APPENDIX A

SEQRA DOCUMENTS

Part 1 Environmental Assessment Form

Hudson Valley Wine Village, Inc.

Blue Point Conservation Development District

NYS Route 9W

Town of Lloyd

Ulster County, New York

July 19, 2011

THE Chazen COMPANIES

Prepared for:
Hudson Valley Wine Village, Inc.
17 East 74th Street
New York, New York 10021

Part 1 Environmental Assessment Form

Hudson Valley Wine Village, Inc.

Blue Point Conservation Development District

NYS Route 9W

Town of Lloyd

Ulster County, New York

July 19, 2011

THE Chazen COMPANIES

Prepared by:

The Dutchess County Office
The Chazen Companies
21 Fox Street
Poughkeepsie, New York 12601

Dutchess County
(845) 454-3980

Capital District
(518) 273-0055

North Country
(518) 812-0513

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

The proposed action is a zoning amendment to the Town of Lloyd Zoning Map to provide for a Tourism/Recreational Resort Floating District (hereafter the TRR-F District) on a portion of the property in the area of the existing Hudson Valley Wine Village (HVWV) buildings at the end of Blue Point Road, a Light Industrial District along Route 9W and a Planned Residential District in certain other portions of the HVWV property. These areas are presently zoned R-1 and R-2. A large portion of the HVWV property that is presently zoned as R-2 will remain under that zoning designation.

The applicant also petitions the Board to create a zoning overlay district that will be imposed over the areas to be rezoned and the R-2 district area to maintain continuity between all of the areas that are subject to this application. The overlay district will also allow important Hudson River Bluff areas to be conserved while allowing HVWV to use credit for that open space in other areas of the project.

Subsequent to the rezoning amendment, the proposed action includes the subdivision and site plan approval of mixed use development. The development will encompass an integrated plan that includes a conference center, residential, retail, office and light manufacturing uses, and public recreational facilities. For the purposes of this EAF, the development is assumed to consist of a maximum of 950 residential units, 50,000 SF of commercial and office space, 400,000 SF of light industrial/manufacturing/institutional space, a conference center and 90 room suite hotel.

PART 1
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM

The Chazen Companies
July 19, 2011

617.20
Appendix A
State Environmental Quality Review
FULL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM

Purpose: The full EAF is designed to help applicants and agencies determine, in an orderly manner, whether a project or action may be significant. The question of whether an action may be significant is not always easy to answer. Frequently, there are aspects of a project that are subjective or unmeasureable. It is also understood that those who determine significance may have little or no formal knowledge of the environment or may not be technically expert in environmental analysis. In addition, many who have knowledge in one particular area may not be aware of the broader concerns affecting the question of significance.

The full EAF is intended to provide a method whereby applicants and agencies can be assured that the determination process has been orderly, comprehensive in nature, yet flexible enough to allow introduction of information to fit a project or action.

Full EAF Components: The full EAF is comprised of three parts:

Part 1: Provides objective data and information about a given project and its site. By identifying basic project data, it assists a reviewer in the analysis that takes place in Parts 2 and 3.

Part 2: Focuses on identifying the range of possible impacts that may occur from a project or action. It provides guidance as to whether an impact is likely to be considered small to moderate or whether it is a potentially large impact. The form also identifies whether an impact can be mitigated or reduced.

Part 3: If any impact in Part 2 is identified as potentially large, then Part 3 is used to evaluate whether or not the impact is actually important.

THIS AREA FOR LEAD AGENCY USE ONLY
DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE - Type 1 and Unlisted Actions

Identify the Portions of EAF completed for this project: ■ Part 1 ☐ Part 2 ☐ Part 3

Upon review of the information recorded on this EAF (Parts 1 and 2 and 3 if appropriate), and any other supporting information, and considering both the magnitude and importance of each impact, it is reasonable determined by the lead agency that:

☐ A. The project will not result in any large and important impact(s) and, therefore, is one which will not have a significant impact on the environment, therefore **a negative declaration will be prepared.**

☐ B. Although the project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect for this Unlisted Action because the mitigation measures described in PART 3 have been required, therefore **a CONDITIONED negative declaration will be prepared.***

☐ C. The project may result in one or more large and important impacts that may have a significant impact on the environment, therefore **a positive declaration will be prepared.**

*A Conditioned Negative Declaration is only valid for Unlisted Actions.

Blue Point Conservation Development District
Name of Action

Town of Lloyd Town Board
Name of Lead Agency

Raymond Costantino
Print or Type Name of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency

Town Supervisor
Title of Responsible Officer

Signature of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency

Signature of Preparer (if different from responsible officer)

Date

PART 1 - PROJECT INFORMATION
Prepared by Project Sponsor

NOTICE: This document is designed to assist in determining whether the action proposed may have a significant effect on the environment. Please complete the entire form, Parts A through E. Answers to these questions will be considered as part of the application for approval and may be subject to further verification and public review. Provide any additional information you believe will be needed to complete Parts 2 and 3.

It is expected that completion of the full EAF will be dependent on information currently available and will not involve new studies, research or investigation. If information requiring such additional work is unavailable, so indicate and specify each instance.

NAME OF ACTION	Blue Point Conservation Development District		
LOCATION OF ACTION	NYS Route 9W & Blue Point Road		
NAME OF APPLICANT/SPONSOR	Hudson Valley Wine Village, Inc. c/o Andrew Maxon	BUSINESS TELEPHONE (203) 325-3310	
ADDRESS	34 Highline Trail South		
CITY/PO	Stamford	STATE CT	ZIP CODE 06902
NAME OF OWNER (if different) Same as Applicant		BUSINESS TELEPHONE	
ADDRESS			
CITY/PO		STATE	ZIP CODE
DESCRIPTION OF ACTION	*See Introduction*		

PLEASE COMPLETE EACH QUESTION - INDICATE N/A IF NOT APPLICABLE.

A. SITE DESCRIPTION

Physical setting of overall project, both developed and undeveloped areas.

1. Present Land Use: ☐ Urban ☐ Industrial ☐ Commercial ☒ Residential ☒ Rural (non-farm) ☒ Forest ☐ Agricultural ☐ Other: _____

2. Total acreage of project area: 428.53± acres[1]

APPROXIMATE ACREAGE	PRESENTLY[2]	AFTER COMPLETION*
Meadow or Brushland (Non-Agricultural)	51.0± acres	_____ acres
Forested	315.0± acres	_____ acres
Agricultural (includes orchards, cropland, pasture, etc.)	22.3± acres	_____ acres
Wetland (freshwater or tidal as per Articles 24, 25 of ECL)	36.0± acres	_____ acres
Water Surface Area	2.0± acres	_____ acres
Unvegetated (rock, earth fill, gravel)	_____ acres	_____ acres
Roads, buildings and other paved surfaces	2.2± acres	_____ acres
Other (Indicate type: lawn/landscaped/overgrown)	_____ acres	_____ acres

**To Be Determined (TBD) in SEQRA process*

3. What is predominant soil type(s) on project site: Bath-Nassau-Rock outcrop complex (BOD), Bath-Nassau-Rock (BnC), Mardin-Nassau complex (MgB), Nassau-Bath-Rock outcrop complex (NBF), Volusia very stony soils (VSB), Lyons-Atherton complex (LY)

   a. Soil drainage: ☒ Well drained 92±% of site ☒ Moderately well drained 5±% of site ☒ Poorly drained 3±% of site

b. If any agricultural land is involved, how many acres of soil are classified within soil group 1 through 4 of the NYS Land Classification System? There are no 1 through 4 soil groups present of the site (see 1 NYCRR 370).

4. Are there bedrock outcroppings on project site? ☒ Yes ☐ No
   a. What is depth to bedrock? varies from 0 to greater than 78 inches

5. Approximate percentage of proposed project site with slopes: ☒ 0-10% 52±% ☒ 10-15% 17±% ☒ 15% or greater 31±%

6. Is project substantially contiguous to or contain a building site, or district, listed on the State or National Registers of Historic Places? ☐ Yes ☒ No[3]

7. Is project substantially contiguous to a site listed on the Register of National Natural Landmarks? ☐ Yes ☒ No[4]

8. What is the depth of the water table? varies from 0 to greater than 78 inches

9. Is site located over a primary, principal, or sole source aquifer? ☐ Yes ☒ No[5]

10. Do hunting, fishing or shell fishing opportunities presently exist in the project area? ☒ Yes ☐ No

11. Does project site contain any species of plant or animal life that is identified as threatened or endangered? ☐ Yes ☒ No
    According to site specific natural resources survey/assessment performed by Mike Nowicki, Ecological Solutions

12. Are there any unique or unusual land forms on the project site? (i.e. cliffs, dunes, or other geological formations) ☒ Yes ☐ No[6]

13. Is the project site presently used by the community or neighborhood as an open space or recreation area? If yes, explain: _____ ☐ Yes ☒ No

14. Does the present site include scenic views known to be important to the community? ☒ Yes ☐ No[7]

15. Streams within or contiguous to the project area: Yes[8]
    a. Name of Stream and name of River to which it is tributary: Hudson River and Unnamed tributaries and/or sub tributaries of Hudson River

16. Lakes, ponds, wetland areas within or contiguous to project area: Yes[9]
    a. Name: (NWI) wetlands b. Size (in acres): scattered wetlands that total 35.7 acres± acres

17. Is the site served by existing public utilities? Yes ☒ No
    a. If Yes, does sufficient capacity exist to allow connection? ☐ Yes ☐ No
    b. If Yes, will improvements be necessary to allow connection? ☐ Yes ☐ No

18. Is the site located in an agricultural district certified pursuant to Agriculture and Markets Law 25-AA, Section 303 and 304? ☒ Yes[10] ☐ No

19. Is the site located in or substantially contiguous to a Critical Environmental Area designated pursuant to Article 8 of the ECL, and 6 NYCRR 617? ☐ Yes ☒ No[11]

20. Has the site ever been used for the disposal of solid or hazardous waste? ☐ Yes ☒ No[12]

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1. Physical dimensions and scale of project (fill in dimensions as appropriate)
   a. Total contiguous acreage owned or controlled by project sponsor 428.53± acres
   b. Project acreage to be developed: 33.74± acres initially; TBD± acres ultimately.
   c. Project acreage to remain undeveloped: TBD± acres.
   d. Length of project in miles: N/A (if appropriate).
   e. If the project is an expansion, indicate percent of expansion proposed: N/A%.
   f. Number of off-street parking spaces existing: undetermined proposed: to be determined
   g. Maximum vehicular trips generated per hour: 1,356± at maximum assumed buildout[13] *Weekday P.M. peak.*
   h. If residential, number and type of housing units: TBD (not to exceed 950 units)

	One Family	Two Family	Multiple Family	Condominium
Initially	_____	_____	_____	_____
Ultimately	_____	_____	_____	_____

i. Dimensions (in feet) of largest proposed structure: 45' height; TBD± ft width; TBD± ft length[14]

j. Linear feet of frontage along a public thoroughfare project will occupy is: 3,600± feet[15]

2. How much natural material (i.e. rock, earth, etc.) will be removed from the site? TBD cubic yards.

3. Will disturbed areas be reclaimed? ☒Yes ☐No
   a. If Yes, for what intended purpose is site being reclaimed? use on site
   b. Will topsoil be stockpiled for reclamation? ☒Yes ☐No
   c. Will upper subsoil be stockpiled for reclamation? ☒Yes ☐No

4. How many acres of vegetation (trees, shrubs, groundcover) will be removed from site? TBD acres.

5. Will any mature forest (over 100 years old) or other locally important vegetation be removed from site? ☐Yes ☒No

6. If single-phase project, anticipated period of construction: N/A months (including demolition).

7. If multi-phased: TBD ~~months~~
   a. Total number of phases anticipated: TBD (number).
   b. Anticipated date of commencement of phase one: 2013 ~~month~~, year.
   c. Approximate completion date of final phase: 2033 ~~month~~, year.
   d. Is phase one functionally dependent on subsequent phases? ☐Yes ☒No

8. Will blasting occur during construction? ☒Yes[16] ☐No

9. Number of jobs generated - during construction: 805±[17]; after project is complete: up to 1,174±[18]

10. Number of jobs eliminated by this project: 0

11. Will project require relocation of any projects or facilities? ☐Yes ☒No
    If Yes, explain: _____

12. Is surface liquid waste disposal involved? ☒Yes[19] ☐ No
    a. If Yes, indicate type of waste (sewage, industrial, etc.) and amount: sanitary sewage 365,315± at maximum assumed buildout
       Name of water body into which effluent will be discharged: The Hudson River following treatment at a proposed on-site WWTP

13. Is subsurface liquid waste disposal involved? ☐Yes ☒No

14. Will surface area of an existing body of water increase or decrease by proposal? ☐Yes ☒No
    If Yes, explain:

15. Is project or any portion of project located in a 100-year floodplain? ☒Yes[20] ☐No

16. Will project generate solid waste? ☒Yes ☐No
    a. If Yes, what is the amount per month? 186.9± tons at maximum assumed buildout[21]
    b. If Yes, will an existing solid waste facility be used? ☒Yes ☐No
    c. If Yes, give name UC Resource Recovery Agency; location: Lloyd Transfer Station or other approved facility
    d. Will any wastes not go into a sewage disposal system or into a sanitary landfill? ☒Yes ☐No
       If Yes, explain: recyclables

17. Will project involve the disposal of solid waste? ☐Yes ☒No
    a. If Yes, what is the anticipated rate of disposal? _____ tons/month
    b. If Yes, what is the anticipated site life? _____ Years

18. Will project use herbicides and pesticides? ☒Yes[22] ☐No

19. Will project routinely produce odors (more than one hour per day)? ☐Yes ☒No

20. Will project produce operating noise exceeding the local ambient noise levels? ☐ Yes ☒ No [23]

21. Will project result in an increase in energy use? ☒ Yes ☐ No
If Yes, indicate type(s): electricity and fuel for heating, lighting, air conditioning, & equipment operation

22. If water supply is from wells, indicate pumping capacity: N/A gallons/minute

23. Total anticipated water usage per day: 365,315± gpd average at maximum assumed buildout[19]

24. Does project involve Local, State or Federal funding? ☐ Yes ☒ No

25. **Approvals Required:**

			Type	Submittal Date
~~City~~, Town, ~~Village~~, Board	☒ Yes	☐ No	Rezoning	July 2011
	☒ Yes	☐ No	Comprehensive Plan Amendment	
	☒ Yes	☐ No	Special Use Permit	
	☒ Yes	☐ No	Water District Extension	
	☒ Yes	☐ No	Sewer District Creation	
	☒ Yes	☐ No	Transportation Coporation	
~~City~~, Town, ~~Village~~, Planning Board	☒ Yes	☐ No	Advisory opinion on zoning changes	
	☒ Yes	☐ No	Costal Zone Consistency Review	
	☒ Yes	☐ No	Site Plan; Subdivision	
~~City~~, Town Zoning Board	☐ Yes	☒ No		
Other Local Agencies	☒ Yes	☐ No	Local Highway Superintendent: Consent to Transportation Corporation for the Waste Water Treatment Plant	
~~City~~, County Health Department	☒ Yes	☐ No	Approval of water and wastewater plans	
Other Regional Agencies (County Funding)	☒ Yes	☐ No	TBD	
Other Regional Agencies (County Planning)	☒ Yes	☐ No	GML 239m/n review	
State Agencies (NYSDEC)	☒ Yes	☐ No	GP-0-10-001 General SPDES Permit	
			SPEDS for wastewater discharge	
			Water and sewer district extension	
			WWTP; STP design	
			Section 401 Water Quality Certification	
State Agencies (NYSDOH)	☒ Yes	☐ No	water distribution system and sewer approval	
State Agencies (NYSDOT)	☒ Yes	☐ No	Highway Work Permit (utility & nonutility)	
			Approval of improvements to Rt. 9W	
State Agencies (NYSDOS)	☒ Yes	☐ No	Costal Consistency Review	
State Agencies (OPRHP)	☒ Yes	☐ No	Consultation with state agencies with permit authority regarding historic and archaeological resources	
Federal Agencies (USACOE)	☒ Yes	☐ No	Section 404 Clean Water Act wetlands permit	
Federal Agencies (USFWS)	☒ Yes	☐ No	Consultation regarding ETR species	
			Federal Fish and Wildlife consultation	

C. ZONING AND PLANNING INFORMATION

1. Does proposed action involve a planning or zoning decision? ☒ Yes ☐ No
If Yes, indicate decision required:
☒ zoning amendment ☐ zoning variance ☒ special use permit ☒ subdivision ☒ site plan
☒ new/revision of master plan ☐ resource management plan ☐ other

2. What is the zoning classification(s) of the site? Single-Family Residence, 1 Acre (R-1) and Single-Family Residence, 2 acre (R-2)

3. What is the maximum potential development of the site if developed as permitted by the present zoning?
244 Residential units.[24]

4. What is the proposed zoning of the site? See Introduction

5. What is the maximum potential development of the site if developed as permitted by the proposed zoning? See project description for maximum assumed build-out

6. Is the proposed action consistent with the recommended uses in adopted local land use plans? ☐Yes ☐No
   To be assessed in SEQRA process

7. What are the predominant land uses and zoning classifications within one-quarter mile?
   Uses: Agriculture (A); Single-Family Residence, 1 Acre (R-1); Single-Family Residence, 2 acre (R-2);LB; Planned Unit Development

8. Is the proposed action compatible with adjoining/surrounding land uses within a quarter mile? ☒Yes ☐No

9. If the proposed action is a subdivision of land, how many lots are proposed? TBD
   What is the minimum lot size proposed? TBD

10. Will proposed action require any authorization(s) for the formation of sewer or water districts? ☒Yes[25] ☐
    No

11. Will proposed action create a demand for any community provided services (recreation, education, police, fire protection)? ☒Yes ☐No
    a. If Yes, is existing capacity sufficient to handle projected demand? TBD ☐Yes ☐No

12. Will proposed action result in the generation of traffic significantly above present levels? ☒Yes ☐No
    a. If yes, is the existing road network adequate to handle the additional traffic? ☒Yes[26] ☐No

D. INFORMATION DETAILS

Attach any additional information as may be needed to clarify your project. If there are or may be any adverse impacts associated with your proposal, please discuss such impacts and the measures which you propose to mitigate or avoid them.

