



Environmental, Planning, and Engineering Consultants

34 South Broadway
Suite 300
White Plains, NY 10601
tel: 914 949-7336
fax: 914 949-7559
www.akrf.com

Memorandum

To: Town of Philipstown Planning Board

From: AKRF, Inc.
Ronald J. Gainer, PE, PLLC, Town Engineer

Date: July 14, 2021

Re: Hudson Valley Shakespeare Festival (HVSF) Project

cc: Steve Gaba, Planning Board Attorney
HVSF Applicant Team

AKRF, Inc. (AKRF) and Ronald J. Gainer, PE, PLLC (RJG) have reviewed the following plans and documents submitted on July 2, 2021 for the above referenced application:

- Part 3 of the Expanded FEAF (and Appendices) for the Hudson Valley Shakespeare Festival prepared by Kellard Sessions Consulting (587 pages total) dated July 2021 including the Part 3 Full Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) Expanded Part 3 Scope Outline dated July 1, 2021.
- Site & Subdivision Plan Set (9 sheets total) prepared by Badey & Watson Surveying & Engineering, P.C., and comprised of the following: Cover Sheet, Subdivision Plan, Existing Conditions Plan, Constraints Plan, Removal Plan, Overall Site Plan, Overall Sediment and Erosion Control Plan, Sight Distance Profiles, and Vehicle Movements; printed on June 30, 2021.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Garrison Properties, LLC and Hudson Valley Shakespeare Festival (HVSF) (the “Applicant”) is seeking approval of several actions (the “Proposed Action”) including a zoning text amendment to the Garrison Golf Club Planned Development District (GCCPDD) and the Rural Conservation (RC) district, as well as subdivision, site plan, and special use permit approval to allow the HVSF to relocate its facility from Boscobel (also in Philipstown), to The Garrison (the “Proposed Project”). HVSF's long-term plan includes the installation of a permanent theater tent and accompanying structures (back of house structure, welcome center, concessions, and restrooms); parking expansion; creation of meadows and gardens; on-site lodging for artists and guests; a year-round theater building; rehearsal barn; and pavilion. The existing restaurant and banquet hall at The Garrison would remain; however, the 18-hole golf course will be eliminated. The application includes the relocation of the Snake Hill Road access driveway, improvements to the

intersection of the site driveway and Route 9, and upgrades to the Route 9 and Snake Hill Road intersection. Modifications may be needed to the existing earthen dam located at the existing Snake Hill Road access drive. The Proposed Action also includes a 3-lot subdivision whereby the HVSF use will be contained to one (1) ±97.26 acre lot, a separate ±29.5 acre lot would be developed as a private residence, and a third ±17.28 acre lot will be created and conveyed to a conservation organization, resulting in a total of ±73.83 acres to be permanently preserved; this includes the portion of the existing golf course located on the west side of Snake Hill Road and north side of Philipse Brook Road.

The proposed zoning text amendment to the GGCPDD and RC district requires approval by the Philipstown Town Board. The proposed subdivision, site plan, and special use permit requires approval by the Philipstown Planning Board. The Philipstown Planning Board is serving as Lead Agency for review of the Proposed Action/Proposed Project under the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA). The Town Board is serving as an Involved Agency under SEQRA and will rely on the Planning Board's SEQRA findings in their review of the proposed zoning changes. Other local, state, and federal agencies involved in the review of the Proposed Action/Proposed Project include the Town of Philipstown Conservation Board, Putnam County Department of Health, Putnam County Planning Board, New York City Department of Environmental Protection (NYCDEP), New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC), New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT), and the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE).

COMMENTS

Full Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) Expanded Part 3 Scope Outline dated July 1, 2021

All outstanding comments in the June 15, 2021 memorandum from AKRF, Inc. and Ron Gainer, PE, PLLC, have been addressed in the revised July 1, 2021 revision of the FEAF Expanded Part 3 Scope Outline appended to the Expanded FEAF.

