Applicant/sponsor for new district: \_\_\_\_\_
- Date application submitted or anticipated: \_\_\_\_\_
- Proposed source(s) of supply for new district: \_\_\_\_\_

v. If a public water supply will not be used, describe plans to provide water supply for the project: \_\_\_\_\_

vi. If water supply will be from wells (public or private), maximum pumping capacity: \_\_\_\_\_ gallons/minute.

d. Will the proposed action generate liquid wastes?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If Yes:

i. Total anticipated liquid waste generation per day: \_\_\_\_\_ 30 800 gallons/day

ii. Nature of liquid wastes to be generated (e.g., sanitary wastewater, industrial; if combination, describe all components and approximate volumes or proportions of each): \_\_\_\_\_

Sanitary Wastewater

iii. Will the proposed action use any existing public wastewater treatment facilities?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If Yes:

- Name of wastewater treatment plant to be used: Village of Cayuga Heights Wastewater Treatment Plant
- Name of district: Village of Lansing Sewer District
- Does the existing wastewater treatment plant have capacity to serve the project? ☒ Yes ☐ No
- Is the project site in the existing district? ☒ Yes ☐ No
- Is expansion of the district needed? ☐ Yes ☒ No

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do existing sewer lines serve the project site? <span style="float: right;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</span></li> <li>• Will line extension within an existing district be necessary to serve the project? <span style="float: right;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</span></li> </ul> <p>If Yes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describe extensions or capacity expansions proposed to serve this project: _____</li> </ul> <p>An 8" PVC Sanitary Sewer extension is proposed to service the development _____</p>	
<p>iv. Will a new wastewater (sewage) treatment district be formed to serve the project site? <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</span></p> <p>If Yes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applicant/sponsor for new district: _____</li> <li>• Date application submitted or anticipated: _____</li> <li>• What is the receiving water for the wastewater discharge? _____</li> </ul> <p>v. If public facilities will not be used, describe plans to provide wastewater treatment for the project, including specifying proposed receiving water (name and classification if surface discharge, or describe subsurface disposal plans): _____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>vi. Describe any plans or designs to capture, recycle or reuse liquid waste: _____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	
<p>e. Will the proposed action disturb more than one acre and create stormwater runoff, either from new point sources (i.e. ditches, pipes, swales, curbs, gutters or other concentrated flows of stormwater) or non-point source (i.e. sheet flow) during construction or post construction? <span style="float: right;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</span></p> <p>If Yes:</p> <p>i. How much impervious surface will the project create in relation to total size of project parcel?</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">_____ Square feet or <u>3.11</u> acres (impervious surface)</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">_____ Square feet or <u>19.46</u> acres (parcel size)</p> <p>ii. Describe types of new point sources. <u>Several swales, roadside gutters, and a network of stormwater sewers will convey water to the stormwater management area</u></p> <p>iii. Where will the stormwater runoff be directed (i.e. on-site stormwater management facility/structures, adjacent properties, groundwater, on-site surface water or off-site surface waters)?</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><u>On site Stormwater Management Facilities</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">• If to surface waters, identify receiving water bodies or wetlands: _____</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">• Will stormwater runoff flow to adjacent properties? <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</span></p> <p>iv. Does proposed plan minimize impervious surfaces, use pervious materials or collect and re-use stormwater? <span style="float: right;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</span></p>	
<p>f. Does the proposed action include, or will it use on-site, one or more sources of air emissions, including fuel combustion, waste incineration, or other processes or operations? <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</span></p> <p>If Yes, identify:</p> <p>i. Mobile sources during project operations (e.g., heavy equipment, fleet or delivery vehicles) _____</p> <p>ii. Stationary sources during construction (e.g., power generation, structural heating, batch plant, crushers) _____</p> <p>iii. Stationary sources during operations (e.g., process emissions, large boilers, electric generation) _____</p>	
<p>g. Will any air emission sources named in D.2.f (above), require a NY State Air Registration, Air Facility Permit, or Federal Clean Air Act Title IV or Title V Permit? <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</span></p> <p>If Yes:</p> <p>i. Is the project site located in an Air quality non-attainment area? (Area routinely or periodically fails to meet ambient air quality standards for all or some parts of the year) <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</span></p> <p>ii. In addition to emissions as calculated in the application, the project will generate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• _____ Tons/year (short tons) of Carbon Dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>)</li> <li>• _____ Tons/year (short tons) of Nitrous Oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O)</li> <li>• _____ Tons/year (short tons) of Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)</li> <li>• _____ Tons/year (short tons) of Sulfur Hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>)</li> <li>• _____ Tons/year (short tons) of Carbon Dioxide equivalent of Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)</li> <li>• _____ Tons/year (short tons) of Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPs)</li> </ul>	