E. VERIFICATION

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

Applicant/Sponsor Name: Andrew Maxon Date: July 19, 2011

Signature: Andrew Maxon Title: 7/26/2011

If the action is in the Coastal Area, and you are a state agency, complete the Coastal Assessment Form before proceeding with this assessment. Attach form to this document.

ENDNOTES

[1] Represents the total project area which consists of two tax parcels identified as 96.3-1-18 (±4.2 acres), 96.3-1-28 (±1.0 acres), 96.3-1-29.100 (±8.1 acres), 96.3-2-5 (±1.2 acres), 96.3-2-8 (±301.7 acres), and parcel 96.3-2-9 (±99.7 acres), and 96.3-2-21 (±4.7 acres) on the Town of Lloyd Tax Map.

[2] Land coverage was derived from USGS National Land Cover Database 2001 Land Cover Version 2.0 GIS layer. Note that this data is derived and depicted at a large geospatial scale. As such, site-specific accuracy is limited. More accurate land coverage information will be developed during subsequent phase of the environmental review process.

[3] According to the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (NYSOPRPH) website (http://www.nysparks.state.ny.us/ shpo/online-tools/), the project site is not substantially contiguous to nor does it contain a building site, or district, listed on the State Register of Historic Places. A small area along the Hudson River is located within an archaeologically sensitive area.

[4] According to the National Park Service website (http://www1.nature.nps.gov/nnl/registry/usa_map/index.cfm).

[5] According to the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) Division of Water Technical and Operational Guidance, Series (2.1.3), *Primary and Principle Aquifer Determinations*, Table 1, 1990, the *Atlas of Eleven Selected Aquifers in New York,* U.S. Geological Survey in cooperation with the NYS Department of Health, 1982, and the EPA website (www.epa.gov/region02/water/aquifer/).

[6] The site includes exposed ledge and cliffs along the Hudson River.

[7] According to the NYSDOS website, a majority of the site is located within Esopus/Lloyd Scenic Area of Statewide Significance (http://nyswaterfronts.com/SASS/SASS_Index.htm).

[8] According to secondary source NYSDEC GIS Data the project site contains portions of a NYSDEC regulated streams that is a minor tributary to the Hudson River (PWL ID: 1301-0194).

[9] According to a wetland delineation that was completed on the site by Crawford and Associates Engineering in April 2009. Ecological Solutions, LLC has since field checked the delineated wetlands on this property and obtained the Jurisdictional Determination for the Applicant from the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE.) The delineation was completed in accordance with the Routine Delineation Method outlined in the *US Army Corps of Engineers* (USACE) *Wetlands Delineation Manual, Technical Report Y-87-12* and NYSDEC Article 24 Freshwater Wetland regulations. The NYSDEC also reviewed the wetlands on the property and verified that there are no potential State jurisdictional wetlands on the property.

[10] According to the map entitled *Ulster County Agricultural Districts dated April 12, 2007, prepared by the Ulster County Planning Department*, the site is located within the Ulster County Agricultural District 1.

[11] According to the list of Critical Environmental Areas on the NYSDEC website (http://www.dec.ny.gov/permits/25157.html).

[12] According to the remediation database on the NYSDEC website (http://www.dec.ny.gov/chemical/8437.html).

[13] The following table provides traffic generation estimates based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) *Trip Generation Report,* 8th Edition, 2008.

Project Component	ITE Land Use Code	ITE Trip Generation Rate	Trip Generation
Residential Units (950 Units)	Base on a mix of residential housing types/use	0.62-1.01 vtes per dwelling unit	601
Commercial/Office Space (50,000 SF)	Based on a mix of commercial and office uses	1.49-2.71 vte's per 1,000 SF GFA	109
Light Industrial/Manufacturing/ Institutional Space (400,000)	Based on a mix of light industrial/manufacturing/ institutional uses	0.97-2.33 vte's per 1,000 SF GFA	593
Hotel (90 Rooms)	310 – Hotel	0.70 vte's per occupied room	53
TOTAL:			**1,356**

A Traffic Impact Study will be prepared by John Collins Engineering, P.C., to further analyze impacts from traffic generated by the proposed project.

[14] The figure represents the proposed height of the tallest structure.

[15] Represents the total linear road frontage along Bluepoint Road and Route 9W, which includes 2,600± linear feet along Bluepoint Road and 1,800± linear feet along Route 9W.

[16] Blasting may be required where there is shallow depth to bedrock. Any rock that is encountered during construction will be removed by mechanical methods (i.e. ripping) when possible. However, if found to be necessary, blasting will be performed in accordance with all Federal, State and local regulations.

[17] Based on Burchell, Robert W., David Listokin, et. al. *Development Assessment Impact Handbook*, Exhibit 7.2, *Computation of Economic Impact*, Washington D.C.: ULI-the Urban Land Institute, 1994, which estimates 9.2 labor hours per $1,000 of construction, and an estimated construction cost of $175,000,000±, the proposed project is expected to generate

approximately 805 construction jobs. This represents the number of construction jobs that will be generated over the life of the construction, which is expected to extend approximately 20 years.

18 The following table provides a breakdown of the estimated number of employees for each component of the proposed project, according to the *Planner's Estimating Guide, Projecting Land-Use and Facility Needs*, by Arthur C. Nelson, FAICP, American Planning Association, 2004. Note that hotel calculations are based on South Florida Regional Planning Council, Fiscal Impact Analysis Model (http://www.sfrpc.com/fiam.htm).

Project Component	Estimate for Number of Employees	Estimated # of Employees
Residential Units (950)	NA	0
Commercial/Office Space (50,000 SF)	1 employee per 280-510 SF of space	138
Light Industrial/Manufacturing/ Institutional Space (400,000)	1 employee per 280-550 SF of space	991
Hotel (90 Rooms)	0.5 employees per room	45
TOTAL:		**1,174**

19 The following table provides estimated water usage/wastewater generation for each project component according to the *Development Impact Assessment Handbook,* Urban Land Institute, 1994, and the NYSDEC *Designs Standards for Wastewater Treatment Works*, 1988. For residential populations, projections were based Rutgers University, Center for Urban Policy Research, *Residential Demographic Multipliers*, 2006.

Project Component	Estimate for Water Usage/Wastewater Generation in gallons per day (gpd)	Water Usage/ Wastewater Generation (gpd)
Residential Units (950 – 2,695 residents)*	100 gpd per capita for single family units	269,547± gpd
Commercial/Office Space (50,000 SF)	93-106 gpd per 1,000 SF of retail space	4,975± gpd
Light Industrial/Manufacturing/ Institutional Space (400,000)	93-150 gpd per 1,000 SF of retail space	82,132± gpd
Hotel (90 Rooms)	96 gpd per room	8,640± gpd
TOTAL:		365,294± gpd
* Population projects are based on an assumed housing mix of 1-3 bedroom units.		

20 According to FEMA information obtained through GIS data, a narrow undevelopable portion of the site located along the Hudson River is within a 100-year floodplain.

21 The following table provides estimated solid waste generation for each project component according to the *Development Impact Assessment Handbook,* Urban Land Institute, 1994.

Project Component*	Rate for Estimate of Solid Waste Generation (tons per day)	Estimated Solid Waste Generation (tons per day)
Residential Units (2,695 residents)*	0.00175 tons per resident per day for residential use	4.72±
Commercial/Office Space (138 employees)	0.001 tons per employee per day for a mix of commercial/office uses	0.14
Light Industrial/Manufacturing/ Institutional Space (400,000)	0.001-0.00138 tons per employee per day for light industrial/manufacturing/institutional uses	1.17
Hotel (90 Rooms & 45 employees)***	0.00175 tons per resident (room) per day for residential use & 0.001 tons per employee per day for office use	0.20
TOTAL:		**6.23± tons per day or 186.9± tons per month**

* Please refer to Endnote #19 for calculation of estimated number of employees and to Endnote #20 for calculation of estimated number of residents.

***The reference does not include an estimate specifically for hotels; therefore, "residential" estimates were used for the number rooms and "office" estimates were used for the number of employees.

22 Minimal amounts of herbicides and pesticides may be used in accordance with manufacture's recommendation for landscaping/lawn care and/or gardening.

23 Noise which exceeds the local ambient noise levels may occur during construction activities.

24 Approximately ±312 acres of the site are located within the Town's Single-Family Residence, two acre (R-2) Zoning District. Approximately ±88 acres, extending approximately ±0.25 miles from the Route 9W frontage, are located in the Single-Family Residence, one acre (R-1) Zoning District.

25 The project will require the extension of municipal water services, which will require a district extension. The project will include the development of an on-site Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP), which will require the creation of a sewage works service area or a new sewer district. These utilities may be deeded over to the Town if necessary and/or desired.

26 With improvements to be determined during SEQRA process.

TOWN OF LLOYD TOWN BOARD
NOTICE OF DESIGNATION OF LEAD AGENCY
and
NOTICE OF DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE
(Positive Declaration)
for
HUDSON VALLEY WINERY PROJECT

Please take notice that, according to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQRA") and its regulations at 6 NYCRR Part 617, the Town of Lloyd Town Board has declared itself lead agency for the purposes of review of the project named below and shall follow the provisions of SEQRA governing determination of significance of the proposed action.

Action: Issuance of a Positive Declaration

Potential Significant Environmental Effects have been identified and the Town of Lloyd Town Board, in accordance with 6 NYCRR Part 617.7, and following review of the application and a Full Environmental Assessment Form ("EAF") Parts I, II and III, has determined that a Positive Declaration of Environmental Impact shall be issued and a Generic Environmental Impact Statement shall be prepared by the Applicant. The potential significant environmental effects identified are: a visual impact on the Hudson River and nearby important historic areas; an impact on downstream storm water systems caused by the alteration of drainage flow or patterns; increased erosion and sedimentation; increased traffic and the need for the design and development of on-site new public and private roadways as well as potential off-site improvements such as turning lanes; a change in community character and density of land use beyond that provided for in the Town's Comprehensive Plan and Existing Zoning Code; increased demand for community services, such as sewage collection and treatment and the provision and distribution of potable water; grading and clearing; and an impact on the existing ecology and vegetative cover, including natural resources such as wetlands and wildlife habitat. The project will permanently affect aesthetic resources in the community because it will alter the landscape along 9W and the Hudson River. The project is also located in close proximity to the Franny Reese State Park and the Walkway over the Hudson. The project will affect the community energy supply by extending energy transmission to serve a major residential and commercial use.

Contact Person: Raymond Costantino, Supervisor

Address: Town of Lloyd Town Board
12 Church Street
Highland, NY 12528

Name of Project: Hudson Valley Winery Project

Location:

Tax Map Parcel: Tax map parcels 96.3-1-18, 96.3-1-29.100, 96.3-2-5, 96.3-2-8, 96.3-2-9, 96.3-2-21 and 96.3-1-28 consisting of +/- 422 acres of land

Project Description: The project is for a mixed-use development consisting of single and multi-family residences, resort hotel, commercial office and light industrial uses and will require rezoning in whole or in part by the Town Board of the Town of Lloyd. The Town of Lloyd Planning Board will review the project for subdivision, site plan and potentially the issuance of special use permits. The project, i.e. rezoning, may affect the entire +/- 422 acres or a portion thereof. Sewer and water service will need to be provided to the property and the Town's Sewer and Water Districts will need to be extended if the project is approved, or new water and sewer districts will need to be created. The overall project master plan will address the future development density of the property as well as the placement of any public or private roadways and utilities.

Scoping Session: Public scoping will take place for the project and a notice of public scoping will be issued by the Town Board upon receipt of a draft scope for the Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("DGEIS") addressing the Town Engineers' comments.

SEQRA Status: Type 1, coordinated

Date of Action: _____

Date of Mailing: _____

<u>Involved Agencies:</u>

Town of Lloyd Planning Board
12 Church Street
Highland, NY 12528

Ulster County Health Department
300 Flatbush Avenue
Kingston, New York 12401-2740

New York State Department of Transportation
4 Burnett Blvd.
Poughkeepsie, New York 12603

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
21 South Putt Corners Road
New Paltz, New York 12561
New York State Office of Parks Recreation and Historic Preservation
Peebles island State Park
10 Delaware Avenue
Cohoes, New York 12047

New York State Department of State Division of Coastal Resources
99 Washington Avenue – Suite 1010
Albany, New York 12231-0001

Interested Agencies/Parties:

Highland Fire District
25 Milton Avenue
Highland, NY 12528-1409

Highland Central School District
320 Pancake Hollow Road
Highland, NY 12528

Ulster County Planning Department
244 Fair Street
P.O. Box 1800
Kingston, NY 12402

US Army Corps of Engineers
Jacob K. Javits Federal Building
26 Federal Plaza, Room 2109
New York, New York 10278-0090

For Publication and Filing:

New York State DEC, Environmental Notice Bulletin (ENB)
625 Broadway, 4th Floor
Albany, New York 12233

Ulster County Industrial Development Agency
5 Development Court
Kingston, NY 12401

RESOLUTION
TOWN OF LLOYD TOWN BOARD

PROJECT NAME:	HUDSON VALLEY WINE VILLAGE PROJECT
PROJECT LOCATION:	VACANT LAND AND BUILDINGS ON THE EAST SIDE OF ROUTE 9W SOUTH OF THE MID-HUDSON BRIDGE ALONG THE HUDSON RIVER
PARCEL IDENTIFIED AS:	TAX MAP PARCELS 96.3-1-18, 96.3-1-29.100, 96.3-2-5, 96.3-2-8, 96.3-2-9, 96.3-2-21, and 96.3-1-28 CONSISTING OF +/- 422 ACRES OF LAND
SEQR TYPE:	TYPE I
APPLICATION DESCRIPTION:	CONFIRMATION OF LEAD AGENCY STATUS AND ISSUANCE OF A POSITIVE DECLARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE REQUIRING THE PREPARATION OF A DRAFT GENERIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE REVIEW OF THE REQUEST FOR REZONING FOR THE PROJECT.

~~~~~~

At a meeting of the Town of Lloyd Town Board held at the Town of Lloyd Town Hall, 12 Church Street, Highland, New York 12528 on September 7, 2011 at 7:30p.m., there were Board members:

	Present	Absent
Supervisor Raymond J. Costantino	__________	__________
Nancy E. Hammond	__________	__________
Herbert Litts III	__________	__________
Kevin Brennie	__________	__________
Jeffrey Paladino	__________	__________

~~~~~~

The following resolution was moved by: ___________________________

Seconded by: ______________________________________

WHEREAS, an application has been made to the Town Board of the Town of Lloyd to rezone property comprising +/- 422 acres for the development of the Hudson Valley Wine Village Project; and

WHEREAS, the HVWP will comprise single and multifamily residential, resort hotel, commercial office and light industrial uses; and

WHEREAS, applications will be made to the Town Board regarding the sewer and water approvals for the project, including but not limited to, the extension and/or creation of the sewer and water districts as necessary to service the proposed project; and

WHEREAS, the Proposed Action is subject to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), and is classified as a Type I Action; and

WHEREAS, given that the Town Board must determine whether and how to rezone the property, it would be most appropriate for the Town Board to assume SEQRA lead agency status; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant has requested that it be directed to prepare a Generic Environmental Impact Statement; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board declared its intent to be SEQRA Lead Agency for the review of the Proposed Action, a Type I action pursuant to SEQRA and undertook the necessary steps to coordinate with all involved agencies as required by SEQRA including circulating the notice of intent to act as lead agency to all involved agencies; and

WHEREAS, all the involved agencies either consented to the Town Board becoming lead agency or failed to respond within the thirty day timeframe provided for in SEQRA; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT

1. The Town Board is hereby SEQRA lead agency for the environmental review of the project;
2. The Town Board having reviewed the full EAF Parts I, II and III hereby issues the attached positive declaration finding that after reviewing the criteria in Section 617.7(c), implementation of the action as proposed may have a significant adverse impact on the environment and given the nature of the project and the size of the property that a generic environmental impact statement will be required (please see attached notice of positive declaration fully incorporated herein);
3. The Town Board also hereby finds that public scoping will be conducted pursuant to Section 617.8(f) and a notice of public scoping providing for public review and comment will be issued when the draft scoping document prepared by the applicant has been revised pursuant to the suggestions of the Town consulting engineers;
4. The Town Board directs that all SEQRA documents for the project be posted on the Town website including the Notice of Positive Declaration and the full EAF Parts I, II and III; and
5. The Town Board further directs that a copy of this resolution, the full EAF Parts I, II and III, and the Notice of Positive Declaration be provided to all involved and interested agencies as well as the applicant and that all the publication, notice and filing requirements of SEQRA be complied with by the Town Clerk.

Roll Call Vote:

	Yes	No	Abstain
Supervisor Raymond J. Costantino	___	___	___
Nancy E. Hammond	___	___	___
Herbert Litts III	___	___	___
Kevin Brennie	___	___	___
Jeffrey Paladino	___	___	___

RESULTS OF THE VOTE ON THE ABOVE RESOLUTION WERE:

VOTE IS CERTIFIED BY:

_____ _____

Rosaria Peplow, Town Clerk Date

THE RESOLUTION IS HEREBY APPROVED AND ORDERED TO THE RECORD BY

_____ _____

Raymond Costantino, T/Lloyd Supervisor Date

Involved Agencies:

Town of Lloyd Planning Board
12 Church Street
Highland, New York 12528

Ulster County Health Department
300 Flatbush Avenue
Kingston, New York 12401-2740

New York State Department of Transportation
4 Burnett Blvd.
Poughkeepsie, New York 12603

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
21 South Putt Corners Road
New Paltz, New York 12561

New York State Office of Parks Recreation and Historic Preservation
Peebles Island State Park
10 Delaware Avenue
Cohoes, New York 12047

New York State Department of State
Division of Coastal Resources
99 Washington Avenue – Suite 1010
Albany, New York 12231-0001

Interested Agencies/Parties:

Highland Fire District
25 Milton Avenue
Highland, New York 12528-1409

Highland Central School District
320 Pancake Hollow Road
Highland, New York 12528

Ulster County Planning Department
244 Fair Street
P.O. Box 1800
Kingston, New York 12402

New York State DEC, ENB
625 Broadway, 4th Floor
Albany, New York 12233

US Army Corps of Engineers
Jacob K. Javits Federal Building
26 Federal Plaza, Room 2109
New York, New York 10278-0090

The ENB SEQRA Notice Publication Form – *Please check all that apply*

Deadline: Notices must be received by **6 p.m. Wednesday** to appear in the following Wednesday's ENB

_____ Negative Declaration - Type 1

_____ Conditioned Negative Declaration

_____ Draft Negative Declaration

x Positive Declaration
x with Public Scoping Session

_____ Draft EIS
_____ with Public Hearing
_____ Generic
_____ Supplemental

_____ Final EIS
_____ Generic
_____ Supplemental

DEC Region # 3 County: Ulster Lead Agency: Town of Lloyd Town Board

Project Title: Hudson Valley Winery Project

Brief Project Description: The action involves…

The Town of Lloyd Town Board has declared itself SEQRA lead agency for the review of this Type I action, the Hudson Valley Winery Project, and has determined that the project may involve at least one significant adverse environmental impact and, therefore, a draft generic environmental impact statement (DGEIS) will be prepared.