Part 3 of the Expanded FEAF (and Appendices)

The Applicant has submitted an expanded FEAF Part 3 in accordance with the "scope outline" accepted by the Planning Board at the June 17, 2021 meeting. The purpose of this review is to determine whether the Part 3 FEAF analysis generally follows the Scope Outline and whether all relevant information is presented and analyzed in a complete and understandable format.

The following table documents AKRF's and RJG's review of the completeness of the FEAF Part 3 as it relates to each technical area outlined in the scope agreed to by the Applicant. Note that substantive comments on the accuracy and responsiveness of the materials presented in the FEAF Part 3 and in the technical studies to the requirements set forth in the scope outline will be provided in a subsequent memorandum.

A "Yes" in the "Provided?" column indicates that the FEAF Part 3 includes materials that address the requirement in the scope outline but does not necessarily indicate that the Planning Board concurs with analyses. There may be areas of disagreement or differences in the interpretation of technical issues that will be addressed during the substantive review. A "Partial" in the "Provided?" column indicates that the materials do not fully address the requirement in the scope outline. A "No" in the "Provided?" column indicates that the materials do not address the requirement in the scope outline.

With regard to the organization of the document, we suggest the Part 3 FEAF be structured to more closely follow the alpha-numeric topics and subtopics set forth in the Scope Outline dated July 1, 2021. This will allow the reader to more easily compare the Part 3 Scope Outline with the Part 3 FEAF. Modification of the numbering scheme in the Scope Outline may also be required.

One suggestion would be to combine Section "III. THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT - EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS" with Section "IV. THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT - EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS" as this separation of topics is not included in the Part 3 Outline. The new Section

III could be titled “III. EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS”. Additionally, the Part 3 FEAF should follow the scope outline by numbering and labelling each technical area of study and all of the related subsections (e.g., 2. Land, Use Zoning and Layout, a. through k.) consistent with the Scope Outline. This would also reduce the effort needed to match the Scope Outline with sections in the FEAF Part 3.

The body of the FEAF Part 3 should be revised to include the sections set forth in the table of contents where appropriate (e.g., I. FRONT END MATERIAL, II. SUMMARY, and III. EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS).

Each Appendix should have a divider page bearing the appropriate label to allow the reader to locate and distinguish between the different appendices.

EAF Part 3 – Review of Content Against Town Approved Outline

Part 3 Scope Outline Topics	Provided?	Notes
1. Project Summary		
a. Project location and description of existing conditions, including description of the existing site, past site disturbances and character of the surrounding area.	Partial	Map and List of adjoining properties included, but no description of character of surrounding area provided.
b. Discussion of past actions and approval history, particularly relating to the Garrison Golf Club Planned Development District (GGCPDD).	Yes	
c. Discussion of existing and proposed zoning.	Yes	
d. Description of the proposed action.	Yes	
e. Discussion of the approval process and list of involved and interested agencies and associated permits/approvals required.	Yes	
f. Describe the proposed action as it relates to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), identify the SEQRA classification (action type), discuss project phasing, the "build year/design year" (as applicable), and how the applicant intends on evaluating impacts relative to the existing condition, the hypothetical buildout of the 2005 GGCPDD plan, and the proposed action at full buildout.	Partial	No clear build year/design year identified for the "Full Campus Buildout" phase – text assumes a range of 5-15 years from 2024.
2. Land Use, Zoning, and Layout		
a. Discussion of existing and proposed zoning, including applicable overlay districts	Yes	
b. Discussion of the 2005 GGCPDD zoning and site plan approval and related SEQRA process.	Yes	
c. Description of the business/operational plan for HVSF.	Yes	
d. Discussion of the proposed subdivision and future use of each lot as well as consistency with the Town's zoning and subdivision regulations.	Yes	
e. Describe consistency with the Town's Comprehensive Plan (existing and draft versions).	Yes	
f. In tabular form, provide a comparison of existing conditions, what was approved in accordance with the 2005 GGCPDD and what is proposed; provide numerical values to the extent possible so a comparison of impacts can be easily understood. Include items such as, but not limited to, the number of structures, gross floor area, maximum occupancy (including staff), number of events, hours of operation, water/sewer demand, number of parking spaces, number of peak traffic trips, tree removal, slope disturbance, wetland/wetland buffer disturbance, overall land disturbance, etc.	Partial	See Table 5 (Comparison Table). Items scoped but missing include staff count, peak traffic trips, tree removal, slope disturbance.
g. The discussion of the 2005 GGCPDD shall summarize the environmental impacts and mitigation measures disclosed (and the timing of such measures) as part of the SEQRA process for that approved but unbuilt plan. To the extent that mitigation measures applicable to the 2005 GGCPDD would be needed for the proposed action, those measures shall be described with references pointing to expanded discussions in the applicable section(s) of the Part 3 EAF	Yes	