h. Will the proposed action generate or emit methane (including, but not limited to, sewage treatment plants, landfills, composting facilities)? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes:

i. Estimate methane generation in tons/year (metric): \_\_\_\_\_

ii. Describe any methane capture, control or elimination measures included in project design (e.g., combustion to generate heat or electricity, flaring): \_\_\_\_\_

---

i. Will the proposed action result in the release of air pollutants from open-air operations or processes, such as quarry or landfill operations? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes: Describe operations and nature of emissions (e.g., diesel exhaust, rock particulates/dust): \_\_\_\_\_

---

j. Will the proposed action result in a substantial increase in traffic above present levels or generate substantial new demand for transportation facilities or services? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes:

i. When is the peak traffic expected (Check all that apply): ☐ Morning ☐ Evening ☐ Weekend  
☐ Randomly between hours of \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_.

ii. For commercial activities only, projected number of semi-trailer truck trips/day: \_\_\_\_\_

iii. Parking spaces: Existing \_\_\_\_\_ Proposed \_\_\_\_\_ Net increase/decrease \_\_\_\_\_

iv. Does the proposed action include any shared use parking? ☐ Yes ☐ No

v. If the proposed action includes any modification of existing roads, creation of new roads or change in existing access, describe: \_\_\_\_\_

---

vi. Are public/private transportation service(s) or facilities available within ½ mile of the proposed site? ☐ Yes ☐ No

vii. Will the proposed action include access to public transportation or accommodations for use of hybrid, electric or other alternative fueled vehicles? ☐ Yes ☐ No

viii. Will the proposed action include plans for pedestrian or bicycle accommodations for connections to existing pedestrian or bicycle routes? ☐ Yes ☐ No

---

k. Will the proposed action (for commercial or industrial projects only) generate new or additional demand for energy? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes:

i. Estimate annual electricity demand during operation of the proposed action: \_\_\_\_\_

ii. Anticipated sources/suppliers of electricity for the project (e.g., on-site combustion, on-site renewable, via grid/local utility, or other): \_\_\_\_\_

iii. Will the proposed action require a new, or an upgrade to, an existing substation? ☐ Yes ☐ No

---

l. Hours of operation. Answer all items which apply.

<p>i. During Construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monday - Friday: _____ 8-5</li> <li>Saturday: _____ 8-5</li> <li>Sunday: _____</li> <li>Holidays: _____</li> </ul>	<p>ii. During Operations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monday - Friday: _____ 8-5</li> <li>Saturday: _____ 8-5</li> <li>Sunday: _____ 8-5</li> <li>Holidays: _____</li> </ul>
--	---