The project is for a mixed-use development consisting of single and multi-family residences, resort hotel, commercial office and light industrial uses and will require rezoning in whole or in part by the Town Board of the Town of Lloyd. The Town of Lloyd Planning Board will review the project for subdivision, site plan and potentially the issuance of special use permits. The project, i.e. rezoning, may affect the entire +/- 428.53 acres or a portion thereof. Sewer and water service will need to be provided to the property and the Town's Sewer and Water Districts will need to be extended if the project is approved, or new water and sewer districts will need to be created. The overall project master plan will address the future development density of the property as well as the placement of any public or private roadways and utilities.

The Town Board has accepted a draft scope for the DGEIS and will hold a public scoping session at which time all interested persons will be heard. The scoping session will be held on October 12, 2011 at 7:00 PM at the Town of Lloyd Town Hall Meeting Room at 12 Church Street Highland, NY 12528. Written comments will be accepted until October 28, 2011. The draft scope has been posted to the Town website: www.townoflloyd.com and is available at Town Hall.

Project Location: 191-200 Blue Point Road, Town of Lloyd, Ulster County, New York
Tax map parcels: 96.3-1-18, 96.3-1-29.100, 96.3-2-5, 96.3-2-8, 96.3-2-9, 96.3-2-21 and 96.3-1-28

Contact Person: Raymond Costantino, Town Supervisor

Address: 12 Church Street City: Highland State: NY Zip: 12528

Phone: 845-691-2144 Fax: 845-691-7417 Email: RCostantino@townoflloyd.com

---

For Draft Negative Declaration / Draft EIS: Public Comment Period ends: ___/___/___ N/A

For Public ~~Hearing or~~ Scoping Session: Date: 10/12/11 Time: 7:00 ~~am~~/pm

Location: Town of Lloyd Town Hall Meeting Room at 12 Church Street Highland, NY 12528

A hard copy of the DEIS/FEIS is available at the following locations: N/A

The online version of DEIS/FEIS is available at the following publically accessible web site: N/A

For Conditioned Negative Declaration: In summary, conditions include: N/A

FINAL SCOPING DOCUMENT

For the:

Hudson Valley Wine Village Project in the Proposed Blue Point Zoning District

Generic Environmental Impact Statement

Applicant: Hudson Valley Wine Village, Inc.

Project Location:

191-200 Blue Point Road,

Town of Lloyd, Ulster County

Lead Agency:

Lloyd Town Board

Revised December 12, 2011

ADOPTED BY THE TOWN BOARD ON DECEMBER X, 2011

Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement (DGEIS) Scoping Document

Final 12/XX/11

INTRODUCTION

The proposed action involves the rezoning all or part of a 428.53 acre parcel for the development of the Hudson Valley Wine Village (HVWV) project. Future development of the property, which is anticipated to occur over a period of twenty (20) years, is based on an integrated plan that includes the construction of a conference center, residential housing, retail, office, light manufacturing, and public recreation facilities. As noted in Part 1 of the Environmental Assessment Form (EAF), the proposed action will consist of a maximum of 950 residential housing units, 50,000 square feet (SF) of commercial and office space, 50,000 SF of adaptive reuse of existing winery facilities, 400,000 SF of light industrial/manufacturing/institutional space, a conference center, and 90-room capacity suite hotel.

The proposed action will require a zoning amendment to the Town of Lloyd Zoning Map on the portion of the property that includes the terminus of Blue Point Road where buildings associated with the former Hudson Valley Winery are situated. Zoning amendments are also proposed for the creation of a Light Industrial District along Route 9W, and a Multifamily Residential District in other designated areas of the property. These above noted areas of the site are presently zoned as R-1 and R-2, while a large portion of the property that is currently zoned as R-2 will maintain that designation. The proposed action seeks to create a zoning overlay district that will be imposed over the areas to be rezoned and the R-2 district area to maintain continuity between all of the areas that are subject to this application. The overlay district will also allow important Hudson River Bluff areas to be conserved while allowing the other area of the property to receive credit for that area for parkland and open space purposes.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the Scoping Document is to define environmental issues that will be addressed by the project sponsor during preparation of the DGEIS. The Scoping Document is intended to serve as the foundation for the identification of all potentially significant adverse impacts pertinent to the proposed action, and appropriate mitigation measures. It is also intended to eliminate consideration of any impacts that are irrelevant or non-significant.

GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR THE DGEIS

The applicant should closely examine SEQRA regulations for direction on the required content of a DGEIS. The provisions of 6 NYCRR 617.9(b) and 617.10 shall apply to the content of the DGEIS and are incorporated herein by reference. The Applicant will prepare a DGEIS that addresses all items in this Scoping Document. (

The DGEIS will assemble relevant and material facts, evaluate reasonable alternatives, and will be written in plain language that can be easily read and understood by the public. Highly technical material will be summarized and, if it must be included in its entirety, referenced in the DGEIS and included as an Appendix.

The DGEIS will be written in the third person without use of the terms I, we, and our. Narrative discussions will be accompanied to the greatest extent possible by illustrative tables and graphics. All graphics will clearly identify the project area, and footnotes will be used to cite references. All assertions will be supported by evidence, while opinions of the applicant that are unsupported by evidence will be identified as such.

Cover Sheet

The DGEIS will contain a document cover that presents a project title, list of document authors and contacts, the name of the Lead Agency and a contact, the project location, SEQRA status and relevant dates (i.e. date of acceptance by the Lead Agency, date by which comments must be received, date of public hearing and final date of acceptance).

Executive Summary

This section will include a brief description of the overall proposed action, and list the following:

i. significant beneficial and adverse impacts;
ii. mitigation measures proposed;
iii. alternatives considered;
iv. issues of controversy (if any); and
v. matters to be decided, including a listing of each permit or approval required from every involved agency.

This section will also include the following elements:

- Reasons for preparing a GEIS instead of an EIS and a discussion of how the GEIS will be used in future project reviews, including thresholds and conditions that would trigger the need for supplemental determinations of significance or site specific EIS' and a summary of environmental issues which would need to be addressed in any supplemental EIS' prepared after the original generic EIS.
- Description of proposed zoning and comprehensive plan actions
- Discussion of the proposed density of development for the site and accounting for non-buildable portions of the property
- Brief description of proposed project, including necessary public and private improvements and consistency with existing on site and adjacent uses.
- List of required local, County, State and Federal approvals and permits
- List of Involved and Interested agencies
- Summary list of impacts
- Summary list of mitigation measures
- A description and evaluation of the range of reasonable alternatives to the action that are feasible considering the objectives and capabilities of the project sponsor. The description and evaluation of each alternative will be at a level of detail sufficient to permit a comparative assessment of the alternatives discussed. Seven (7) alternatives in addition to the "No-Build" alternative will be discussed.

Table of Contents

The Executive Summary will be followed by a Table of Contents listing document sections, figures, tables, maps, charts and appendices. The appendices will include the scope of and results of the technical studies that are necessary including complete reports with data collected. All pertinent SEQRA documentation shall be included as appendices to the DGEIS, including but not limited to, the Full EAF, Circulation Notice, Positive Declaration of significance, Final Scoping Document, and letters from Involved and Interested Agencies and any non-governmental organizations or members of the public who comment during the scoping process. All correspondence relating to issues addressed in the DGEIS, such as technical studies and reports, shall also be included in the appendices. Particular attention will be paid to comments on the scope of the technical studies provided by agencies such as the NYS Department of Transportation and the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose and Process of the Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement

The purpose of the DGEIS is to evaluate the direct and indirect impacts as well as the potential cumulative impacts, regional influences, and/or secondary effects of the proposed group of actions (i.e. planned development district rezoning, residential development, conference center and manufacturing/commercial park) that constitute the Hudson Valley Winery Village Project, and to provide a record for the subsequent decisions by the Town and to demonstrate that the requirements of SEQRA have been satisfied.

This section will provide a general overview of the SEQRA process. It will further discuss the specific SEQRA process for this project, including an anticipated timeline. It will also discuss the specific purposes of this DGEIS.

1.2 Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action

This section will describe the history and background of the project. It will present the applicant's goals and objectives as well as the socio-economic benefits of the project to the Town of Lloyd and other taxing jurisdictions. It will further discuss the Town's and, in some cases, County's need for the project based on their adopted plans and policies as well as current socio-economic conditions and recent planning initiatives by the County.

The DGEIS will provide a discussion of the types of markets envisioned to be served under the project. It will discuss housing prices and income levels to be served by the project. The form of ownership/management of each project component will be discussed.

1.3 Project Location, Description and Environmental Setting

a. Location

The boundaries of the project site with relation to municipal boundaries will be presented. The limits of overall disturbance will be discussed and illustrated on maps, with emphasis on geographic boundaries and the local and regional context of the site to immediately surrounding areas. A site location map and an aerial photograph of the site and neighboring areas will be prepared to depict the site and surrounding areas.

Vehicle access and local neighborhood transportation routes will be presented, as well as a description of off-site infrastructure serving the site. The site's location with respect to park lands, local historic and archaeological resources, visually

significant viewsheds and important natural and man-made features in the immediate area will be mapped. The document will also identify property ownership, easements, rights-of-way, local restrictions and other legal constraints to developing portions of the project site.

b. Description and Environmental Setting

A description of the site will be provided, including its location on a bluff overlooking the Hudson River, an overview of topography, water resources, soil) and bedrock characteristics, ecological characteristics, proximity to significant natural areas and parklands, and habitat/land cover types. The land use history of the site will be discussed, including its past use as a winery. Current improvements on the site will be described.

1.4 Project Sponsor

This section will describe the project sponsor and its ability to undertake the project.

1.5 Required Approvals

This section will describe the approvals required for the project, including Federal, State and local agency permits and local board actions.

This section will further describe the relationship between the Federal, State and local permitting processes and the SEQRA process.

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 Detailed Description of the Proposed Action

This section will present a description of the project, to include the following:

- The purpose or objective of the action, including any public need for, or public benefits, including social and economic considerations
- The background and history of the action and the site
- Relationship of the action to local, regional and state plans, policies and regulations
- A description of proposed zoning and comprehensive plan amendments, including any amendments to existing zoning district requirements

Generic

- Proposed new zoning code language for the proposed zoning changes for the project.

Generic

- A conceptual site plan illustrating conceptual building and lot layouts sufficient to demonstrate the buildability of the entire proposed project and evaluate environmental impacts.

Site Specific

- A thorough assessment and characterization of the property to determine what areas are buildable and non-buildable (as defined by the Town's zoning) to evaluate environmental impacts and density.

- Conceptual level plans depicting the proposed development areas: the Tuscan Village Conference Center, the manufacturing park and a first phase of residential development, to include:

    - Layout and location of buildings, parking, vehicle and pedestrian circulation areas

    - Building massing, location and potential architectural styles and building materials including a list of unacceptable (if any) building materials.

    - Concept level lighting and landscaping plans

    - Preliminary grading plans

    - Preliminary stormwater collection, conveyance and management plans. Stormwater quality and quantity controls that will be presented in these plans will be preliminary in nature and intended to demonstrate their location, approximate size, and design concept. Final stormwater facility hydrologic and hydraulic models will need to be developed as part of the future subdivision and/or site plan review, approval and permitting processes.

- Housing type, style and bedroom count

- Size, layout and style of non-residential components

- Design guidelines setting forth use, area and bulk requirements, allowable building styles, the maximum height of the buildings, building placement and form, street standards and pedestrian standards demonstrating how the guidelines are consistent with the density proposed for the project

- Internal and external vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian circulation patterns, including a description and standards for the proposed access boulevard

- A discussion of the various types and approximate amounts of impervious surfaces on the site, as well as a description of all methods that will be used in the design to limit impervious surfaces

- Public and private access, including access to open space and public parking

- Provisions for water supply, wastewater disposal and stormwater management and discussion of extension of Highland Water District, Stormwater Management District (or other management/administrative measures as may be proposed) and creation of Blue Point Sewer District, including summary of water and wastewater Map, Plan and Reports.

- Provision of private utilities

- Solid waste recycling and disposal

- Form of ownership

- Anticipated timing and phasing schedule, to the extent currently known

- A list of any specific detailed reports or analyses that may be prepared as a part of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for each phase of the development project.

2.2 Construction Activities

This section will describe the proposed construction process. Site ingress and egress relative to vehicle routing, construction traffic and emergency response will be presented. The approximate limits of site disturbance will be discussed.

Special concerns such as noise generated during construction, rock blasting, demolition of existing structures, vibration impacts, construction related dust and odors, and on-site stockpiling and grading will be discussed. Potential noise related impacts associated with construction activities, anticipated noise levels associated with typical construction equipment and operations will be identified.

A general construction schedule will be presented. A general description of the types of site grading and construction activities anticipated will be presented. In addition, a general discussion of scheduling of necessary construction of sanitary wastewater, water and stormwater systems, including the construction of off-site infrastructure, will be presented. A discussion of protection of significant trees and sensitive environmental features, especially in the bluff overlay zone, will be provided.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

This section of the DGEIS will describe the project's existing environmental setting and those aspects of the environment that may be adversely or beneficially impacted by the proposed action. Where potential impacts are identified, mitigation measures will be described to reduce or avoid the environmental impacts that may be identified. In all relevant instances, potential impacts due to construction activities will be analyzed as well as those from site use upon completion.

This section will be organized by first describing existing conditions, then potential impacts of the project and finally, mitigation measures, if necessary, for each environmental subject area. Possible impacts and mitigation measures set forth below are preliminary only and shall be expanded or refined based on detailed analysis in each subject area. A table summarizing permit requirements will be provided in the introduction to this section.

3.1 Topography and Slope

a. Environmental Setting

This section will describe the topography of the site and will present a 2 foot interval topographic survey of the entire site. A map illustrating slopes >15% and >25% will be provided.

b. Potential Impacts

A conceptual grading plan will be presented. Alteration of the site's topography, vegetation and drainage patterns due to grading/excavation and/or blasting will be discussed. The influence of topography on site drainage and site planning will be discussed.

c. Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures will be presented as required. Mitigation measures will include thresholds for site specific geotechnical and slope stability analyses at the time of site plan review.

3.2 Soils and Geology

a. Environmental Setting

This section will provide a description of the site's soils and their capabilities to support site development based on published sources such as the Ulster County Soil Survey. Characteristics that will be considered will include depth

to seasonal high water table, depth to bedrock and erosion potential. Areas of special concern such as streams and wetlands will be identified. Available soils mapping will be presented. The suitability of the soils for agricultural use will be discussed.

This section will also provide a description of the site's geologic characteristics, including depth to bedrock, type of bedrock and bedrock outcroppings, based on published sources. Available geologic mapping will be presented.

This section will present the results of a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment.

b. Potential Impacts

Potential adverse impacts to on-site soils and geology will be identified and discussed. Anticipated impacts relating to site grading, sediment and soil erosion, and blasting will be described. Impacts relating to the results of the Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment will also be discussed.

c. Mitigation Measures

Measures designed to minimize or eliminate anticipated impacts will be presented. A Master Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and report (SWPPP) will be prepared in general conformance with the requirements of NYSDEC's SPDES General Permit GP-0-10-001 and New York State Storm Water Management Design Manual" (Dated August 4, 2010.) The Master SWPPP will provide sufficient documentation for an overall SEQR determination, and serve as the baseline for future SWPPP's that will be prepared during the future subdivision and/or site plan review, approval and permitting processes of each phase of development. As such, only design concepts for the various phases of development will be provided to substantiate regulatory compliance determinations and to provide input pertinent to the environmental assessment of impacts of the proposed project. Stormwater quality and quantity controls that will be presented in this Master SWPPP will be preliminary in nature and intended to demonstrate their location, approximate size, and design concept. Final stormwater facility hydrologic and hydraulic models will need to be developed as part of the future permitting processes.

Mitigation measures for blasting will be presented. Other mitigation measures will be presented as required.

3.3 Hydrogeology

a. Environmental Setting

This section will describe the existence and hydrogeological characteristics (i.e., depth to water table, seasonal variation in water table elevation, groundwater flow direction, and water quality) of both unconsolidated (i.e., sand and gravel) and bedrock aquifers that exist on the site, including approximate boundaries of their respective recharge areas. In addition, a discussion regarding the possible occurrence of a perched water table condition at the site due to the shallow depth to bedrock and/or presence of impermeable surface soils will also be presented in this section. And finally, this section will provide information regarding the location of both on-site and nearby off-site (i.e., with a o.5 mile radius) groundwater supply wells, their type of use (i.e., public, private, industrial) and average daily demand.

b. Potential Impacts

This section will discuss the potential impacts that the construction of impervious surfaces during the various proposed phases of the project will have on the long term quality and quantity of the groundwater resources on the site. In addition this section will discuss the potential impact the blasting may have on the quality, quantity, and groundwater flow conditions of the bedrock aquifer system.

c. Mitigation Measures

This section will discuss the measures that will be employed both during and following periods of construction (in particular blasting) to minimize impacts to groundwater quantity and quality at the site.

3.4 Surface Water Resources and Stormwater Management

a. Environmental Setting

This section will describe and map existing water resources on the site, including the Hudson River (H), tributary H-112 and tributary H-112-CP438h and their regulatory status. The NYSDEC water classification will be provided for all waters the project site is tributary to. All federally regulated waters of US, ephemeral, intermittent, and perennial streams on site will be identified.