EAF Part 3 – Review of Content Against Town Approved Outline

Part 3 Scope Outline Topics	Provided?	Notes
h. Description of proposed buildings and structures, including size, scale, use, occupancy, proximity to neighboring parcels and uses and compliance with zoning. This will include a thorough discussion of the proposed lodging for artists and guests. Representative pictures or renderings of proposed buildings and structures will be provided and discussed.	Partial	-Text provided excludes details on proximity to neighboring parcels. -Compliance with zoning only mentioned for tent structure. -Pictures/renderings provided as “precedent” images (exhibits 46-51) but not discussed in this section.
i. Discussion of overall site capacity and ability to accommodate simultaneous activities and events (i.e. theatrical performances, weddings, and other events which may overlap).	Partial	Unclear from text if Saturday PM event hour (400 vehicles) accounts for overlapping theatrical performances, weddings, other events at full capacity.
j. The portions of the subject property to be conveyed or otherwise protected for conservation will be discussed, including the anticipated conservation organization that will be involved in such conservation efforts. A comprehensive description of activities that are anticipated to be permitted/prohibited on the conserved lands will be provided. Reference to the open space/recreation section of the Part 3 EAF will be provided, as necessary	Partial	Missing full description of activities anticipated to be permitted on conserved lands. Text indicates this is to come from HHLT.
k. Discuss mitigation measures, if needed.	No	No statement re: need for mitigation measures.
3. Geology and Soils		
a. Discuss the site’s subsurface geology including anticipated depth to bedrock. Portions of the site which contain exposed or shallow depth to bedrock and which are expected to be disturbed by the proposed action, will be identified; source material will be provided.	Yes	
b. Identify and map on-site soil classifications in accordance with the Soil Survey of Putnam and Westchester Counties, New York, and the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Web Soil Survey. Evaluate on-site soils in terms of distribution onsite, erosion potential, permeability, and depth to bedrock/water table. This shall include an examination of the suitability of the soils (stability, quality, etc.) and potential engineering limitations, if any, associated with the proposed action.	Yes	
c. Develop and graphically illustrate the proposed limits of land disturbance; identify the proposed area of disturbance within the various on-site soil categories.	Yes	
d. Describe the potential for rock removal, methods of rock removal, including the potential for blasting; this evaluation shall be based upon the proposed grading plan, cut and fill analysis, and available and reputable soil surveys (referenced above).	Yes	
e. Discussion of potential impacts from rock removal on noise, air, visual and community character, vegetation (including the potential of fragmentation of habitats), and erosion.	Partial	Only noise addressed.
f. Discuss mitigation measures, if needed.	Yes	
4. Topography and Slopes		
a. Description of the site’s topography including a discussion of any prominent or unique features.	Yes	