<p>m. Will the proposed action produce noise that will exceed existing ambient noise levels during construction, operation, or both? <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</span></p> <p>If yes:</p> <p>i. Provide details including sources, time of day and duration:</p> <p>_____</p>	
<p>ii. Will proposed action remove existing natural barriers that could act as a noise barrier or screen? <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</span></p> <p>Describe: _____</p>	
<p>n. Will the proposed action have outdoor lighting? <span style="float: right;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</span></p> <p>If yes:</p> <p>i. Describe source(s), location(s), height of fixture(s), direction/aim, and proximity to nearest occupied structures:</p> <p>A series of residential dark sky compliant site light fixtures will illuminate the roadway. The residential lanterns will be 14' tall, aimed down to the ground, with a proximity of approximately 30' to the nearest occupied buildings.</p>	
<p>ii. Will proposed action remove existing natural barriers that could act as a light barrier or screen? <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</span></p> <p>Describe: _____</p>	
<p>o. Does the proposed action have the potential to produce odors for more than one hour per day? <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</span></p> <p>If Yes, describe possible sources, potential frequency and duration of odor emissions, and proximity to nearest occupied structures:</p> <p>_____</p>	
<p>p. Will the proposed action include any bulk storage of petroleum (combined capacity of over 1,100 gallons) or chemical products 185 gallons in above ground storage or any amount in underground storage? <span style="float: right;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</span></p> <p>If Yes:</p> <p>i. Product(s) to be stored Propane _____</p> <p>ii. Volume(s) 1400 gallon per unit time _____ year (e.g., month, year)</p> <p>iii. Generally describe proposed storage facilities: _____</p> <p>Underground Storage Tanks</p>	
<p>q. Will the proposed action (commercial, industrial and recreational projects only) use pesticides (i.e., herbicides, insecticides) during construction or operation? <span style="float: right;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</span></p> <p>If Yes:</p> <p>i. Describe proposed treatment(s):</p> <p>General preventative maintenance and treatment of lawn areas.</p> <p>_____</p>	
<p>ii. Will the proposed action use Integrated Pest Management Practices? <span style="float: right;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</span></p>	
<p>r. Will the proposed action (commercial or industrial projects only) involve or require the management or disposal of solid waste (excluding hazardous materials)? <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</span></p> <p>If Yes:</p> <p>i. Describe any solid waste(s) to be generated during construction or operation of the facility:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction: _____ tons per _____ (unit of time)</li> <li>• Operation : _____ tons per _____ (unit of time)</li> </ul> <p>ii. Describe any proposals for on-site minimization, recycling or reuse of materials to avoid disposal as solid waste:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction: _____</li> <li>• Operation: _____</li> </ul> <p>iii. Proposed disposal methods/facilities for solid waste generated on-site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction: _____</li> <li>• Operation: _____</li> </ul>	

s. Does the proposed action include construction or modification of a solid waste management facility? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes:

i. Type of management or handling of waste proposed for the site (e.g., recycling or transfer station, composting, landfill, or other disposal activities): \_\_\_\_\_

ii. Anticipated rate of disposal/processing:

- \_\_\_\_\_ Tons/month, if transfer or other non-combustion/thermal treatment, or
- \_\_\_\_\_ Tons/hour, if combustion or thermal treatment

iii. If landfill, anticipated site life: \_\_\_\_\_ years

t. Will proposed action at the site involve the commercial generation, treatment, storage, or disposal of hazardous waste? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes:

i. Name(s) of all hazardous wastes or constituents to be generated, handled or managed at facility: \_\_\_\_\_

ii. Generally describe processes or activities involving hazardous wastes or constituents: \_\_\_\_\_

iii. Specify amount to be handled or generated \_\_\_\_\_ tons/month

iv. Describe any proposals for on-site minimization, recycling or reuse of hazardous constituents: \_\_\_\_\_

v. Will any hazardous wastes be disposed at an existing offsite hazardous waste facility? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes: provide name and location of facility: \_\_\_\_\_

If No: describe proposed management of any hazardous wastes which will not be sent to a hazardous waste facility: \_\_\_\_\_

#### E. Site and Setting of Proposed Action

##### E.1. Land uses on and surrounding the project site

###### a. Existing land uses.

###### i. Check all uses that occur on, adjoining and near the project site.

- ☐ Urban ☒ Industrial ☐ Commercial ☒ Residential (suburban) ☐ Rural (non-farm)
- ☐ Forest ☐ Agriculture ☐ Aquatic ☐ Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_