This section will further describe and map the 100 and 500 year elevations of the Hudson River floodplain and the floodway along the project site. Existing peak discharge rates for the 1, 10 and 100 year storm events will be

computed for on-site streams as well as points where stormwater discharges from the project site. These rates will be determined in accordance with NYSDEC's Stormwater Management Design Manual and will establish the thresholds that shall be maintained under future development phases.

b. Potential Impacts

This section will discuss impacts to aquatic resources, including alterations to drainage patterns as a result of the project. Post development watershed mapping will be included to present how drainage patterns will be affected as a result of the development including Protection of Waters under Article 15.

Potential coverage under GP-0-10-001 or the need for an individual permit will also be evaluated.

A Master Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and report (SWPPP) will be prepared in general conformance with the requirements of NYSDEC's SPDES General Permit GP-0-10-001, Water Quality Certification (Section 401 of the Clean Water Act) and New York State Storm Water Management Design Manual" (Dated August 4, 2010.) The Master SWPPP will provide sufficient documentation for an overall SEQR determination, and serve as the baseline for future SWPPP's that will be prepared during the future subdivision and/or site plan review, approval and permitting processes of each phase of development. As such, only design concepts for the various phases of development will be provided to substantiate regulatory compliance determinations and to provide input pertinent to the environmental assessment of impacts of the proposed project. Stormwater quality and quantity controls that will be presented in this Master SWPPP will be preliminary in nature and intended to demonstrate their location, approximate size, and design concept. Final stormwater facility hydrologic and hydraulic models will need to be developed as part of the future permitting processes.

This section will also discuss potential impacts to the site from climate change and resulting sea level rise, consistent with guidance from the NYSDEC.

c. Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures to minimize impacts from storm water quantity and quality will be described. Such measures will include management and treatment of stormwater and protection of aquatic resources. Measures to minimize adverse impacts to the Hudson River will also be described.

3.5 Wetlands

a. Environmental Setting

This section will present a formal delineation of any State Freshwater Wetlands (NYS Environmental Conservation Law Article 24) and/or Federally regulated wetlands (regulated pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act) on the site. A delineation report and map will be included. Any vernal pools on the site will be mapped and described. Regulation of vernal pools will be described.

b. Potential Impacts

This section will describe impacts to any wetlands, including vernal pools, on the site including compliance with Water Quality Certification (Section 401 of the Clean Water Act).

c. Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures to compensate for impacts, if any, will be described.

3.6 Flora and Fauna

a. Environmental Setting

Vegetative communities within the limits of the site will be identified, described and presented on an ecological communities map as referenced in "Ecological Communities of NYS (Edinger et. Al 2002). Site-wide wildlife species and habitat potentials will be identified, relative to terrestrial and aquatic habitats. The proposed project is located adjacent to the "Esopus/Lloyd Wetlands and Ridges", a significant biodiversity area of the Hudson River Estuary corridor notable for wetlands. The project is also located within the "Blue Point Biodiversity Area" as identified in the Northern Wallkill Biodiversity Plan, a description of the project in this context will be provided. The New York State Natural Heritage Program and the US Fish and Wildlife Service will be contacted to determine known occurrences of threatened and endangered species on or in close proximity to the site. A review of the NYS 2nd Breeding Bird Atlas will be conducted and a listing of species observed on the property will be presented.

The DGEIS will contain mapping showing the location of the vernal pools on site and potential habitat areas in the area of the vernal pools will be shown. The species and habitat found in the areas of the vernal pools will be specifically noted and discussed. The presence or absence of state-listed

species of special concern such as Jefferson Salamander, Marbled Salamander or Blue-spotted Salamander and habitat will be noted. In the spring, additional study for the presence of species of special concern in the vernal pools and its environs will be conducted and if present a breeding study will be conducted.

b. Potential Impacts

A description of potential impacts to plant and animal communities on the site will be provided. A discussion of the amount of existing vegetative cover/habitats likely to be removed and habitat fragmentation will be provided. Land disturbance by ecological community type will be presented in graphic form. The potential impacts on the "Esopus/Lloyd Wetlands and Ridges" and "Blue Point Biodiversity Area" resource of regional importance including loss of habitat and fragmentation will be discussed. A discussion of the potential impacts to Hudson River submerged aquatic vegetation resultant from potential increased turbidity of on-site tributaries to the Hudson will be discussed. Potential impacts to vernal pools on the site will be discussed.

c. Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures will be presented as required. A discussion of avoidance measures to minimize fragmentation of habitat and impacts to wildlife corridors will be provided. The use of native flora in the landscaping plans will be discussed The use of directional buffers for the vernal pools as described by Aram Calhoun, University of Maine will be discussed for the site as will be conventional circular buffers around the vernal pools.

3.7 Air Resources

a. Environmental Setting

A tabulation and description of ambient pollution levels at the closest SLAMS/NAMS stations will be provided. The description will focus on the dominant non-point source pollutants, including carbon monoxide (CO) and in particulate matter (2.5 micron - $PM_{2.5}$).

b. Potential Impacts

The air quality impact determination will begin with a first-level screening of traffic data for potentially impacted locations per the New York State Department of Transportation Environmental Procedures Manual

(NYSDOT/EPM). This analysis will be described in terms of potential impacts to localized air quality as a result of increased traffic due to the Proposed Action.

If the traffic data demonstrates that NYSDOT/EPM parameters are exceeded, the above effort will be followed by computer modeling, microscale analyses for both CO and $PM_{2.5}$ at up to three intersections in the project vicinity in Lloyd, New. In the event the EPM triggers are not met at the intersections analyzed for traffic, the three top volume and delay locations will still be subjected to a microscale analysis for both CO and $PM_{2.5}$. One such intersection will be the main entry to the proposed project. Sensitive receptors such as school buildings, churches and adjacent homes will be included to the extent they occur near the modeled intersections. This modeling will include CAL3QHC and MOBILE6.2 analyses for CO and $PM_{2.5}$. Emission models will be modified per the current NYSDOT/EPM guidance at the acceptance of this Scope $PM_{2.5}$

Impacts from construction activities will be described and assessed. Impacts from operation of the project, including potential impacts from manufacturing operations, will be qualitatively discussed. Compliance with noted state and federal regulatory programs will be described.

c. Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures to address mobile sources shall be discussed as required to address anticipated impacts.

Measures to reduce construction impacts such as dust suppression will be described. Other mitigation measures, including thresholds for analysis of manufacturing discharges, will be presented. For purposes of future evaluation of impacts an example facility will be addressed as established by NYSDEC and USEPA permitting and regulatory requirements.

3.8 Cultural Resources

a. Environmental Setting

A Phase 1A literature review and sensitivity assessment will be conducted for the site. If recommended by the Phase 1A study, A Phase 1B archaeological field reconnaissance will be conducted.

b. Potential Impacts

If cultural resources are found on the site, the potential for impacts to such resources will be discussed. If avoidance is not feasible, a Phase II archaeological study will be required.

c. Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures, including the potential for preservation of some of the existing buildings on the site and potential architectural themes that incorporate historic elements of the property will be presented. In the event the project proposes impact to a listed or eligible resource which cannot be avoided, data recovery plan will be developed for review and approval by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) prior to implementation.

3.9 Land Use and Zoning

a. Environmental Setting

Existing land use and zoning controls for the project site and environs will be mapped and described.

The Town of Lloyd Comprehensive Plan and the Town of Lloyd Local Waterfront Revitalization Plan will be discussed. The relationship of the project to the practices and vision of the Hudson River Valley Greenway will be discussed and evaluated for consistency.

b. Potential Impacts

This section will summarize the proposed zoning changes by which the project will be regulated.

This section will provide a description of how the project complies with the policies of the Town of Lloyd Zoning Code, Comprehensive Plan and Local Waterfront Revitalization Plan. Any proposed amendments will be discussed.

This section will discuss public access to and use of the site, including a public trail and other potential uses. A description of any lands set aside for public access and/or protection from development will be provided. Planned measures for protection (deed restriction, covenants, conservation easements, offer of dedication) and long term management will be discussed.

c. Mitigation Measures

Amendments to Town of Lloyd planning and zoning documents will be discussed. This will include presentation of design guidelines that may be developed, any form based measures of the zoning code, as well as site design elements such as green infrastructure, complete streets elements, community connectivity and other sustainable design practices.

3.10 Visual Character

a. Environmental Setting

All visual impact assessment will fully comply with the NYSDEC guidelines for such assessments. Existing designated scenic and historic areas on both sides of the Hudson River as they may be affected by the project will be located and mapped, including relevant Scenic Areas of Statewide Significance (SASS) and subunits. A visual analysis will be completed to determine and describe the visual character of the project site within the context of its surrounding area. A viewshed map will be prepared to locate possible visual resources and receptors within five miles of the project site. Views from visual resources that may be impacted by the project will be recorded in leaf-off and leaf-on conditions. The following viewpoints will be analyzed in leaf-off conditions:

View point 1 – from the east end of the Mid-Hudson Bridge, on the walkway on the southern side of the bridge

View point 2 – from the east end of the Walkway Over the Hudson State Park

View point 3 – from the Marist College boathouse area

View point 4 – from Quiet Cove Riverfront Park

View point 5 – from the Vassar College boathouse area

View point 6 – from Victor C. Waryas Park

View point 7 – from Kaal Rock Point

View point 8 – from Shadows on the Hudson

View point 9 – from the top level of the Vassar Medical Center parking garage

View point 10 – from Livingston Street, adjacent to Route 9

View point 11 – from the end of Prospect Street adjacent to the Hudson River

View point 12 – from the Poughkeepsie Rural Cemetery

View point 13 – from the bench on the Saw Mill Trail at Locust Grove

View point 14 – from the Pirate Canoe Club

Three (3) additional/alternate viewpoint locations (2 at the Locust Grove site, and 1 at the Vassar Brothers Hospital site) will be evaluated using existing information and the preparation of a line of sight sections and to allow comparison to the nearby/adjacent viewpoints.

During leaf-on conditions, an additional viewpoint will be taken from the Hudson River across from the Project site.

b. Potential Impacts

The changes in the visual environment will be illustrated from the viewpoints above using visual simulation techniques.

A description of changes to the landscape and a discussion of visual impacts will be provided including a discussion regarding site lighting and night time/light glow and its impacts on adjacent properties

Impacts to sensitive visual resources and receptors, including SASS units, will be discussed.

A line of site profile from Route 9W to the proposed manufacturing park will be provided to determine its visibility.

c. Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures will be proposed based on the nature of the impacts identified. Examples may include alternative building locations, designs, heights (lower profile), screening, downsizing, materials, camouflage/disguise, and forms of lighting and landscaping. Night lighting performance measures/guidelines such as IESNA will be discussed as appropriate to address impacts.

3.11 Noise

a. Environmental Setting

Existing sources of noise in and around the project site will be described qualitatively. The effect of topography and vegetation on noise transmission will be discussed. Any Town noise ordinances affecting the project site will be identified and discussed.

App to do T Rev

Train

A list and description of sensitive noise receptors which currently exist in close proximity to the project site and along the Route 9 W corridor in the Town of Lloyd will be prepared. A noise screening assessment will be performed to provide an indication of existing noise levels at up to eight (8) pre-selected locations along the boundaries of the site (two at the north adjacent to Franny Reese State Park, two to the east, two to the south, and two to the west adjacent to residences along Blue Point Road and at 9W at the location of the planned industrial component).

Noise levels recorded at these locations (Level Equivalents – L eq) will be compared to United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) guidelines for noise resources.

b. Potential Impacts

The impact of the project on sensitive receptors will be discussed. Compliance with Town noise ordinances will be discussed.

Impacts resulting from construction activities will be assessed using information from standard references. Expected noise levels produced by typical earth moving equipment will be reviewed against existing noise levels, as well as applicable USEPA and NYSDEC guidelines. The NYSDEC program policy document entitled "Assessing and Mitigating Noise Impacts" will be used to report on expected noise levels. Distance, topography, vegetation, noise source duration, and weather conditions will be evaluated for expected noise impacts associated with construction activities, construction traffic, and traffic flow upon project completion.

c. Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures will be proposed as necessary based on the results of the analysis. Mitigation measures will include discussion of measures identified in the referenced NYSDEC program policy document as well as proposed noise thresholds for project components.

3.12 Traffic

a. Environmental Setting

Existing public transportation systems which serve the site will be described. Existing and potential future plans for extending bus, pedestrian and bicycle paths to the site will be discussed.

Roadways and intersections providing access to the site will be described, including pavement widths and condition, number of lanes, posted speeds, traffic controls and traffic signal timings.

Traffic volume data for intersections will be collected for weekday AM and PM peaks. Daily volume and speed data will be collected for Route 9W adjoining the project site.

Capacity analyses, based on the procedures specified in the most recent edition of the "Highway Capacity Manual" will be undertaken for all roadways and intersections subject to potential significant increases in volume or potential decreases in function, including the following intersections:

- U.S. Route 9W and Chapel Hill Road/Macks Lane
- U.S. Route 9W and Blue Point Road
- U.S. Route 9W and Sam Williams Road
- U.S. Route 9W and North Site Access
- U.S. Route 9W and Sam Williams Road/Mackey Road
- U.S. Route 9W and South Site Access
- U.S. Route 9W and Argent Drive
- U. S. Route 9W and Mayer Drive
- U. S. Route 9W and Tillson/Haviland
- U.S. Route 9W and Ramps for the Mid-Hudson Bridge
- Vineyard Avenue and Chapel Hill Road

An accident analysis using the latest three-year accident history will be prepared for Route 9W in the vicinity of the project site.

b. Potential Impacts

Impacts to public transportation and pedestrian systems will be identified and discussed. This will include an analysis of impacts on parking accommodations at the Poughkeepsie Rail Station.

Capacity analyses will be performed to determine roadway conditions at all of the above intersections for each major stage and for project buildout. This analysis will include an annual growth rate as approved by the UCTC and incorporate traffic generated by previously approved but not completed projects, and proposed projects, as provided by the Town of Lloyd.

Peak hour trip generation volumes from the project will be estimated based on trip generation rates in the most recent edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers reference, "Trip Generation." Distribution of project generated trips on the area roadway system will be estimated and explained. Project generated traffic will be used to complete capacity analyses of roadway conditions at each of the study area roadway intersections for the build condition upon completion of each major stage of the project and upon completion of the entire project.

Sight distances at project roadway intersections with existing public roads will be evaluated in accordance with published standards.

Emergency access to the site and internal traffic circulation and parking will be discussed.

Impacts from construction traffic will be discussed. Impacts to the Route 9W intersection as well as adjoining land uses will be discussed.

c. Mitigation Measures

Arrangements for incorporating pedestrian/bicycle pathways and greenway trails through the project site will be presented.

Measures to mitigate traffic impacts, if required, should include, but not be limited to roadway and intersection improvements (e.g. widening and restriping), and intersection signalization improvements. The potential for transit/shuttle services will be discussed. The presentation of mitigation measures will include an identification of the anticipated levels of service to exist following their implementation.

Measures to mitigate impacts of construction traffic on surrounding areas will also be identified including route changes, phasing, and specified hours of operation.

3.13 Utilities

a. Environmental Setting

Existing water supply facilities and lines servicing the site and/or environs will be identified. The responsible authority will be contacted to verify the capacity and ability to provide service to the site. Any expansions or improvements will be identified.

Existing wastewater lines and facilities servicing the site, if any, will be identified.

A description of existing private utilities such as electric service, telecommunications and natural gas serving the site will be provided. Service providers will be contacted to verify their capacity and ability to service the project. Any expansions or improvements will be identified.

b. Potential Impacts

Demands on water service will be evaluated, including whether sufficient service capacity exists and how much capacity will exist after project completion. Impacts on conveyance systems will be evaluated. Construction impacts of new facilities will be evaluated, including the routes of all facilities. Remaining capacity after completion of the project will be identified. A formal water Map, Plan and Report will be provided.

Since a private wastewater treatment plant is proposed, impacts to receiving waters from treated wastewater discharge will be evaluated. Compliance with SPDES (Article 17m Titles 7 and 8) will be discussed. Compliance with NYS effluent treatment standards and their relationship/impact to water quality of the Hudson River will be discussed. A formal Map, Plan and Report will be provided. An evaluation of the potential connection to the municipal wastewater collection system will be provided.

This section will further discuss the ability of private utility providers (i.e. gas, electric and telecommunications) to service the project based on discussions with such providers. These discussions will include determination of demand levels that could force service/system upgrades. Any improvements or upgrades will be assessed. Any capacity issues after completion of the project will be identified.

Ownership of utilities will be described and any ownership related impacts identified.

c. Mitigation Measures

Required or planned water improvements to water systems to provide increased capacity of treatment or conveyance systems will be discussed and a program to provide such facilities presented. The use of conservation measures designed to reduce the demand for water supply will be discussed.

Required or planned private utility improvements to service the project will be discussed. The use of conservation measures to reduce energy usage will be discussed.

3.14 Community Services

a. Existing Conditions

Schools

The location and capacity of public schools serving the site will be identified. School District officials will be contacted to determine available capacity at each school serving the site.

Police, Fire, Emergency and Health Care Services

A description of police, fire protection, emergency services and health care services serving the site will be provided. Information about the number of personnel employed (including volunteers), response procedures (i.e. mutual aid), jurisdictional areas and plans for expanding services will be described based on discussions with service providers.

Solid Waste Disposal

The types of public and private solid waste management facilities in Ulster County available to handle the project's demands for solid waste disposal will be identified. Future plans for facility expansions will be described.

Recreation Facilities

A description of local and area-wide recreational facilities operated by the Town of Lloyd, Ulster County, and New York State will be provided, including a discussion of the extent to which such facilities serve the project site. This discussion will include the Walkway Over the Hudson, the Hudson Valley Rail Trail Franny Reese State Park and other regional facilities which residents of the project may utilize.

b. Potential Impacts

Schools

The expected demand on district schools due to project development will be estimated based on accepted rates of school children generation per dwelling unit.

Police, Fire and Emergency Health Care Services

A determination of project related demands for police, fire, emergency and health care services for the Town of Lloyd will be provided based on existing service demand rates and documented discussions with service providers. Identification of potential significant adverse impacts of the proposed project on these services will be presented.

Solid Waste Disposal

Based on discussions with service providers, a description of potential impacts on area-wide solid waste disposal facilities will be provided in terms of capacity and transport. The potential for manufacturing waste generation will be discussed.