EAF Part 3 – Review of Content Against Town Approved Outline

Part 3 Scope Outline Topics	Provided?	Notes
b. Provide a topographic map (2-foot contours) and graphically illustrate steep slopes for each steep slope category (0-15%, 15-25% and 25% and greater).	Yes	Ranges for EAF and Town slope categories do not match scope outline.
c. Quantitative analysis of the projected disturbance to each steep slope category (0-15%, 15-25% and 25% and greater).	Yes	Same as above.
d. Identify, quantify and map potential impacts to steep slopes (25% and greater) based upon the expected limits of disturbance.	Partial	Exhibits 17 and 18 omit limit of disturbance lines.
e. Describe the proposed grading plan.	Yes	Provided under "Geology and Soils" section.
f. Provide a cut and fill analysis and assess impacts, if any, including off-site truck traffic.	Yes	Provided under "Geology and Soils" section.
g. Discussion of the maximum area of land to be disturbed at one time.	Yes	Should provide plan of general construction phasing as described in Table 10, utilizing mapping showing Town regulated slope ranges (i.e.; data illustrated on Exhibit 18).
h. Describe compliance with the Town's steep slope regulations and standards as per Chapter 175-36 of the Town Code include analyzing the Town's regulatory slope categories of 0-20%, 20-35% and 35% and greater.	Yes	Should include discussion of compliance with Town limitations of disturbances permitted on slopes >20%.
i. Discuss modifications to the golf course and changes to the golf course topography/vegetation.	Yes	
j. Discussion of proposed erosion and sediment control measures	Yes	
k. Discuss mitigation measures, if needed	Yes	
5. Vegetation and Wildlife		
a. Describe existing ecological communities on the subject parcel	Yes	
b. List any rare, special concern, threatened, endangered, proposed and candidate plant or animal species, as well as significant natural communities and designated critical habitat, either located on or proximate to the subject property based upon the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) Natural Heritage Program and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) databases	Yes	
c. Describe potential impacts to ecological and significant natural communities, designated critical habitat, as well as protected wildlife and plant species	Yes	
d. To the extent that portions of the subject property, which are currently undisturbed and are in a natural state, will be impacted by development activity and will result in the removal of mature/valuable vegetation, the applicant will be required to evaluate the conservation value of such areas and establish mitigation for the loss of said areas, if applicable and as necessary	Yes	
e. Discuss mitigation measures, if needed	Yes	

EAF Part 3 – Review of Content Against Town Approved Outline

Part 3 Scope Outline Topics	Provided?	Notes
6. Wetlands and Watercourses		
a. Identify all Town, NYSDEC and USACOE regulated existing surface waterbodies, wetlands, and intermittent and perennial streams, as well as FEMA mapped 100-year floodplains located on the subject property and immediately adjacent (within 100- feet from the property lines).	Yes	
b. On-site wetlands and watercourses within or proximate to the limits of land disturbance shall be delineated and mapped and FEMA floodplains shall be depicted graphically.	Yes	
c. Describe and quantify Town, State, and federally regulated wetland areas and Town and State regulated wetland buffer areas on the subject property.	Partial	All wetland and buffer areas are not quantified. Wetland boundary validation may be required.
d. Describe the existing dam, its existing condition and regulatory status. The applicant will identify and describe, to the extent known, anticipated modifications to the dam and resulting impacts, if any, on adjacent surface waters and wetlands.	Partial	Engineering evaluation of existing dam documenting improvements, impacts and regulatory status is outstanding.
e. Describe and quantify wetland, wetland buffer, and floodplain disturbance and impacts.	Partial	Final impacts will be determined once the bridge design is finalized. Wetland boundary validation may be required.
f. Discuss naturalization efforts in connection with existing man-made ponds.	Yes	
g. Discuss permits required and mitigation measures, if needed.	Partial	Additional details related to permits is needed.
7. Stormwater Management		
a. Describe the existing drainage patterns and discharge points of existing drainage systems.	Partial	Plan of existing/proposed drainage patterns should be provided.
b. Provide an initial assessment of stormwater runoff quantity and quality impacts based upon the existing condition and proposed development. Conceptually illustrate and describe the proposed stormwater management plan from increased stormwater runoff from various project components.	Partial	Conceptual illustration of proposed stormwater management plan not included (only references SWPPP to be developed).
c. Describe Town and NYSDEC stormwater regulations and requirements that will be adhered to. While a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will not be required prior to a SEQRA determination, the applicant will provide a conceptual stormwater management design to demonstrate that compliance can be achieved; this will include preliminary sizing of required stormwater treatment measures to assure that said practices can be located where intended on site.	Partial	Development/calculations of the conceptual sizing of stormwater management facilities should be included, for review/evaluation.
d. Discussion of potential impacts of past and/or future use of lawn fertilizers and pesticides on on-site waterbodies and watercourses.	Yes	
e. Discuss permits required and mitigation measures, if needed.	Yes	