###### ii. If mix of uses, generally describe: \_\_\_\_\_

###### b. Land uses and covertypes on the project site.

Land use or Covertype	Current Acreage	Acreage After Project Completion	Change (Acres +/-)
• Roads, buildings, and other paved or impervious surfaces	0	3.11	+3.11
• Forested	14	4	-10
• Meadows, grasslands or brushlands (non-agricultural, including abandoned agricultural)	3.46	8.35	+4.89
• Agricultural (includes active orchards, field, greenhouse etc.)			
• Surface water features (lakes, ponds, streams, rivers, etc.)	2	4	+2
• Wetlands (freshwater or tidal)			
• Non-vegetated (bare rock, earth or fill)			
• Other Describe: _____			

c. Is the project site presently used by members of the community for public recreation? ☐ Yes ☒ No  
 i. If Yes: explain: \_\_\_\_\_

d. Are there any facilities serving children, the elderly, people with disabilities (e.g., schools, hospitals, licensed day care centers, or group homes) within 1500 feet of the project site? ☐ Yes ☒ No  
 If Yes,  
 i. Identify Facilities: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

e. Does the project site contain an existing dam? ☐ Yes ☒ No  
 If Yes:  
 i. Dimensions of the dam and impoundment:  
     • Dam height: \_\_\_\_\_ feet  
     • Dam length: \_\_\_\_\_ feet  
     • Surface area: \_\_\_\_\_ acres  
     • Volume impounded: \_\_\_\_\_ gallons OR acre-feet  
 ii. Dam's existing hazard classification: \_\_\_\_\_  
 iii. Provide date and summarize results of last inspection: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

f. Has the project site ever been used as a municipal, commercial or industrial solid waste management facility, or does the project site adjoin property which is now, or was at one time, used as a solid waste management facility? ☐ Yes ☒ No  
 If Yes:  
 i. Has the facility been formally closed? ☐ Yes ☐ No  
     • If yes, cite sources/documentation: \_\_\_\_\_  
 ii. Describe the location of the project site relative to the boundaries of the solid waste management facility: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 iii. Describe any development constraints due to the prior solid waste activities: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

g. Have hazardous wastes been generated, treated and/or disposed of at the site, or does the project site adjoin property which is now or was at one time used to commercially treat, store and/or dispose of hazardous waste? ☐ Yes ☒ No  
 If Yes:  
 i. Describe waste(s) handled and waste management activities, including approximate time when activities occurred: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

h. Potential contamination history. Has there been a reported spill at the proposed project site, or have any remedial actions been conducted at or adjacent to the proposed site? ☐ Yes ☒ No  
 If Yes:  
 i. Is any portion of the site listed on the NYSDEC Spills Incidents database or Environmental Site Remediation database? Check all that apply: ☐ Yes ☐ No  
     ☐ Yes – Spills Incidents database Provide DEC ID number(s): \_\_\_\_\_  
     ☐ Yes – Environmental Site Remediation database Provide DEC ID number(s): \_\_\_\_\_  
     ☐ Neither database  
 ii. If site has been subject of RCRA corrective activities, describe control measures: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 iii. Is the project within 2000 feet of any site in the NYSDEC Environmental Site Remediation database? ☐ Yes ☒ No  
 If yes, provide DEC ID number(s): \_\_\_\_\_  
 iv. If yes to (i), (ii) or (iii) above, describe current status of site(s): \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_



v. Is the project site subject to an institutional control limiting property uses? ☐ Yes ☒ No

- If yes, DEC site ID number: \_\_\_\_\_
- Describe the type of institutional control (e.g., deed restriction or easement): \_\_\_\_\_
- Describe any use limitations: \_\_\_\_\_
- Describe any engineering controls: \_\_\_\_\_
- Will the project affect the institutional or engineering controls in place? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- Explain: \_\_\_\_\_

---

**E.2. Natural Resources On or Near Project Site**

a. What is the average depth to bedrock on the project site? \_\_\_\_\_ 10 feet

b. Are there bedrock outcroppings on the project site? ☐ Yes ☒ No  
If Yes, what proportion of the site is comprised of bedrock outcroppings? \_\_\_\_\_ %

c. Predominant soil type(s) present on project site:

Bath & Valois Soils - BgC - HSG C	25.2 %
Erie Chippewa Channery - ErA - D	39.4 %
Langford Channery - LaB - D	35.4 %

d. What is the average depth to the water table on the project site? Average: \_\_\_\_\_ 6 feet

e. Drainage status of project site soils: ☐ Well Drained: \_\_\_\_\_ % of site  
☒ Moderately Well Drained: 100 % of site  
☐ Poorly Drained: \_\_\_\_\_ % of site

f. Approximate proportion of proposed action site with slopes: ☒ 0-10%: 95 % of site  
☒ 10-15%: 5 % of site  
☐ 15% or greater: \_\_\_\_\_ % of site

g. Are there any unique geologic features on the project site? ☐ Yes ☒ No  
If Yes, describe: \_\_\_\_\_

---

h. Surface water features.

i. Does any portion of the project site contain wetlands or other waterbodies (including streams, rivers, ponds or lakes)? ☒ Yes ☐ No

ii. Do any wetlands or other waterbodies adjoin the project site? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If Yes to either i or ii, continue. If No, skip to E.2.i.

iii. Are any of the wetlands or waterbodies within or adjoining the project site regulated by any federal, state or local agency? ☒ Yes ☐ No

iv. For each identified regulated wetland and waterbody on the project site, provide the following information:

• Streams:	Name 898-245	Classification C
• Lakes or Ponds:	Name _____	Classification _____
• Wetlands:	Name Federal Waters Federal Waters Federal Waters	Approximate Size _____
• Wetland No. (if regulated by DEC)	_____	

v. Are any of the above water bodies listed in the most recent compilation of NYS water quality-impaired waterbodies? ☐ Yes ☒ No  
If yes, name of impaired water body/bodies and basis for listing as impaired: \_\_\_\_\_

---

i. Is the project site in a designated Floodway? ☐ Yes ☒ No

j. Is the project site in the 100 year Floodplain? ☐ Yes ☒ No

k. Is the project site in the 500 year Floodplain? ☐ Yes ☒ No

l. Is the project site located over, or immediately adjoining, a primary, principal or sole source aquifer? ☐ Yes ☒ No  
If Yes:  
i. Name of aquifer: \_\_\_\_\_

<p>m. Identify the predominant wildlife species that occupy or use the project site:</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">Deer</td> <td style="width: 33%; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">Squirrel</td> <td style="width: 33%; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">Rabbit</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;">Ground Hog</td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;">Muskrat</td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;"></td> </tr> </table>			Deer	Squirrel	Rabbit	Ground Hog	Muskrat	
Deer	Squirrel	Rabbit						
Ground Hog	Muskrat							
<p>n. Does the project site contain a designated significant natural community? <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</span></p> <p>If Yes:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">i. Describe the habitat/community (composition, function, and basis for designation): _____</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">ii. Source(s) of description or evaluation: _____</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">iii. Extent of community/habitat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Currently: _____ acres</li> <li>• Following completion of project as proposed: _____ acres</li> <li>• Gain or loss (indicate + or -): _____ acres</li> </ul>								
<p>o. Does project site contain any species of plant or animal that is listed by the federal government or NYS as endangered or threatened, or does it contain any areas identified as habitat for an endangered or threatened species? <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</span></p>								
<p>p. Does the project site contain any species of plant or animal that is listed by NYS as rare, or as a species of special concern? <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</span></p>								
<p>q. Is the project site or adjoining area currently used for hunting, trapping, fishing or shell fishing? <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</span></p> <p>If yes, give a brief description of how the proposed action may affect that use: _____</p>								
<p><b>E.3. Designated Public Resources On or Near Project Site</b></p>								
<p>a. Is the project site, or any portion of it, located in a designated agricultural district certified pursuant to Agriculture and Markets Law, Article 25-AA, Section 303 and 304? <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</span></p> <p>If Yes, provide county plus district name/number: _____</p>								
<p>b. Are agricultural lands consisting of highly productive soils present? <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</span></p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">i. If Yes: acreage(s) on project site? _____</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">ii. Source(s) of soil rating(s): _____</p>								
<p>c. Does the project site contain all or part of, or is it substantially contiguous to, a registered National Natural Landmark? <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</span></p> <p>If Yes:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">i. Nature of the natural landmark: <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Community <input type="checkbox"/> Geological Feature</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">ii. Provide brief description of landmark, including values behind designation and approximate size/extent: _____</p>								
<p>d. Is the project site located in or does it adjoin a state listed Critical Environmental Area? <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</span></p> <p>If Yes:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">i. CEA name: _____</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">ii. Basis for designation: _____</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">iii. Designating agency and date: _____</p>								