Recreation Facilities

Impacts to Town of Lloyd, Ulster County and New York State recreational facilities, including Franny Reese Park, will be discussed. This evaluation will include discussion with Town recreation officials. Any planned on site facilities, their planned use and potential for public access/use will be discussed.

c. Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures will be presented as required.

3.15 Fiscal Conditions

a. Environmental Setting

This section will summarize the current taxes paid on the site and the current job generation attributable to the site.

b. Potential Impacts

This section will include a 20-year projection of annual real property and special district taxes to be generated upon project completion. This projection will be compared to the cost of providing municipal services using marginal cost method. In addition, this section will project the numbers and grade breakdown of new public school children and the district costs for providing services to these children will be estimated. The number of new households, residents and employees and their cost of impacts to municipal services will be estimated.

This section will also discuss spin-off impacts and regional impacts.

c. Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures will be presented as required.

3.16 Demographics

a. Environmental Setting

Existing demographics for the Town of Lloyd will be presented. Available census information for the Town will be used to describe existing population characteristics, distribution, household size, income and composition. The Mid-Hudson Community Profiles as prepared by the Dyson Corporation will be referenced. In addition, population projections for the Town will be provided from published sources. . A discussion of the Town's work force housing needs will be discussed with reference to the *Three County Affordable Housing Strategy.*

b. Potential Impacts

The target market(s) for the project will be described. A discussion of how the project will contribute to the Town's housing needs, as identified by housing studies, will be provided. Measures to incorporate affordable housing will be described.

c. Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures will be presented as required.

3.17 Community Character

a. Environmental Setting

This section will describe the environs around the project site.

b. Potential Impacts

This section will discuss impacts to community character, focusing on compatibility with surrounding uses. This section will discuss compatibility with the Town's comprehensive plan, especially as related to the Hamlet of Highland. Compatibility with the continued revitalization of the Highland Hamlet will be discussed.

c. Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures will be presented as required.

3.18 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

a. Environmental Setting

This section will generally address greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) locally, regionally and beyond following NYSDEC guidelines.

b. Potential Impacts

This section will quantify GHG from the project, including the following sources of GHG: direct emissions from stationary sources; direct emissions from non-stationary sources; indirect emissions from stationary sources; indirect emissions from mobile sources; and total GHG emissions. The method for such assessment and quantification shall follow NYSDEC guidelines.

c. Mitigation Measures

This section will include a review and assessment of mitigation measures, with calculations of the projected reduction in GHG emissions that will result from mitigation measures. Where practicable, the DGEIS should also include a quantification of reductions in GHG emissions that would result from mitigation measures that were considered and rejected. Where models do not allow reasonable quantitative analysis, the EIS should still provide qualitative comparison of GHG emissions of various measures. Mitigation measures should be identified in relation to the level of LEED certification, if

any, sought by the applicant. Examples of mitigation measures can be found in NYSDEC guidance documents.

4.0 ALTERNATIVES

A description and evaluation of the range of reasonable alternatives to the action that are feasible will be presented, considering the objectives and capabilities of the project sponsor. The description and evaluation of each alternative should be at a level of detail sufficient to permit a comparative assessment of the alternatives discussed. The range of alternatives must include the no action alternative. action.

4.1 No-Action Alternative

The "No Build" alternative will be addressed as required under 6 NYCRR 617.9(b)(5). The "No Action" alternative is the scenario that would occur if no residential or industrial development were to take place on the project site.

4.2 Alternative Development Plans

This section will present alternative development plans and will summarize the qualitative and quantitative (where applicable) impacts of such plans as compared to the proposed plan. The plans will be developed to a level of detail to allow such comparison. The following alternative plans will be presented.

- As-of-right development plan for 200 +/- units of housing
- A conservation subdivision plan for 200 +/- units of housing
- The previously approved Revolutionary Ridge Development consisting of approximately 400 units of housing, a golf course and equestrian facilities.
- A project consisting of 1200 units of housing and 400,000 square feet of commercial development
- A project consisting of a 120 room hotel, 240 condominium units and 750 residential units
- A project consisting of a 90 room hotel, conference center, 50,000 square feet (SF) of commercial and office space, and 50,000 SF of adaptive reuse of existing winery structures.
- A project consisting of maximum of 750 residential housing units, 50,000 square feet (SF) of commercial and office space, 50,000 SF of adaptive reuse of existing winery facilities, 600,000 SF of light

industrial/manufacturing/institutional space, a conference center, and 90-room capacity suite hotel.

4.4 Alternative Sites

This section will state that there are no alternate sites under the control of the project sponsor that meet the project objectives

5.0 IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE RESOURCE COMMITMENTS

This section will discuss the commitment of resources such as materials and energy that cannot be retrieved or avoided as a result of the project. This section will acknowledge the irreversible commitment of the site to the proposed use, as well as the potential for redevelopment. This section will discuss the quantities and timing of resource commitments.

6.0 UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

This section will summarize any unavoidable adverse impacts as a result of the project. Impacts that cannot be mitigated will be defined and quantified, and reasons given as to why they cannot be mitigated.

7.0 GROWTH INDUCING ASPECTS

Both positive and negative effects of growth inducing aspects associated with the proposed project will be considered relative to the potential socioeconomic influences that the project may have on the surrounding community.

8.0 EFFECTS ON THE USE AND CONSERVATION OF ENERGY

The expected short and long-term uses of energy resources and the means to reduce energy usage during construction and operation will be discussed. These measures will include a discussion of compliance with local/state building/energy code, potential for designation/certification under the United States Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) program, and potential for project components adherence with NYS Energy STAR requirements for new construction.

9.0 SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The cumulative impact of other proposed projects identified by the Lead Agency (including Highland Square, Mountainside Woods, and the "Sixteen Acres, LLC" project will also be considered. In particular, the cumulative impacts of transportation, land use, community services, utilities, fiscal, visual character, demographics, noise and air will be

assessed. Positive benefits such as job creation, increased tax revenues and the precedent setting characteristics of the project will be discussed.

REFERENCES

A section listing all references used in preparation of the DGEIS will be provided.

PRELIMINARY LIST OF APPENDICES

- Final Scoping Document
- Applicable Correspondence
- Proposed Zoning Amendments in Draft Form including design guidelines
- Conceptual Site and Architectural Plans
- Master Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and Report
- Sewer and Water Map, Plan and Reports
- Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment
- Wetlands and Threatened and Endangered Species Documentation
- Biodiversity Assessment
- Phase 1A and 1B Archeological Reports
- LWRP and DOS Coastal Assessment Form and Documentation
- Visual Impact Assessment (Photo Simulations) and Maps
- Traffic Impact Study
- Fiscal and Community Services Impact Assessment
- Air Quality Assessment
- Noise Assessment
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment Documentation
- Other Appendices will be included as appropriate.

letter 1

RESOLUTION
TOWN OF LLOYD PLANNING BOARD

Blue Point Conservation Development District GEIS
Referral of Draft Scoping Document by the Lloyd Town Board for Comment

PROJECT NAME:	Hudson Valley Wine Village, Inc. Blue Point Conservation Development District GEIS
PROPERTY OWNER:	Hudson Valley Wine Village, Inc.
PROJECT LOCATION:	Route 9W at Blue Point Road

The following resolution was moved by: _____ _____
Seconded by: _____ _____

WHEREAS, the Town Board received a request for comments on the Draft Scoping Document for the Blue Point Conservation Development District / Hudson Valley Wine Village Project dated September 9, 2011; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board referred the Draft Scoping Document to the Planning Board for comment; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board heard a presentation by the applicant on the Blue Point Conservation Development District Project at the Town Planning Board meeting held on August 25, 2011; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board discussed the Draft Scoping Document and the project in general at a special meeting on September 22;

THEREFORE;
BE IT RESOLVED that the Town Planning Board hereby agrees that the Draft Scoping Document adequately identifies the relevant issues related to the preparation of a Generic Environmental Impact Statement for the project, with the exception of the following general comments and suggestions, along with comments received from the Planning Boards' attorney, Terresa Backner (See attachment A):

a. The project name is confusing and recommends that the applicant consider a more appropriate name moving forward as the inclusion of 'Conservation Development District' implies that a single zoning district will be proposed by that name. The board understands that is not the case and in fact the applicant's petition includes three separate zone changes. 1.1

b. The applicant should provide specific parameters for density, both residential and non-residential as part of the proposed codes. 1.2

c. Complete avoidance of the 'Bluff' area would result in a missed opportunity for the Town of Lloyd. The planning board suggests that the applicant propose development that is in concert with the existing WBOD and other applicable codes. 1.3

d. The planning board suggests that the applicant evaluate the cumulative impacts of traffic from this project and other nearby projects that are in the planning stages. The board suggests that the typical growth rate should be reviewed to ensure it is applicable for a project with such a long term estimated build-out. 1.4

e. The internal layout of roads and inter-connectivity should be provided in a form that will provide for future interconnectivity within the project site and externally to adjoining parcels. 1.5

f. The planning board recommends that the applicant incorporate green technology and sustainable site practices to the greatest extent practicable. 1.6

g. Architectural concepts should clearly illustrate the desired architectural features that will be utilized in future developments throughout the project. This would include typical architectural detailing on buildings, site development guidelines and typical landscape features that will communicate the applicant's common design/architectural theme. 1.7

h. The applicant should refer to the Mid-Hudson Valley Community Profiles provided by the Dyson Foundation on the website http://www.mhvcommunityprofiles.org for up-to-date demographic profiles and economic data for the region, county and project vicinity. 1.8

i. The planning board suggests that the applicant evaluate the project's cumulative economic impacts to include other town projects in the planning stages including approved and potential projects such as Highland Square, Mixed-use Development of the Sixteen Acres, and Mountainside Woods. 1.9

j. Recognizing the local needs for employment, the planning board strongly encourages the applicant to consider light industrial development that maximizes job creation per developable acre of project area for the light industrial area: 1.10

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED; that the comments received from the Planning Boards' attorney, Terresa Bakner (See attachment A), be annexed to the comments above from the Planning Board as Attachment A,

	AYE	NAY	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Chairman Scott Saso	_____	_____	_____	_____
Lawrence Hammond	_____	_____	_____	_____
Dominick Martorana	_____	_____	_____	_____
Carl DiLorenzo	_____	_____	_____	_____
Brad Scott	_____	_____	_____	_____
Dave Plavcheck	_____	_____	_____	_____
Tom Rozzi	_____	_____	_____	_____
Alt, John Fraino	_____	_____	_____	_____

Ayes, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain, Absent

THIS VOTE IS CERTIFIED THIS ___ DAY OF _____, 2011.

By: _____
Secretary
Planning Board/Zoning Board of Appeals

THIS RESOLUTION IS APPROVED AND HEREBY ORDERED TO THE RECORD THIS _____ DAY OF _____, 2011

By: _____
Scott C. Saso, Chairman
Town of Lloyd Planning Board

Letter 2

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
Division of Environmental Permits, Region 3
21 South Putt Corners Road, New Paltz, New York 12561-1620
Phone: (845) 256-3054 **FAX:** (845) 255-4659
Website: www.dec.ny.gov

Joe Martens
Commissioner

October 27, 2011

Rosaria Peplow, Town Clerk
Town of Lloyd
12 Church Street
Highland, New York 12528

Re: Blue Point Conservation Development District
Town of Lloyd, Ulster County
DEC No. 3-5132-00178/00001
Proposed Draft Scope for Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Ms. Peplow:

The NYS Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC/Department) has completed its review of the "Draft Scoping Document" dated September 9, 2011 for the Blue Point Conservation Development District Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). DEC staff note that this document lacks some details regarding specific methodologies to be used to evaluate potential adverse impacts. The Department offers the following comments for incorporation by the Town Board in the Final DEIS Scope:

Section 3.6 – Flora and Fauna

In addition to the "Esopus/Lloyd Wetlands and Ridges" significant biodiversity area, this section should evaluate potential impacts to the "Blue Point Biodiversity Area" as identified in the Northern Wallkill Biodiversity Plan. This should include a discussion of potential impacts to the state-listed yellow breasted chat (*Icteria virens*) and other development sensitive species know to occur within the "Blue Point Biodiversity Area". 2.1

A discussion of how the proposed development will fit within the landscape should be included in this section. Potential wildlife corridors should be identified and discussed in the context of how it will maintain links between large habitat patches off site (e.g. Franny Reese Preserve State Park). 2.2

Potential impacts stemming from habitat loss and fragmentation should be discussed in this section. Fragmentation decreases habitat quality and ecosystem health by increasing access for predators and parasites, and disrupting wildlife movement. Therefore, subsection c of this part (Mitigation Measures) should include a discussion of how fragmentation of habitat and the disruption of wildlife movement will be avoided or minimized within the project area. 2.3

Consideration of impacts to Hudson River submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) should also be included in this section, particularly impacts from increased turbidity in the stream which flows off-site to the north and ultimately out to an SAV bed. 2.4

Re: **Blue Point Conservation Development District**
Town of Lloyd, Ulster County
DEC No. 3-5132-00178/00001
Proposed Draft Scope for Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Section 3.13 - Utilities

As an alternative to the proposed private wastewater treatment plant, this section should also discuss the feasibility of expanding the municipal sewer district in order to serve the proposed Blue Point Conservation Development District. Please note that this Department has encouraged centralized sewer systems, when appropriate, owned and operated by municipalities rather than independent private sewage treatment systems. The Department believes this ensures a more stable financial and administrative structure which can provide the necessary maintenance and oversight. In addition, if an existing municipal sewage system is reasonably accessible, as is the case here, the proposed subdivision will be required to connect to said sewage system absent proof satisfactory to the department that developer cannot effect arrangements for the installation and/or connection of the sewage system pursuant to 6NYCRR Part 653.4(a)(2). 2.5

Analysis of the capacity of the municipal treatment plant and impacts to water quality of its wastewater receiving stream should be evaluated and compared to that of the private wastewater treatment plant alternative. The routing of connector sewer lines to municipal treatment plant should be disclosed and potential impacts due to construction evaluated. 2.6

Section 8.0 – Effects of the Use and Conservation of Energy

The scope should include analysis of all measures appropriate to reduce energy demands associated with the redevelopment of the site. This section should provide a description of the effect of the proposed action on the short and long term use and conservation of energy resources; methods to reduce inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy during construction and long term operation; and a discussion of applicable building codes. Design elements suggested by the *United States Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design* (LEED) program should be evaluated for potential incorporation in the project design. 2.7

DEC wishes to thank the Town Board for the opportunity to provide these comments. Department staff remains available to discuss them to ensure a complete DEIS.

If you have any questions regarding this notice please contact me at 845-256-3040.

Sincerely,

Joseph R. Murray
Environmental Analyst I

ecc: L. Heady
J. Sansalone

[1] LaBruna, D. T. and M. W. Klemens. 2007. Northern Wallkill Biodiversity Plan: Balancing Development and Environmental Stewardship in the Hudson River Estuary Watershed. MCA Technical Paper No. 13, Metropolitan Conservation Alliance, Wildlife Conservation Society, Bronx, New York.

Letter 3

Scenic Hudson, Inc.
One Civic Center Plaza, Suite 200
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601-3156
Tel: 845 473 4440
Fax: 845 473 0740
email: info@scenichudson.org
www.scenichudson.org

SCENIC HUDSON

October 28, 2011

Ms. Rosaria J. Peplow, Town Clerk
Town of Lloyd
12 Church Street
Highland, NY 12528

RE: Scoping Comments
Hudson Valley Wine Village

Dear Ms. Peplow:

Scenic Hudson is writing to provide comments intended to improve the scope of the Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement (DGEIS) for the Hudson Valley Wine Village. These should be added to the testimony provided on October 12 and the statement submitted via email.

Background
With outstanding views, proximity to an emerging network of regional "green infrastructure," this is arguably the premier riverfront site in the Mid-Hudson Valley. Its careful redevelopment could add lasting value to Lloyd and the surrounding communities. However, approval that would result in the entitlement of the proposed 950 residential units, 400,000sf of light industry, and hotel/conference center/retail space on this 425-acre site at the edge of town would likely jeopardize longstanding plans to revitalize the hamlet of Highland and consume the capacity of other parcels in town to absorb future growth. In addition, the site, in the Esopus-Lloyd Scenic Area of Statewide Significance, the Blue Point Biodiversity Area, and housing what the Town's Comprehensive Plan describes as the "one of the most historic Estate Wineries in North America" is of such importance that it has been listed since 1990 as a conservation priority on New York State's Open Space Plan.

The area along the Lloyd Bluffs where this site lies has historically been zoned low density residential, and, in fact, the Town's 2005 Comprehensive Plan has recommended further reducing the scope of development in this area by another 50% (from one unit per two acres to 1 unit per three acres) because of both the well documented and longstanding environmental and scenic resources, as well as the Town's adopted vision to promote a future of "Smart Growth" by directing development to places near the hamlet of Highland where existing development can support development.

Therefore, it is critically important that the Town Board, as Lead Agency in this environmental review, adopt a scope that identifies all the environmental, fiscal, and community impacts that could potentially result from the largest project in Lloyd's history, proposed on arguably its most sensitive site at a time when the real estate market can least support residential units of this magnitude and when scores of residents are in foreclosure or cannot sell their existing homes.

Scenic Hudson believes that our participation in this SEQRA review, along with Town residents, and other interested parties and stakeholders, will help build consensus for a project that the Town will be proud of for years to come.