EAF Part 3 – Review of Content Against Town Approved Outline

Part 3 Scope Outline Topics	Provided?	Notes
8. Utilities		
Water Supply		
a. Describe and quantify daily water demand in the existing and proposed condition; identify existing and proposed well locations and regulatory requirements; provide a table to further explain and demonstrate how water demand/capacity values were determined.	Partial	Exhibit 24 should illustrate the location of well 6 (off-site); proposed well "A" obscured by labeling). Describe the status of well 6 (not referenced in Table 17). Well capacities should be identified.
b. Graphically illustrate or otherwise describe the location of nearby private wells, as required by the Putnam County Department of Health (if any).	Yes	
c. Discuss provisions for fire protection including an evaluation of National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) guidelines for required fire flows (existing and proposed) as well as those flows available from existing fire protection sources on the site.	No	No discussion of fire protection or NFPA guidelines in this section.
d. Develop a water budget and assess impacts to the underlying aquifer to determine that a sufficient groundwater supply exists to support the proposed use. This evaluation shall include recharge of the aquifer from septic and stormwater management facilities. The purpose of this analysis is to ensure that project water usage will not result in significant water level drawdown of the existing and proposed on-site wells. The demands of existing development within the identified recharge area of the supply wells, as well as potential impacts to other nearby private wells, will be considered.	No	Water budget analysis not yet provided; no discussion on drawdown, recharge, impacts on- and off-site (i.e. pumping tests).
e. Demonstrate compliance with Putnam County Department of Health regulations.	No	Not provided.
f. Discussion of permits required and mitigation measures, if needed	No	No statement re: need for mitigation measures, or possible mitigation measures which could be employed to address off-site impacts.
Sanitary Sewage Disposal		
a. Identify and map all existing wastewater systems and capacities.	Yes	
b. Graphically illustrate or otherwise describe the location of nearby wastewater disposal systems, as required by the Putnam County Department of Health (if any).	Yes	
c. Demonstrate adequate separation distances to on-site and off-site wells.	Yes	
d. Estimate anticipated wastewater generation for the proposed project.	Yes	
e. Identify and map any proposed wastewater systems that will be required to serve the proposed use; demonstrate adequate capacity.	Yes	
f. Provide deep and percolation test results to demonstrate suitability of soils to accommodate septic.	No	Text should refer to percolation testing provided in Appendix E
g. Demonstrate compliance with Putnam County Department of Health regulations.	Yes	