e. Does the project site contain, or is it substantially contiguous to, a building, 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?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
If Yes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Nature of historic/archaeological resource: <input type="checkbox"/> Archaeological Site    <input type="checkbox"/> Historic Building or District</li> <li>ii. Name: _____</li> <li>iii. Brief description of attributes on which listing is based: _____</li> </ul>	
f. Is the project site, or any portion of it, located in or adjacent to an area designated as sensitive for archaeological sites on the NY State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) archaeological site inventory?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
g. Have additional archaeological or historic site(s) or resources been identified on the project site?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
If Yes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Describe possible resource(s): _____</li> <li>ii. Basis for identification: _____</li> </ul>	
h. Is the project site within five miles of any officially designated and publicly accessible federal, state, or local scenic or aesthetic resource?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If Yes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Identify resource: <u>Stewart Park, Eastshore Park, Sunset Park, Ithaca Falls</u></li> <li>ii. Nature of, or basis for, designation (e.g., established highway overlook, state or local park, state historic trail or scenic byway, etc.): <u>Local Parks and local waterfall</u></li> <li>iii. Distance between project and resource: _____ <u>2.5 miles.</u></li> </ul>	
i. Is the project site located within a designated river corridor under the Wild, Scenic and Recreational Rivers Program 6 NYCRR 666?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
If Yes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Identify the name of the river and its designation: _____</li> <li>ii. Is the activity consistent with development restrictions contained in 6NYCRR Part 666? <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</span></li> </ul>	

**F. Additional Information**

Attach any additional information which may be needed to clarify your project.

If you have identified any adverse impacts which could be associated with your proposal, please describe those impacts plus any measures which you propose to avoid or minimize them.

**G. Verification**

I certify that the information provided is true to the best of my knowledge.

Applicant/Sponsor Name Matthew Moore Date August 1, 2017

Signature  Title Engineer



**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.

- 1e. The proposed project will be more than one year, but this would still be a small impact due to location and having a minor impact on neighbors.
- 1f. Due to the current project having a SWPPP, mitigation effects will be made to not have an impact for erosion control.
- 3b. The runoff will not increase because of post construction stormwater facilities.
- 3d. The stream would not be considered a water body. The only wetlands that will not be impacted are outside of the proposed construction area.
- 3h. No due to a full SWPPP provided and utilized for construction and post construction activities.
5. No due to this project not being located in a flood prone area or on any flood maps.
- 7g. No due to the proposed list provided in Part 1 E.2.m. They have other areas that they can relocate to.
- 7h. It has been determined that it is 19 acres of regionally non important habitat.
9. This project is obviously different from the current use, is visible from public vantage points but is not designated as scenic or aesthetic resource in municipality.
10. The mapper as used by the applicant indicated that it was not part of a historical or archaeological resource as determined by SHPO.
- 14a. This would be a small impact based on the project compliant with NYS Energy Code.
- 15a. No or small impact because they are working during normal business hours.
- 15d & 15e. Are mitigated due to the applicant being required to gain approval from the Village of Lansing Lighting Commission.