Specific comments

Section 1.0 Introduction
Section 1.2 Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action
Longstanding efforts have been underway to strengthen Lloyd's hamlet of Highland. The approval of nearly 950 units—even over a 20 year build-out period—could have the potential to exhaust the capacity for future residential development in places closer to the hamlet. These impacts include the ability of others to develop their land, particularly in and around the hamlet and along North Road where Town water is provided and projected to be extended. With the weak real estate market and no prospect for significant increase in demand for new homes, an absorption study of the 950 proposed residential units should be provided, including an analysis of potential impacts on the sales of existing homes. 3.1

Section 1.3 Project Location, Description and Environmental Setting
1.3.b Description and Environmental Setting
This description should include the property's local and regional context as one of the most productive forest blocks in the area. It is contiguous with a state park created to protect a part of that significant forest block. Both the subject parcel and the park are important habitat for migrating birds and other forest-dependent species. 3.2

Section 3.0 Environmental Setting, Impacts and Mitigation Measures
3.2 Soils and Geology
3.2.a Environmental Setting
Provide a survey and map all bedrock outcrops on the site (not only those shown on existing geologic and soil maps). 3.3

Section 3.3 Hydrogeology
3.3.a Environmental Setting
Provide a site-specific hydrogeology study in order to get a good understanding of the groundwater resources specific to this site. 3.4

Section 3.4 Surface Water Resources and Stormwater Management
3.4.a. Environmental Setting
Given that the frequency of the currently defined 500-year storm event is increasing, this section should be expanded to include 500-year storm events as well as existing peak discharge rates for the 1, 10 and 100-year storm events for on-site streams as well as points where stormwater discharges from the project site. 3.5

Section 3.5 Wetlands
3.5.a Environmental Setting
Provide a vernal pool study, including a breeding amphibian survey and an assessment of other values of vernal pools. A valuation of all wetlands should also be provided (based on an accepted method). 3.6

3.5.b Potential Impacts
Provide a discussion of the important role vernal pools play in protecting biodiversity with respect to amphibians and other fauna and flora. Describe the consequences of loss and impacts to both regulated and unregulated affects local and regional biodiversity in cumulative terms. 3.7

Potential impacts of storm water and waste water on the tidal wetland in the cove behind the railroad must be evaluated. 3.8

Section 3.6 Flora and Fauna
3.6.a Environmental Setting

The Northern Wallkill Biodiversity Plan describes the context of the project site as being within the Blue Point Biodiversity Area. According to the Northern Wallkill Biodiversity Study, the site hosts many high-priority or listed species. The DGEIS should include this information in Section 3.6.a.

> *17-Blue Point Biodiversity Area*
> Blue Point was designated a biodiversity area due to the large number of woodland warbler species found here, especially considering the small size of this area. Surprisingly, in the northern part of this area we observed no development-associated bird species. While some development-associated species likely do live in this area, such a low observance rate suggests that this habitat is of very high quality. The southern part of this area contains several observations of a state- listed, HDS bird species, the yellowbreasted chat (*Ictëria virens*), that is at the northern limit of its range here, an indication of high quality successional habitat. Other HDS bird species observed here include: alder flycatcher (*Empidonax alnorum*), black-billed cuckoo, black-throated blue warbler, magnolia warbler, scarlet tanager, willow flycatcher, and worm-eating warbler. Sixteen MDS bird species were also observed, including the brown thrasher and blue-winged warbler, among others. One MDS reptile, the northern black racer, was also observed here. The fact that this region is adjacent to the Hudson River is another strong reason for its designation as a Biodiversity Area, as quality riverside habitat is important for many species yet increasingly rare due to development.

This section should include the site's connectivity to Franny Reese State Park and the role its unfragmented forest plays in supporting biodiversity in the Esopus/Lloyd Wetlands and Ridges significant biodiversity area, the Illinois Mountain Biologically Important Area, and Blue Point Biodiversity Area. 3.9

Include the site's importance in the NYS Open Space Conservation Plan.

A complete habitat map for the property should be provided. Vegetation community mapping should follow New York Natural Heritage Program (NYNHP) natural community classification standards. Specific field surveys should be conducted for all species listed as having the potential to occur on the site by the NYNHP, if suitable habitat is mapped during vegetation community mapping. In addition to snakeroot, which is listed in the scope, there other species listed in the database as having the potential to occur on or near the site. If through the community mapping, habitats are found that could potentially support additional Natural Heritage-listed species, surveys should be conducted for those species as well 3.10

3.6.c Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures studied should include the avoidance of fragmentation of the forest block, minimization of stream crossings by roads, the inclusion of wildlife-friendly road construction techniques, and the use of appropriate buffers and set backs from important wetlands. 3.11

Section 3.9 Land Use and Zoning

Lloyd's Comprehensive Plan and Local Waterfront Revitalization Program (LWRP)

Lloyd's past and present Comprehensive Plans' vision over the past three decades has consistently recommended low residential densities for the portion of town where the subject site is located. These densities ranged from two acres per unit in 1981 to the recently adopted plan recommending a further reduction in density to three acres per unit. As proposed, the applicant's proposed program of development—even if phased over 20 or more years—is diametrically opposed to the Town's 2005 Comprehensive Plan, as well as generally accepted principles of Smart Growth which direct development to existing built areas, such as the hamlet of Highland. Clearly, the proposed development and any enabling rezoning must support the goals of the Town's Comprehensive Plan. And, since the site is in the Coastal Zone, the proposal must also be consistent with Lloyd's Local Waterfront Revitalization Program. 3.12a

According to the Town's Comprehensive Plan, in 2000 there were 3,818 housing units in Lloyd (page 2-11). Allowing up to 945 more units would represent 25% of the entire town's 2000 housing stock—in an area well outside of the hamlet. Approving this level of residential development—even over a 20-year build-out period—could well exhaust the capacity for future residential development in places closer to the hamlet and affect the ability of residents to sell existing homes. The Bridgeview development, built in fits and starts over a 20+ year period, has about 170 units, all within walking distance of a grocery store and other services. As proposed, the Hudson Valley Wine Village would result in over five times as many units in an auto-dependent location without easy access to goods and services.

Therefore we have serious concerns about the project's inconsistency with both the Town's Comprehensive Plan and LWRP and the potential fiscal consequences for both the hamlet of Highland and taxpayers of Lloyd, as well as environmental impacts to the large, undisturbed biodiversity area in which the site is located.. 3.12b

3.9.b Potential Impacts

The site is within New York State's Coastal Zone and the Town of Lloyd has an adopted and approved Local Waterfront Revitalization Program (LWRP). Policy 5 encourages the location of development in areas where public services and facilities essential to such development are adequate. The policy's explanation states:

> "Development, particularly large scale development in the Waterfront Area will be encouraged to locate within, contiguous to, or in close proximity to, existing areas of concentrated development where infrastructure and public services are adequate, where topography, geology, and other environmental conditions are suitable for and able to accommodate development. The Highland hamlet area, which is located just outside the Waterfront Area, is of particular concern in this regard, as it is an area of concentrated development and the traditional Central Business District of the Town. The hamlet and immediate outskirts provide water and sewer to residents in this area. As development proceeds along the Route 9W corridor, the Town is interested in ensuring the continued revitalization of the hamlet area.
>
> The policy is intended to accomplish the following:
>
> - Strengthen the existing residential, industrial, and commercial centers, such as Highland Landing and the hamlet area;
> - Foster an orderly pattern of growth where outward expansion is occurring;
> - Increase the productivity of existing public services and moderate the need to provide new public services in outlying areas; and
> - Preserve open space in sufficient amounts.

This section should include the above referenced portions of the LWRP and fully explain how the proposed extension of public water to this environmentally sensitive site at the edge of town is consistent with this policy and accomplishes its four goals. 3.12c

As indicated above, there were 3,818 housing units in Lloyd (page 2-11). Allowing 945 more units would represent 25% of the entire town's existing (2000) housing—in an area outside the hamlet. With the weak real estate market, limited prospects for significant increase in demand for new homes, hundreds of homes for sale, in foreclosure, or already approved, the DGEIS should explain how the approval of up to 950 units in a dramatic redistribution of development to an auto-dependent location removed from the hamlet, retail activities, schools, and other essential services would affect the Town's community character, including efforts to revitalize the hamlet, and preserve rural character? 3.12d

Provide a discussion of how the project's consistency with the following goals in the Town of Lloyd's recently adopted 2005 Comprehensive Plan. 3.12e

- **Goal 1:**
  - Preserve the Town's rural character
  - Reduce rural densities, where appropriate, in relation to environmental constraints throughout various portions of the town
- **Goal 2:**
  - Maintain the hamlet as center of town
- **Goal 6:**
  - Encourage economic development consistent with Lloyd's small town character
  - Develop a comprehensive water and sewer plan
    - Develop a comprehensive water and sewer plan…facilitating commercial mixed use expansion and redevelopment of the hamlet
    - Expand municipal water and sewer mains NORTH on Route 9W

The Town's Comprehensive Plan states (page 3-1) Most portions of the town outside the hamlet of Highland need to maintain low densities (particularly in areas of steep slopes and wetlands) to preserve rural atmosphere and avoid traffic congestion. Provide a discussion as to why this particular environmentally sensitive site with wetlands and steep slopes warrants development at densities of 15 units per acre when the existing plan recommends reducing densities to 1 unit per three acres. Citing the above-referenced statement, justify the rationale behind the proposal for 400,000sf of light industry on this particular site 3.12f

The Comprehensive Plan provides direct guidance about residential densities in outlying parts of Lloyd.

> **Residential densities** (page 3-17)
> Throughout the northern, western, and southern portions of the Town, steep slopes, and the presence of wetlands inhibit development potential, In response to these environmental factors, the 1981 comprehensive plan recommended that allowable densities in these areas of Town be decreased. However this recommendation has never been implemented. The current Comprehensive Plan reiterates the recommendation to reduce the allowable density in areas constrained by natural features. The environmental sensitivity and carrying capacity of the land should be evaluated in these areas and density reduced accordingly in the same manner that density was reduced in the WBOD to protect the Hudson River bluffs.
>
> However, decreased density should also be accompanied with clustering to ensure that the impact of development is not just spread across larger area of land.
>
> Land Use and transportation are interconnected; a high density of residential development in outlying areas of the town will have an adverse impact on the existing transportation network, forcing expensive road widenings, that will be detrimental to the town tax structure and rural ambiance Lloyd residents value. As a result, the Comprehensive Plan recommends generally reducing allowable densities in all outlying areas of the Town.

Citing these statements from the Comprehensive Plan, provide a discussion as to the rationale why such a dramatic shift in policy is required at this particular site. 3.12.g

The Comprehensive Plan makes particular recommendations regarding the manner in which the extension of public infrastructure should promote economic development.

Economic development
Comp Plan (page 8-3) describes a study for feasibility of extending water north from hamlet on 9W.

Water and Sewer
The town should expand existing water and sewer districts to areas adjacent to Highland.

The Comprehensive plan recommends directing increased density to the hamlet.

Expand municipal facilities to permit light industrial development on North Road adjacent to Route 9W (page 9-2)

Rapid expansions (of water and sewer) into areas which are distant from existing service districts and would incur substantial costs to the existing users should be discouraged.

Citing these statements in the Comprehensive Plan, provide a discussion as to the rationale why such a dramatic shift in policy is required at this particular site. 3.12.h

Section 3.10 Visual Character.
3.10.1 Environmental Setting
There are two important viewing locations at Locust Grove—one is higher in elevation and the other lower near the water. Visual simulations should be provided from both. The view point higher in elevation should be made from which the project would be most visible at a site along the Lane Loop trail. 3.13

Simulations should be provided from a view point at the little park along the west wall of Vassar Brothers Hospital, adjacent to Route 9. 3.14

Section 3.12 Traffic
3.12.a Environmental Setting
Traffic accessing the site from the west (western Lloyd, Clintondale, Plattekill, Gardiner, etc.) will use Vineyard Avenue and Chapel Hill Road. This intersection is already congested during many times of the day. Add to the list of intersections for which capacity analyses will be conducted Vineyard Avenue and Chapel Hill Road. 3.15

Section 3.15 Fiscal Conditions
3.15.a Environmental Setting
With much undeveloped and in parts of Lloyd with better access to roads, infrastructure, and commercial services, the entitlement of this one site to 945 residential units is likely to impact the ability of other residents to sell their homes or to build in more suitable parts of town. The scope should contain a requirement for the DGEIS to include an absorption study that demonstrates the impact that approving 945 residential units, in combination with other approved projects and those in the pipeline, would have on efforts to sell existing homes or build on other sites in the Town. 3.16

Section 3.16 Demographics
3.16.a Environmental Setting
The Town's Comprehensive Plan states that in 2000 there were 3,818 housing units in Lloyd (page 2-11). The DGEIS should provide a map that demonstrates the distribution of existing homes in Lloyd. 3.17

3.16.b Potential Impacts
The proposed action would result in 945 more units (25% of the entire town's existing (2000) housing) in an area well outside the hamlet. For comparison, this section of the DGEIS should include a map showing the conceptual location of these 945 units combined with the location of the existing 3,818 units. 3.18

Section 3.17 Community Character
Section 3.17.b Potential Impacts
Describe how road improvements necessary on 9W and other roads over the buildout of this project (potential widenings, traffic signals, and turn lanes, etc) will affect the community character and rural setting of the area. 3.19

Section 3.18 Greenhouse Gas Emissions
3.18.b. Potential Impacts
This section should provide a full and robust evaluation of the proposed action's consistency with the state's goals for reducing greenhouse gas emissions? This should include a vehicle miles traveled (VMT) analysis and resulting greenhouse gas emissions comparing 950 residential units at this location to 950 units in a walkable location adjacent to the hamlet. 3.20

Section 4 Alternatives
4.2 Alternative Development Plans
Add to this section another alternative consisting of the redevelopment of the existing wine village with a hotel/conference center only, and related retail only. Development at this location should be confined to the general area around the existing buildings and former vineyard areas and avoid areas to the north and south. 3.21

Section 9.0 Cumulative impacts
Cumulative Impacts should examine cumulative impacts on natural resources/biodiversity within the Towns of Lloyd and Marlborough. 3.22

Conclusion
The subject site is arguably the premier riverfront site in the Mid-Hudson Valley. It possesses outstanding views, proximity to Walkway Over the Hudson, Franny Reese State Park, and is adjacent to an emerging network of regional "green infrastructure." And being one of the largest sites along the Hudson River, bordering a State Park and, as part of the Blue Point Subunit of the Esopus Lloyd Scenic Area of Statewide Significance (SASS), the "Esopus/Lloyd Wetlands and Ridges," a significant biodiversity area identified by the Hudson River Estuary Program, and the Northern Wallkill Biodiversity Plan's Blue Point Biodiversity Area, the development of the site must be undertaken with the utmost sensitivity. Hence, it must be carefully redeveloped in order to add lasting value to Lloyd and the surrounding communities.

Given that the Hudson Valley Wine Village is the largest project proposed in Lloyd's history and would impact what is arguably a site of utmost sensitivity, it is critically important that the scope identifies all the environmental, fiscal, and community impacts that could potentially result.

Scenic Hudson hopes that these comments will be helpful to the Town Board as it refines the scope and that the resulting project will be one that the Town can be proud of for years to come.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Anzevino

Jeffrey Anzevino, AICP
Director of Land Use Advocacy

Letter 4

Scenic Hudson, Inc.
One Civic Center Plaza, Suite 200
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601-3157
Tel: 845 473 4440
Fax: 845 473 2648
email: info@scenichudson.org
www.scenichudson.org

SCENIC HUDSON

Statement of

Jeffrey Anzevino, AICP
Director of Land Use Advocacy
Scenic Hudson, Inc.

Town of Lloyd
Town Board

Hudson Valley Wine Village
Draft Scope

October 12, 2011

Good evening. My name Jeffrey Anzevino; I am Director of Land Use Advocacy for Scenic Hudson, a 48-year-old nonprofit environmental organization that protects and restores the Hudson River and its majestic landscapes. We do this by providing planning assistance to support communities' efforts to revitalize their waterfronts and conserve significant natural resources that underpin our outstanding quality of life. The Scenic Hudson Land Trust has created or enhanced more than 50 public parks, preserves and historic sites up and down the Hudson River. We very much appreciate the opportunity to offer these comments.

Background

Scenic Hudson has over 200 supporters in the Town of Lloyd and we have worked closely over the years with Town officials and other agencies, ordinary citizens and stakeholders to establish a network of parks that is now attracting hundreds of thousands of visitors to Highland annually. These parks include Bob Shepard Highland Landing Park, Franny Reese State Park, and, of course, Walkway Over the Hudson. In addition, we are working with the Town to establish a connection between the Hudson Valley Rail Trail, Berean Park and the Gaffney Farm, and eventually farther up on to Illinois Mountain in order to create a network of hiking and mountain biking trails.

It should also be noted that, in addition to our role in the creation of Franny Reese State Park, we manage that park for New York State and the park shares a long common boundary and shared habitat with the proposed Hudson Valley Wine Village. In combination, Franny Reese State Park and the Wine Village comprise about 675 acres of forested, old field, and wetland habitat.

This background is important because these parks and trails are having a positive impact on the local economy. And, to be sure, the hamlet of Highland, which everyone agrees is hungry for new capital investment, lies at the center of this network. The Town's Comprehensive Plan makes clear over and over that development is to be directed to the hamlet and away from outlying parts of town.

The Proposal

Before us tonight is the scope of a Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement for a project that would create an entire new village center on an environmentally sensitive, scenic, and historic 425-acre site at

the southern edge of town. And, on a parallel track, but certainly related, the Town is considering establishing a new zoning district, PRD, to which this applicant seeks a rezoning.

Our task in "scoping" is to identify the potential environmental and community impacts of a proposal that would reverse the Town's vision as expressed in its two previous Comprehensive Plans and—rather than decrease density over existing levels by 50% as the latest plan recommends, would seek to increase the allowable housing units—up to 950—by as much as to 375%. Further, the 2005 Comprehensive Plan does not envision up to 400,000 square feet of light manufacturing and a hotel, conference center and retail space. Then we must work together to review the resulting environmental impact statement and find ways to avoid, reduce or mitigate those impacts.

The proposed site of the Hudson Valley Wine Village is arguably the premier riverfront site in the Mid-Hudson Valley. It possesses outstanding views, proximity to Walkway Over the Hudson, Franny Reese State Park, and is adjacent to an emerging network of regional "green infrastructure." And being one of the largest sites along the Hudson River, bordering a State Park and, as part of the Blue Point Subunit of the Esopus Lloyd Scenic Area of Statewide Significance (SASS), the "Esopus/Lloyd Wetlands and Ridges," a significant biodiversity area identified by the Hudson River Estuary Program, and the Northern Wallkill Biodiversity Plan's Blue Point Biodiversity Area, the development of the site must be undertaken with the utmost sensitivity. Hence, its careful redevelopment could add lasting value to Lloyd and the surrounding communities.

The Town's Comprehensive Plan has long recognized the importance of the SASS and Biodiversity Areas and has zoned them for low density development. But the proposed action tonight includes amendments to the Comprehensive Plan, creation of a brand new zoning district, and rezoning parts of this site to allow high density development.