EAF Part 3 – Review of Content Against Town Approved Outline

Part 3 Scope Outline Topics	Provided?	Notes
h. Evaluate the potential use of composting toilets.	Yes	
i. Discussion of permits required and mitigation measures, if needed.	No	No statement re: need for mitigation measures.
Energy		
a. Describe existing and anticipated energy sources and change in the use of energy resulting from the project. Evaluate options to improve energy efficiency through design.	Partial	- Energy provider not identified. - Change in use of energy not quantified.
b. Discuss mitigation measures, if needed	No	No statement re: need for mitigation measures.
9. Traffic, Transportation, and Parking		
a. Prepare a traffic study in accordance with a memorandum prepared by the applicant's Traffic Engineer, Kimley Horn, last revised May 25, 2021, as submitted to the Town's Planning Consultant, Mr. Ronald Gainer, P.E. (see Appendix B). The traffic study will include the items identified in AKRF's memorandum to the Planning Board, dated June 15, 2021.	Yes	
10. Visual Resources and Community Character		
a. Identify and illustrate existing visual conditions on the site and as viewed from public streets and adjacent properties.	Yes	
b. Describe anticipated impacts to views to the site from said surrounding public streets and adjacent properties.	Yes	
c. Provide a combination of sight line profiles, photographs, photo-simulations, and precedent images, to evaluate visibility and potential impacts; locations to be analyzed will be identified on a map and agreed upon with the Planning Board.	Yes	
d. Provide representative pictures and/or renderings of various proposed buildings and structures.	Yes	
e. Assess impacts to the proposed tent theater from wind.	Yes	
f. Discuss existing on-site light sources and proposed conceptual lighting plan; provide precedent images of proposed lighting and evaluate proposed lighting and the visibility of proposed lighting at night.	Yes	
g. The visual resource and community character analysis will be prepared to address the item contained within AKRF's June 15, 2021 memorandum to the Planning Board.	Partial	Discussion of leaf-off/on conditions and NYSDEC/NYSDOS documents needed.
h. Discuss mitigation measures, including any proposed supplemental landscaping provided to screen views, if needed.	Yes	

EAF Part 3 – Review of Content Against Town Approved Outline

Part 3 Scope Outline Topics	Provided?	Notes
11. Noise		
a. Assess potential operational noise impacts on neighbors and surrounding uses when the facility is in full operation, including simultaneous on-site activities (theatrical performances, rehearsals, wedding events, restaurant use, etc.) and impacts associated with construction related noise. Prepare an acoustical survey in accordance with a memorandum from Jaume Soler of SoundArts to the Town of Philipstown Planning Board, dated May 24, 2021.	No	Noise Study is outstanding.
b. Noise measurement locations shall be illustrated on a map and described in text (addresses will be provided, as applicable).	No	Noise Study outstanding.
c. The methodology for conducting the acoustical study shall be consistent with the Town's noise ordinance, (Section 175-36C).	No	Noise study outstanding.
d. Discuss mitigation measures, if needed.	No	Noise study outstanding.
12. Cultural Resources		
a. The applicant shall consult with the NYS Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) relating to potential impacts on historic and cultural resources and shall provide the findings of such consultation, including any written correspondence with said agency. This section will include an assessment of impacts to any resources as identified and directed by SHPO.	No	Applicant waiting on SHPO response
b. Discuss mitigation measures, if needed.	No	Pending outcome of SHPO review
13. Open Spaces and Recreation		
a. Discuss any proposed open space, conservation or recreational use of the property (public or private) and proposed use controls.	Yes	
b. Describe access to planned passive recreation opportunities, identify what facilities will be open to the public, if any, and use controls.	Yes	
c. Discuss mitigation measures, if needed.	No	No statement re: need for mitigation measures.
14. Construction		
a. Describe proposed construction phasing and schedule.	Yes	
b. Describe potential temporary impacts to surrounding land uses due to construction activities such as traffic, noise, dust and erosion.	Yes	
c. The applicant shall identify (by address/land use) any sensitive receptors subjected to the temporary construction impacts and the anticipated intensity and duration of those impacts through the buildout of the proposed action.	Partial	Nearby residential parcels mentioned by general location but not address. Addresses from Exhibit 2 should be specifically mentioned at work
d. Refer to Section 16, Human Health/Site Assessment, as applicable.	No	No reference provided but warranted due to planned Phase II investigation and possible measures needed to protect health/safety of workers on-site.