**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

and considering both the magnitude and importance of each identified potential impact, it is the conclusion of the  
Village of Lansing Planning Board \_\_\_\_\_ as lead agency that:

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

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

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

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

Name of Action: Bomax Drive Apartments

Name of Lead Agency: Village of Lansing Planning Board

Name of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency: Mario Tomei

Title of Responsible Officer: Planning Board Chair

Signature of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency:



Date: 10/24/2017

Signature of Preparer (if different from Responsible Officer)



Date: 10/24/2017

**For Further Information:**

Contact Person: Adam Robbs

Address: 2405 N Triphammer Road, Ithaca, NY 14850

Telephone Number: 607-257-0424 ext.#3

E-mail: codeofficer2@vlansing.org

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

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

Other involved agencies (if any)

Applicant (if any)

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

Transportation  
Land Development  
Energy

October 18, 2017

Mr. Adam Robbs  
Code Enforcement Officer  
Village of Lansing  
2405 North Triphammer Road  
Ithaca, NY 14850

Development Review  
Bomax Drive Apartments

Dear Mr. Robbs:

We have completed our review of the proposed Bomax Drive Apartment complex development that is being considered for the area on the south side of Bomax Drive between Warren Road and Nor Way. The development will consist of 14 - 10 unit apartment buildings for a total of 140 apartments with a one-story clubhouse and pool. According to the site plan that was provided, access will be provided through two new driveways on Bomax Drive, one located approximately 1,000 feet west of Warren Road and the other approximately 1,500 feet west of Warren Road.

We have the following comments on the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) that was completed by Passero Associates, dated October 2017.

**Traffic Volumes**

The traffic volumes presented in the TIS accurately represent the existing conditions of roadway network. Traffic data was collected on May 4, 2016. According to academic calendars for Cornell University and Ithaca College, both schools were still in session at this time. It was noted that in general the peak hours of traffic flow were from 7:30-8:30 AM and 4:30-5:30 PM.

We also reviewed the growth projections and it is our opinion that a more conservative approach could have been used. If there are several developments underway within the area, traffic volume projections for those developments should have been directly accounted for at the study area intersections with a slightly smaller background growth rate. However, it is likely that this would not likely have a significant impact on the results of the level of service analysis, unless the developments that is underway are significant.

It should be noted that the northbound and southbound PM peak hour through volumes at the Warren Road/Bomax Drive intersection are shown incorrectly on the No Build Traffic Volume map (drawing C), however, the correct volumes were utilized in the level of service analyses.

**Site Trip Generation and Distribution**

We concur with the site trip generation and distribution of site traffic that is presented in the TIS. The proposed project is anticipated to generate 72 total trips during the AM peak hour and 95 total trips during the PM peak hour with the majority of trips (80%) traveling to and from Warren Road and 20% of trips using North Triphammer Road.



### **Capacity Analyses**

We reviewed the capacity analyses that was completed using the Synchro traffic analysis software, which is an industry accepted standard for the analysis of operations at intersections. No information was presented on how the signal timings at the two signalized intersections were derived. Ideally, traffic signal timing sheets should have been provided, or a statement saying that signal timings were measured in the field to confirm signal timings and phasing. Review of the analyses revealed that all movements at the intersections of Warren Road/Bomax Drive and North Triphammer Road/Craft Road currently operate satisfactorily and are projected to operate satisfactorily with the proposed development. All movements operate at level of service (LOS) C or better with the exception of the westbound left turn/through movement at the North Triphammer Road/Craft Road intersection which currently operates at LOS D during the PM peak hour and will continue to operate at LOS D with the proposed development with only minor increases in delay.

### **Site Distances**

Bomax Drive is a straight and relatively flat roadway and provides excellent sight distances for vehicles exiting the proposed development. Measured sight distances greatly exceed the minimum distances required for acceptable sight distances.

It is our opinion that the Traffic Impact Study adequately represents the traffic impacts of the proposed development and that the proposed development will not have a significant impact on traffic operations at study area intersections. If you have any questions or require clarification of these comments, please contact me.

Sincerely,

**FISHER ASSOCIATES, P.E., L.S., L.A., D.P.C.**

Timothy R. Faulkner, PE  
Senior Transportation Manager