Lloyd's Comprehensive Plan

Lloyd's vision over the past three decades and two comprehensive plan cycles calls for decreasing densities from two acres per unit in 1981 to the recently adopted plan recommending three acres per unit. As proposed, the program of development—even if phased over 20 or more years is at odds with the Town's 2005 Comprehensive Plan and generally accepted principles of Smart Growth. Clearly, the proposed development must support goals of the Town's Comprehensive Plan, and, since the site is in the Coastal Zone, be also consistent with its Local Waterfront Revitalization Program.

According to the Town's Comprehensive Plan, in 2000 there were 3,818 housing units in Lloyd (page 2-11). Allowing up to 945 more units would represent 25% of the entire town's 2000 housing stock—in an area well outside of the hamlet. Approving this level of residential development—even over a 20-year build-out period—could well exhaust the capacity for future residential development in places closer to the hamlet and affect the ability of residents to sell existing homes. The Bridgeview development, built in fits and starts over a 20+ year period, has about 170 units, all within walking distance of a grocery store and other services. As proposed, the Hudson Valley Wine Village would result in over five times as many units in an auto-dependent location without easy access to goods and services.

Therefore our concerns over the scope and scale of development for this site are both economic as well as environmental. We will submit detailed scoping comments by the close of the comment period on October 28th, but will outline just a few tonight.

Specific Comments

4.1

1) Justify the drastic rezoning and Comprehensive Plan amendments required to enable this development. We will provide specific references in the 2005 Comprehensive Plan that recommend increased densities in and around the hamlet and reduced densities on sites like this at the outer edge of town.

2) According to the Town's Comprehensive Plan, in 2000 there were 3,818 housing units in Lloyd (page 2-11). Allowing 945 more units would represent 25% of the entire town's existing (2000) housing—in an area outside the hamlet. With the weak real estate market, limited prospects for significant increase in demand for new homes, hundreds of homes for sale or in foreclosure, or already approved, how would the approval of up to 950 units in a dramatic redistribution of development to an auto-dependent location removed from the hamlet, retail activities, schools, and other essential services affect the Town's community character, including efforts to revitalize the hamlet, and preserve rural character? 4.2

3) The Town's 2005 Comprehensive plan makes several recommendations regarding water and sewer service (page 9-2) all of which are intended to advance the goal of increasing the vitality of Highland hamlet and retaining the rural character of other parts of town:

- Expand existing water and sewer districts to areas adjacent to Highland.
- directing increased density to the hamlet.
- Expand municipal facilities to permit light industrial development on North Road adjacent to Route 9W
- Rapid expansions (of water and sewer) into areas which are distant from existing service districts and would incur substantial costs to the existing users should be discouraged.

How would the necessary water line extension to the site affect the Town's longstanding plans as articulated in the Comprehensive plan to extend water and sewer service to the north of Highland, where there is an existing light industrial area? 4.3

4) How does the proposed program of development relate to the Comprehensive Plan's objectives regarding reducing residential densities in areas outside the existing hamlet (see below)? 4.4

Residential densities

Throughout the northern, western, and southern portions of the Town, steep slopes, and the presence of wetlands inhibit development potential., In response to these environmental factors, the 1981 comprehensive plan recommended that allowable densities in these areas of Town be decreased. However this recommendation has never been implemented. The current Comprehensive Plan reiterates the recommendation to reduce the allowable density in areas constrained by natural features. The environmental sensitivity and carrying capacity of the land should be evaluated in these areas and density reduced accordingly in the same manner that density was reduced in the WBOD to protect the Hudson River bluffs.

However, decreased density should also be accompanied with clustering to ensure that the impact of development is not just spread across larger area of land.

Land Use and transportation are interconnected; a high density of residential development in outlying areas of the town will have an adverse impact on the existing transportation network, forcing expensive road widenings that will be detrimental to the town tax structure and rural ambiance Lloyd residents value. As a result, the Comprehensive Plan recommends generally reducing allowable densities in all outlying areas of the Town.

Town of Lloyd Comprehensive Plan, 2005, page 3-17

6) The site hosts many wetlands and unregulated vernal pools both individually and as an interconnected system of habitats. Discuss the importance of these water resources, the need for buffer areas protecting them and how the program of development would impact these wetlands and vernal pools and the wildlife they support. Include in the discussion the town Comprehensive 4.5

Plan's recommendation (on pages 7-9 and 7-10) to adopt a wetlands law to protect isolated wetlands less than 12.4 acres and vernal pool inventory.

7) Include information found in and impact on Northern Wallkill Biodiversity Plan and the Blue Point Biodiversity Area. The description of the Blue Point Biodiversity Area indicates that the "low observance rate of development associated species in the northern part of the site suggests very high quality habitat. In addition, the southern part of the site contains several observations of state-listed HDS bird species, the yellow breasted chat (Icteria virens), that is at the northern limit of its range, an indication of high quality successional habitat. Other MDS bird species observed here include: alder flycatcher (Empidonax aldnorum), black billed cuckoo, black throated blue warbler, magnolia warbler, scarlet tanager, willow flycatcher, and worm eating warbler. One MDS reptile, the northern black racer was also observed here. The description of this biodiversity area indicates that its site adjacent to the Hudson River is a strong reason for its biodiversity area, as quality riverside habitat is important for many species yet increasingly rare due to development. The scope EIS should examine how fragmenting this 428-acre site with a road and large scale development could impact to the above-referenced species and biodiversity area. 4.6

8) How will necessary road improvements on 9W and other roads necessary over the buildout of this project (potential widenings, traffic signals, and turn lanes, etc) affect the community character and rural setting of the area. 4.7

9) Remove the alternative that would examine the impacts of 1,200 residential units and 400,000sf of light industrial space and replace it with an alternative that would redevelop the area in the immediate vicinity of the Regent Champagne Cellar buildings with a 90-room boutique hotel, conference center and related retail space of the scale that is proposed in the preferred alternative. 4.8

Conclusion

As proposed, the program of development with up to 950 +/- residential units, 400,000sf of light industry, and boutique hotel, conference center and retail facility is ill conceived, not based on market realities, and diametrically opposed to the Town's 2005 Comprehensive Plan—as well as generally accepted principles of Smart Growth—and will have lasting and significant impacts on the environment and community character.

With outstanding views, proximity to Walkway Over the Hudson, Franny Reese State Park, and an emerging network of regional "green infrastructure," this is arguably the premier riverfront site in the Mid-Hudson Valley and its careful redevelopment could add lasting value to Lloyd and the surrounding communities.

Scenic Hudson will provide additional comments by the close of the comment period on October 28.

Thank you.

LetHor 5
10/28/11 COPY TOWN BOARD
L. D. STASI
DAVE BARTON

Oct. 26, 2011

ELECTRONIC TO T BARNER
T. KOLANKOWSKI

Town Clerk
Town of Lloyd
Town Hall
12 Church St., Highland, N.Y., 12528

Dear Sirs,

I am writing regarding the draft scope of the GEIS for Hudson Valley Wine Village Project.

As a frequent visitor to the Scenic Hudson property at Franny Reese Park, most of my concern relates to the continued viability and preservation of that wonderful area. Although the draft scope does promise to address the impact on the park on p. 21, I would like to highlight some specific concerns of my own.

I would specifically like the impact statement to assess the potential impact of loss of habitat from the project on surrounding areas such as wildlife populations in Franny Reese. 5.1 I am also concerned about the potential impact of noise from construction and from any future industry, hotels or housing on flora and fauna in the park. 5.2 Of course, I would also be concerned about wastewater and storm drainage effects on the park, as well as on the Hudson River. 5.3 I don't see where this last concern is specifically addressed in the draft scope.

Also, with regard to local traffic, I don't see that the report specifically mentions any impact on traffic on the Mid Hudson Bridge, the place which already experiences the greatest traffic delays, especially for on and off ramps and 9W near the bridge. 5.4 Since the park is right next to the bridge, I would like the impact statement to address the problem of additional traffic on the park, especially with regard to noise and local air pollution. 5.5 I would like to hear about any additional mitigation proposed to address this potential problem.

As an area resident, I appreciate the efforts of the Town Board to solicit the concerns of those who will be affected by this project. I look forward to reviewing the final impact statement when it becomes available.

Sincerely,

Charles Gadol, M.D.
555 Plutarch Rd.
Highland, N.Y., 12528

Letter 6

8 Lauretta Dr.
Highland, NY 12528
October 25, 2011

To: Rosalie Peplow, Town Clerk and Members of the Lloyd Town Board:

I recently attended the Public Hearing held on Oct. 12, 2011 to hear and comment on the proposed Highland Wine Village Development.

I must say that I have been very discouraged to hear of this massive development that is being suggested and the apparent willingness of the Town Board to accommodate the wishes of the developer.

It has been my experience that unless the people of the Town organize, spend their time and energy, raise funds to fight these projects the people who represent us will allow the land to be destroyed, the rural character of the town to be ignored and continually bend the zoning laws and disregard the Comprehensive Master Plan. I saw this with the proposal for a racetrack, the development of large housing complexes, the Highland Square project and now this huge development. Many times, after the fact, the developer who promised so much couldn't deliver and even asks for a reduction in their taxes!! Do we ever learn our lesson?

I am against changing the zoning law to accommodate this project. Although some development on this property would seem reasonable the idea that 920 houses would be approved gives me nightmares! I hope you realize that this would increase our total housing by 20%. Is there really a need for these homes in today's market or in the forseeable future? What happens if this development remains unused? What benefit do we gain when we allow all the trees to be cut down, the wildlife to be disturbed, and the water table to be disrupted, not to mention the increase of traffic and other assaults on the townspeople? 6.1 6.2 6.3

Please reconsider this proposal with a clear vision for the future of the town and its citizens. If the developer will not compromise by scaling down his proposal I recommend denying the changes in zoning that he requests.

Sincerely,

Madeline Mazzetti-Labriola

10/27/11 COPY TOWN BOARD
L. D. STAS
D. BARTON

ELISE VIOLA
39 PERKINSVILLE RD.
HIGHLAND, NY 12528

October 26, 2011

Town Board, C/O Town Clerk
Town Hall, 12 Church St.
Highland, NY 12528

RE: Public Hearing for Draft Scoping,
GEIS of Hudson Valley Wine Village

Dear Town Clerk,

I have the following comments regarding the scoping document and the potential impact of the HVWV project itself:

IMPACTS & CUMULATIVE IMPACTS OF THE HVWV PROJECT

Proposed Features Inconsistent With Our Comprehensive Master Plan:

Developer has submitted an application to rezone a portion of the property to PRD with the eventual possibility of allowing 950 units of housing. Our CMP suggests lower densities of housing on the outskirts of town NOT higher densities. Locating business centers outside of the Hamlet does not help our existing struggling business in the Hamlet, a frequently stated goal of Town Boards and a big concern for residents.

Rezoning to suit the financial needs of a developer simply because "the market may bear it" over 20 years is not the proper incentive for town planning and not fair to the residents who live and own property here. Probable negative impacts of 950 additional housing units would be:

1. Glutted housing market. Lower property resale values on existing homeowners looking to sell. 7.1
2. Inevitable congestion on the narrow 9W and on going cost to maintenance of infrastructure in general. 7.2
3. Higher population density generally results in more children in our school system. The likelihood this will eventually create a higher school tax burden seems probable. 7.3
4. Higher population density on this piece of property (& on the outskirts of town) does nothing to promote our already compromised "preservation of rural atmosphere", an objective of CMP. 7.4

MITIGATIONS AND ALTERNATIVES

Aside from the general issue that PRD's should not be floating and need regulations that downsize the units allowed a PRD designation should not be given to this project.

Rather, I would suggest a design standard mandating the same or fewer homes as currently allowed with R1 and R2 zoning on the Blue Point property would be in the best interest of the community at large. In this case, approximately 300 units maximum. The design standard should include cluster building and conservation subdivision allowing for the larger part of the land as uninterrupted open space. 7.5

Studies have shown that people prefer to live (and I would argue "stay or vacation") in places with views and vistas of undeveloped land. If people prefer this, would it not be a more financially profitable approach for the developer?

Instead of housing units, why not create a development which follows the objectives described in our CMP (direct benefit to the residents and existing business's of Lloyd) while providing the opportunity for **profitability to the developer with unique business ventures**, suitable to the Hudson Valley. The Hudson Valley is on the frontier of the national trend toward sustainable markets in agriculture, local and artisan food, farm to table and agri tourism products.

Why not create a development, which provides an environment for the businesses that are serving this niche industry? In addition, seeking out those business's, with lease and purchase agreements would guarantee success. **Here are some ideas conducive to that end:** 7.6

1. As already planned, a hotel utilizing existing architecture but not a high rise.

2. A high-end resort with amenities and recreation for people looking for a rural atmosphere.

3. A regional and state center for wine producers to bring their product for tasting. (Vineyards attached. We have a farmer right here in Lloyd looking to revitalize some Vineyards). Customers would come from all over to taste and purchase wines.

4. Equestrian facility and related businesses.

5. A resort specializing in Agra tourism activities such as: Olive picking, truffle hunting, cooking, small game hunting, outdoor recreation.

6. Industries that support these other industries. For example; New York has a growing number of independent distilleries producing specialty spirits. With the increase in this market, there is a shortage in barrel manufacturers. Light industries such as barrel manufacturing that don't produce droves of people driving to work every day as well as substantial impacts on our environment.

7. A historical village with business's to suit (ala Williamsburg, Virginia). The village could be from the colonial period, using the draw of the revolutionary war soldier grave. Look at the huge commercial success of places like Gettysburg and Mystic Seaport just to name a couple!

8. Distilleries of Artisanal spirits.

These are just a handful of ideas. I hope you will give careful consideration to this approach. This could be a very exciting business model for all involved.

SCOPING DOCUMENT –
Executive Summary: " Description of proposed zoning and comprehensive plan actions"
2.1 Detailed Description of the Proposed Action --- " A description of proposed zoning and comprehensive plan amendments". Are we altering our Comprehensive Plan to suit this development or will the development be mitigated to suit our Comprehensive Plan?
If it is the former not the latter, that is **unacceptable** in my view.

"List of Involved and interested agencies". I vote that a citizens group NOT appointed by the Town Board or the Developer, but comprised of volunteers from all over town be formed to submit a survey of quality of life issues which will be impacted by this project.

Speaking to the same quality of life issues, Section *1.2 – Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action* -- " It will present the applicant's goals and objectives as well as the socio-economic benefits of the project to the Town of Lloyd and other taxing jurisdictions. It will further discuss the Town's need for the project based on its adopted plans and policies as well as current socio-economic conditions." This wording suggests that it's already determined that we **need** this project.

We, as residents of Lloyd don't need to be told by someone who doesn't live here but only has a financial interest in their property, what the socio-economic benefits of a project will be to us. Again, a citizens group should be the one submitting this argument pro and con, not the developer. For example, the developer has stated repeatedly that the development will create up to a thousand jobs although they have no idea what those are. This is a very tired argument. Unless the developer can guarantee us that only residents of Lloyd will be employed in the building, maintenance and ongoing business of this development ----- then we don't care. Also, if as the developer states, these jobs will create a need for more housing then obviously those jobs will not be held by residents of Lloyd because we already live in and own houses here.

On the subject of tired arguments, there is one more – "ratables". Will the developer sign something to guarantee us that they won't be suing the town for a lower tax rate? Why haven't our taxes gone down over the years as "ratables" have steadily increased? Again, a tired, unproven argument not worthy of the risk to our quality of life. 7.7

I could go on, but I won't. Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Elise Viola

Letter 8

New York State Office of Parks,
Recreation and Historic Preservation
Historic Preservation Field Services Bureau • Peebles Island, PO Box 189, Waterford, New York 12188-0189
518-237-8643
www.nysparks.com

Andrew M. Cuomo
Governor

Rose Harvey
Commissioner

September 26, 2011

Rosaria J. Peplow
Town of Lloyd
12 Church Street
Highland, New York 12528

Re: SEQRA
Hudson Valley Wine Village, 422 acres,
9W east side of 9W south of the Mid-Hudson
Bridge/LLOYD, Ulster County
11PR06501

Dear Ms. Peplow:

Thank you for requesting the comments of the Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP) concerning your project's potential impact/effect upon historic and/or prehistoric cultural resources. Our staff has reviewed the documentation that you provided on your project. Preliminary comments and/or requests for additional information are noted on separate enclosures accompanying this letter. A determination of impact/effect will be provided only after ALL documentation requirements noted on any enclosures have been met. Any questions concerning our preliminary comments and/or requests for additional information should be directed to the appropriate staff person identified on each enclosure. 8.1

In cases where a state agency is involved in this undertaking, it is appropriate for that agency to determine whether consultation should take place with OPRHP under Section 14.09 of the New York State Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation Law. In addition, if there is any federal agency involvement, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation's regulations, "Protection of Historic and Cultural Properties" 36 CFR 800 requires that agency to initiate Section 106 consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). 8.2

When responding, please be sure to refer to the OPRHP Project Review (PR) number noted above.

Sincerely,

Ruth L. Pierpont

Ruth L. Pierpont
Acting Deputy Commissioner for Historic Preservation

Enclosure

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION BUILDINGS/STRUCTURES/DISTRICTS

PROJECT NUMBER 11PR06501

(Hudson Valley Wine Village, 422 acres, 9W/east side of 9W south of the Mid-Hudso n Bridge/T/LLOYD)

In order for us to complete our evaluation of the historic signification of all buildings/structures/districts within or adjacent to your project area we will need the following additional information

- [x] Full project description showing area of potential effect.
- [x] Clear, original photographs of buildings/structures 50 years or older.
  - [x] within or [x] immediately adjacent to the project area
  - *** key all photographs to a site map*
- [x] Clear, original photographs of the surroundings looking out from the project site in all direction, *keyed to a site map.*
- [ ] Date of construction.
- [ ] Brief history of property.
- [ ] Clear, original photographs of the following:
- [x] Other:

  Please show boundaries of the 422 acres on a USGS map; also, provide street addresses (keyed to a map) of all 50+ year old buildings-structures on/near the project area.