EAF Part 3 – Review of Content Against Town Approved Outline

Part 3 Scope Outline Topics	Provided?	Notes
e. Discuss mitigation measures, if needed.	Partial	Text eludes to Code requirements for noise and ESC for dust, but not definitively called out as mitigation.
15. Community Services and Economy		
a. Describe the emergency service agencies that serve the subject property and potential impacts, if any, to said agencies from the proposed development; the applicant shall meet with the fire department and other emergency service providers, as necessary, to discuss the project and to obtain input; a written account of any meetings will be provided.	Partial	Documented meeting with fire department but not police/EMS.
b. Identify all applicable taxing jurisdictions and anticipated changes in tax revenue as a result of the proposed action; include a qualitative assessment of potential municipal costs to the applicable taxing jurisdictions.	Yes	
c. Include a qualitative discussion of anticipated changes to the local economy as a result of the proposed action, including the estimated number of on-site jobs.	Yes	
d. Discuss mitigation measures, if needed.	No	No statement re: need for mitigation measures.
16. Human Health/Site Assessment		
a. The applicant shall prepare a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA), the scope of which shall be prepared to the satisfaction of the Town's Consulting Planner and Town Engineer. Depending on the findings of the Phase 1 ESA, a limited Phase II ESA may be required within the proposed areas of disturbance and in proximity to the proposed well sites. The scope of any future Phase II ESA shall be made in consultation with the Town Consulting Planner and Town Engineer.	Partial	- Details of Phase II pending outcome of Phase I. - As discussed with Applicant, Phase II sampling at maintenance building and golf course holes (not just in limits of disturbance) recommended.
b. Discuss mitigation measures, if needed.	No	Need for mitigation pending outcome of Phase I/Phase II studies.

Initial Comments on the Traffic Impact Study

1. Further explain the development of the 16 percent COVID factor that was used to adjust the traffic counts for 2021 conditions (pre-pandemic conditions).
2. Provide the backup for the 0.76 percent growth factor used to develop future No Build traffic volumes.
3. The No Build projects should be listed in the summary of the traffic text.
4. The figure depicting the turning movements of internal truck movements and those at the driveway is not legible. Identify the truck used in the analysis on the graphic. Indicate if the analysis included a fire truck.
5. Indicate if the parking overflow areas are paved?
6. Describe, in more detail, how the parking demand number was developed.
7. Meetings with DOT and the police department to discuss the intersection of US Route 9/Snake Hill Road/Travis Corners Road should be scheduled. The first with DOT to determine if they will approve signalization of the intersection. If not, then a second with the police department to determine if they are willing and able to direct traffic at the intersection.

8. Describe the Jitney service -- frequency and size of the Jitney.
9. For the intersection of US Route 9/Snake Hill Road/Travis Corners Road, what is the 95th percentile queue for and what is the storage capacity of the left lane?
10. Describe how the 2.1-person per vehicle occupancy was determined and provide the backup.
11. Describe how the signalization of US Route 9/Snake Hill Road/Travis Corner Road would affect accidents at the intersection.
12. Describe the Event Management Plan in more detailed.
13. Provide the Synchro (capacity analysis) electronic files to the Town for review.
14. Indicate if the traffic signal at US Route 9/Snake Hill Road/Travis Corner Road would be visible to the surrounding homes.
15. If bus parking is to be provided, please provide the number of spaces in the TIS.

Once responses to the above comments are received from the applicant, a full assessment of project related impacts will be completed. Additional substantive comments may be provided as a result of that assessment.

RECOMMENDATIONS

At the July 15, 2021 Planning Board Meeting, we recommend that the Planning Board allow the Applicant to present the latest plans for the Proposed Project; provide a walkthrough of the EAF Part 3 organization/structure; and discuss Planning Board and consultant comments on the initial completeness review of the FEAF Part 3 as it relates to the Scope Outline agreed to by the Applicant.