Please provide only the additional information checked above. If you have any question concerning this request for additional information, please call Nancy Todd at 518-237-8643. ext 3262

PLEASE BE SURE TO REFER TO THE PROJECT NUMBER NOTED ABOVE WHEN RESPONDING TO THIS REQUEST

WHITEMAN
OSTERMAN
& HANNA LLP

Attorneys at Law
www.woh.com

One Commerce Plaza
Albany, New York 12260
518.487.7600 phone
518.487.7777 fax

Terresa M. Bakner
Partner
518.487.7615 phone
tbakner@woh.com

September 30, 2011

Ruth Pierpont, Acting Deputy Commissioner for Historic Preservation
NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation Historic Preservation
Field Services Bureau, Peebles Island
PO Box 189
Waterford, NY 12188-0189

Re: SEQRA
Hudson Valley Wine Village, 422 Acres,
9W East site of 9W South of the Mid-Hudson Bridge/LLOYD, Ulster County
11PR06501

Dear Ms. Pierpont:

Whiteman Osterman & Hanna represents the Town of Lloyd in the review of the above referenced project. The Town Board of the Town of Lloyd is the SEQRA Lead Agency for the review of the above referenced project which has been proposed by the Property Owner and Applicant, Hudson Valley Wine Village, Inc. The Town Board issued a positive declaration determining that a Generic Environmental Impact Statement must be prepared for the project. The Town Board also decided to conduct public scoping for the GEIS. The draft scope was provided to your agency to seek your input on issues related to historic and archeological preservation that you would like addressed in the draft GEIS by the applicant. Your letter of September 26, 2011 will be provided to the Applicant, Hudson Valley Wine Village Inc., so that the issues raised can be covered in the scope of the GEIS, as well as in the Draft GEIS.

Thank you for your comments.

Very truly yours,

Terresa M. Bakner

Terresa M. Bakner

w:\17600\17687\cor\pierpont ltr 09.30.11.docx

c: Stu Mesinger, consultant to the Applicant (with Pierpont letter of 9/26/11)
James Horan, counsel to the Applicant (with Pierpont letter of 9/26/11)
Rosalie Peplow, Town Clerk
Raymond J. Costantino, Town Supervisor
David Barton II, Town ZEO

Letter 3

Copy: Town Board
Teresa Bakner
Ted Kolankowski

Hudson Valley Wine Village
Scoping questions 10-13-2011

1. What are the anticipated school enrollment projections with and without the project's residential build-out? 9.1
2. What are the summary results to the Town's anticipated revenues from each element of the project, like added property taxes, school taxes, and other revenues, versus added costs of fire protection, policing, schools, and other costs borne by Town residents, essentially, the net tax consequence to current tax paying residents? 9.2
3. What options are available to the project as offered by the Ulster County Industrial Development Agency as incentives, which are tied to the tax environment (IDA gets state monies)? Options (grants, loans, tax abatements, etc.) may include ones designed for the developer or for potential site occupants and may or may not be specific at this time. 9.3
4. What options are available to the project as offered by the Ulster County Development Corporation as incentives? Options (grants, loans, tax abatements, etc.) may include ones designed for the developer or for potential site occupants and may or may not be specific at this time. 9.4
5. Is the project build-out legally bound to proceed sequentially as presented, first, the light industrial, second, the hotel/ conference center, and thirdly, the residential build-out? 9.5
6. What wildlife displacement is anticipated and the results of their migration? For instance, the deer population is exploding in residential neighborhoods as evidenced by its growth in the town of Washingtonville and elsewhere. 9.6
7. Is there room for an agricultural element, such as vineyards? 9.7

Thank you.

Alan Van De Bogart

10/27/11 copy T/B
L. D. STASI
D. BARTON

Letter 10

October 27, 2011

TO: Town Clerk
Town of Lloyd

REF: Hudson valley Wine Village

#1 (Commercial Zoning in residential neighborhood) would that not take away business from the Hamlet? 10.1

#2 (Road congested) I live on Chapel Hill Road and in the morning it can take up to 10 minutes to get out of my drive-way and another 10 to 15 minutes to get out on to the 9-W. What will the impact be while construction is going on and after it is complete over 20 years? 10.2

#3 (Housing Market) over the last years my home has lost value. If more houses are built I feel that my house will lose more value. 10.3

#4 (School Taxes) for the 950 homes are to be covered by the 400,000 square feet of light industrial/manufacturing and the conference center and hotel) what about the impact of this project on our Fire Department, Police Department, Water and Sewer Department, Highway Department, Building Department and other Departments that would have to be increased. Who will pay for them? 10.4

#5 If the Hudson Valley Wine Village project is approved with a 20 year completion date will the Developer be Grand Fathered in with today's building codes over the 20 years or will they have to comply with new codes. Changes such as size of lot sizes, road construction, water and sewer? 10.5

#6(Construction Jobs) will the developer hire local contractors to perform the work and will they be willing to sign a Labor Agreement? 10.6

#7 Environment animals habitat, removing woodlands what's going to hold back water when the land is stripped and where will all this water be going? MORE FLOODING and where will the animals go? IN MY BACKYARD? 10.7

#8 Will the industrial/manufacturing jobs pay enough to their employees so that they can afford one of the 950 homes that are to be built? 10.8

Vito Dispensa
196 Chapel Hill Road
Highland, N Y 12528

Letter 11

Town Clerk
Town of Lloyd
RE: PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS
Hudson Valley Wine Village Rezoning

Dear Hudson Valley Wine Village,

What a huge project this undertaking is for you. If done right I think could quite awesome. I like the idea of the resort, the two acre homes, preserving the bluffs, trails to walk. I am not sure how I feel about the commercial on 9W. I worry about traffic there, but perhaps it could be done. 11.1

What I do object to though is the rezoning for the large amounts of homes on the north side of the property. I don't care if you are planning to build this over 20 years. I don't like it because no matter how many years you build it over, it will take away from the Hamlet. In fact it may even create another whole little village (HVW Village) all on own. This will NOT work. I think that what could work and make everything fall into place is to just keep this area two acre residential, just the way it is.

It is also unfortunate that your project is being forced to be part of the zoning chaos that exists in this town. You might find it easier to make your case as the new administration comes in and people begin to trust their council men and women again.

Sincerely,

Kit Cowan
235 Hawleys Corners
Highland, NY 12528

Letter 12

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
Division of Environmental Permits, Region 3
21 South Putt Corners Road, New Paltz, New York 12561-1620
Phone: (845) 256-3054 • FAX: (845) 255-4659
Website: www.dec.ny.gov

Joe Martens
Commissioner

Date: 08/17/2011

Supervisor Raymond Constantino
Town of Lloyd Town Board
Thomas Shay Square
12 Church Street
Highland, NY 12528

Re: **SEQR Lead Agency Coordination Hudson Valley Wine Village, Inc.**
Town of Lloyd
DEC Clearing House ID: 3639

Dear Supervisor Constantino,

On August 1st, 2011 the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC or Department) received the Town Lloyd's response to a July 26th, 2011 Department request for additional information relating to the SEQR lead agency circulation for the above referenced project. The information submitted in response to the August 1st letter, including the Town Board Resolution of July 20, 2011 and the full EAF, dated July 19th, 2011, are not clear regarding exactly what the action before the Town involves. The Department views the "whole action" as the proposed zoning amendment **and** the proposed "integrated plan", including development of conference center, residential, retail, office and light manufacturing uses, and public recreational facilities. Interrelated or phased decisions should not be made without consideration of their consequences for the whole action. Consequently, any determination of significance for the proposed zoning amendment, as per SEQR 617.3 (g), must include an evaluation of the potential environmental impacts of all elements of the "integrated plan". 12.1

Based upon review of the circulated documents, it appears that the project will require the following Departmental approvals:

1. Protection of Waters (Article 15)

The following streams and waterbodies are located within or near the site you indicated:

Name	Class	DEC Water Index Number	Status
Hudson River	A*	H	Protected
Trib. of Hudson River	C**	H-112	Non-Protected
Unnamed Pond	C**	H-112-CP438h	Non-Protected

* A Protection of Waters permit is required to physically disturb the bed or banks (up to 50 feet from stream) of any streams identified above as "protected."

** For streams identified as "Non-protected" the applicant is still responsible for ensuring that work shall not pollute any stream or waterbody. Care shall be taken to stabilize any disturbed areas promptly after construction, and all necessary precautions shall be taken to prevent

contamination of the stream or waterbody by silt, sediment, fuels, solvents, lubricants, or any other pollutant associated with the project.

2. Freshwater Wetlands (Article 24)

Your project site is not within a New York State protected Freshwater Wetland. However, please contact town officials and the United States Army Corps of Engineers in New York City, telephone (917) 790-8411 (other counties), for any permitting they might require.

3. Water Quality Certification (Section 401 of Clean Water Act)

The proposed project site appears to contain federally regulated wetlands. Federally regulated wetlands fall under the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE). If the proposed project involves the filling of any federally regulated wetland, a Section 401 Water Quality Certification (WQC) may also be required from DEC.

4. State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System SPDES (Article 17, Titles 7& 8)

Based upon the information provided in the EAF, a SPDES permit will be required for the discharge of wastewater/operation of a WWTP.

5. Water Supply (Article 15, Title 15)

Based upon the information provided in the EAF, a Water Supply permit will be required for the proposed installation/expansion of a supply and distribution system.

6. Compliance with the State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System SPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activities (GP-0-10-001)

Compliance with this SPDES General Permit is required for construction projects that disturb greater than one acre of land. If this proposal involves greater than one acre of disturbance, a Notice of Intent must be filed with DEC to obtain coverage under this general permit. Authorization for coverage under the SPDES general permit is not granted until issuance of the other necessary DEC permits.

Note: The subject property is located within the Town of Lloyd Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS-4). Therefore the SWPPP must be accepted by the Town and the MS-4 Acceptance Form must be submitted to the Department.

Other permits from this Department or other agencies may be required for projects conducted on this property now or in the future. Also, regulations applicable to the location subject to this determination occasionally are revised and you should, therefore, verify the need for permits if your project is delayed or postponed. This determination regarding the need for permits will remain effective for a maximum of one year unless you are otherwise notified. Applications may be downloaded from our website at www.dec.ny.gov under "Programs" then "Division of Environmental Permits."

In addition to the approvals identified above, the Department offers the following comments regarding the environmental review for the project:

Hudson River Estuary Wildlife and Habitat Conservation Framework

The proposed project is located adjacent to the "Esopus/Lloyd Wetlands and Ridges", a significant biodiversity area of the Hudson River Estuary corridor notable for wetlands. The environmental review for this project should include an evaluation of the potential environmental impacts to this resource of regional importance. 12.2

Franny Reese Preserve State Park

The proposed project is located adjacent to the Franny Reese Preserve State Park. The environmental review for this project should include an evaluation of the potential environmental impacts to this resource of statewide importance. 12.3

Scenic Area of Statewide Significance (SASS)

The proposed project is located within the "Esopus/Lloyd" SASS district. The visual impact assessment for this project should include an evaluation of the potential environmental impacts to this state significant aesthetic resource. 12.4

State-Listed Species

DEC has reviewed the State's Master Habitat Databank (MHDB) records. The following records of sensitive resources were identified by this review: Virginia Snakeroot (Endodeca serpentaria). 12.5

Cultural Resources

We have reviewed the state-wide inventory of archaeological resources maintained by the New York State Museum and the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation. These records indicate that the project is located within an area considered to be sensitive with regard to archaeological resources. For more information, please visit the New York State Office of Historic Preservation website at http://nysparks.state.ny.us/. 12.6

In addition to transmittal of the above comments, this letter also serves to confirm that the Department has no objection to the Town Board assuming lead agency for this project. 12.7

Please contact this office if you have questions regarding the above information. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Daniel Whitehead

Division of Environmental Permits
845-256-3801

Cc: Planning Board Chair, Town of Lloyd
Ecc: Stuart Mesinger, Chazen Companies
Ecc: Patrick Ferracane, NYS DEC

MORRIS ASSOCIATES
ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS, PLLC

☒ 9 Elks Lane, Poughkeepsie, New York 12601 Tel: (845) 454-3411 Fax: (845) 473-1962
☐ 64 Green Street, Suite 1, Hudson, New York 12534 Tel: (518) 828-2300 Fax: (518) 828-3963

February 14, 2014

Town of Lloyd Town Board
Town Hall
12 Church Street
Highland, NY 12528

Attn: Supervisor Paul Hansut and Town Board Members

RE: Hudson Valley Wine Village
DEIS Review
MA #212503.011

Dear Supervisor Hansut and Town Board Members

Morris Associates has performed a completeness review of the Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement (DGEIS) for the Hudson Valley Wine Village, dated February 5, 2014 (Second Draft Completeness Review). We find that our previous completeness comments dated November 19, 2013 have been addressed. Based upon our review and input from Fitzpatrick Engineering, we find the DGEIS to be in substantial conformance with the Final Scoping Document dated December 12, 2011. Subject to any further discussion by the Town Board, we recommend that the Board act to accept the DGEIS as complete, and release it for public comment.

Please note that although the DGEIS is deemed complete, additional substantive comments will be provided prior to the close of the public comment period. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (845) 454-3411, Ext. 20.

Very truly yours,

MORRIS ASSOCIATES,
Engineering Consultants, PLLC

Andrew L. Learn, PE
Sr. Engineer

AL/dm

Cc: D. Barton
T. Bakner
S. Mesinger

e:\documents\lloyd\2012\212503.00 hud val wine village\correspondence\2014, 02-14 hvwv dgeis completeness ltr.docx

STATE OF NEW YORK)
§
COUNTY OF ULSTER)

I, ROSARIA PEPLOW, Town Clerk of the Town of Lloyd, Ulster County, New York, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT:

I have compared the annexed extract of Minutes of the meeting of the Town Board of said Town of Lloyd, Ulster County, New York, including the Resolutions contained herein, held on the 19th day of February, 2014 with the original thereof on file in my office, and the same is a true and correct transcript therefrom and the whole of said original so far as the same relates to the subject matters therein referred to.

I, FURTHER CERTIFY, that all members of said Board had due notice of said meeting.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the said Town this 20th day of February, 2014

Rosaria Peplow

ROSARIA PEPLOW, Town Clerk
Town of Lloyd, Ulster County, New York

(SEAL)

At the Regular Meeting of the Town of Lloyd Town Board on February 20, 2014, the following resolution was adopted:

N. **RESOLUTION** made by Brennie, seconded by Paladino,

WHEREAS, an application has been made to the Town Board of the Town of Lloyd to rezone property comprising +/- 428.53 for the development of the Hudson Valley Wine Village Project which application was amended via a letter dated February 18, 2014 to include two additional tax map parcels, 96.3-1-32 and 96.3-1-19 for a total of +/- 430.5acres; and

WHEREAS, the HVWP will comprise single and multifamily residential, resort hotel, commercial office and light industrial uses; and

WHEREAS, applications will be made to the Town Board regarding the drainage, sewer and water approvals for the project, including but not limited to, the extension and/or creation of the drainage, sewer and water districts as necessary to service the proposed project; and

WHEREAS, the Proposed Action is subject to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), and is classified as a Type I Action; and

WHEREAS, given that the Town Board must determine whether and how to rezone the property, it would be most appropriate for the Town Board to assume SEQRA lead agency status; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant has requested that it be directed to prepare a Generic Environmental Impact Statement; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board declared its intent to be SEQRA Lead Agency for the review of the Proposed Action, a Type I action pursuant to SEQRA and undertook the necessary steps to coordinate with all involved agencies as required by SEQRA including circulating the notice of intent to act as lead agency to all involved agencies; and

WHEREAS, all the involved agencies either consented to the Town Board becoming lead agency or failed to respond within the thirty day timeframe provided for in SEQRA; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board resolved to be SEQRA lead agency and issued a positive declaration of environmental significance requiring the Applicant to prepare a Generic Environmental Impact Statement; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant provided a draft scoping document for the GEIS; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board held a duly noticed public scoping meeting and accepted comments on the scope until October 28, 2011; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board referred the draft scope to the Town Planning Board and Town Zoning Board, as well as the involved agencies for comments on the scope; and

WHEREAS, the applicant revised the Final Scope as directed by the Town Board and the Final Scope was accepted by the Town Board as meeting the requirements of 6 NYCRR Section 617.8 at its meeting in December 2011; and

WHEREAS, the applicant prepared and submitted preliminary Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement (DGEIS) and the preliminary DGEIS was reviewed by the Town Board as lead agency and by its consulting engineers and determined not to be complete at the Town Board meeting in November 2013; and

WHEREAS, the applicant has revised and resubmitted the second preliminary DGEIS which was again reviewed by the Town Board as lead agency and by its consulting engineers;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED as follows: That the Town Board hereby determines that the DGEIS, dated February 2014, is complete and sufficient for public review. The Town Board hereby directs Town Staff to duly file and publish the DGEIS and the attached notice of completion of and public hearing and comment period on the DGEIS. The DGEIS public hearing shall be held on March 19, 2014 commencing at 6:00 p.m. at the Town of Lloyd Town Hall, 12 Church Street, Highland, New York 12528. The written public comment period shall remain open until April 18, 2014. Any written public comments shall be provided to the Town of Lloyd to the attention of the Town Clerk. The DGEIS is posted on the Town website at www.Townoflloyd.com. A copy of this resolution shall be filed with the Town Clerk and provided to the Applicant.

Roll call: Hansut, aye; Brennie, aye; Guerriero, aye; Paladino, aye.

Four ayes carried.

The ENB SEQRA Notice Publication Form - *Please check all that apply*

Reset Form

Deadline: Notices must be received by **6 p.m. Wednesday** to appear in the following Wednesday's ENB

____ Negative Declaration - Type I

____ Conditioned Negative Declaration

____ Draft Negative Declaration

____ Positive Declaration
____ with Public Scoping Session

✔ Draft EIS
✔ with Public Hearing
✔ Generic
____ Supplemental

____ Final EIS
____ Generic
____ Supplemental

DEC Region # 3 County: Ulster Lead Agency: Town Board of the Town of Lloyd

Project Title: Hudson Valley Wine Village Project

Brief Project Description: The action involves . . .

The project is for a mixed-use development consisting of single and multi-family residences, resort hotel, commercial office and light industrial uses and will require rezoning in whole or in part by the Town Board of the Town of Lloyd. The Town of Lloyd Planning Board will review the project for subdivision, site plan and potentially the issuance of special use permits. The project, i.e. rezoning, may affect the entire +/- 428.53 acres or a portion thereof. Sewer and water service will need to be provided to the property and the Town's Sewer and Water Districts will need to be extended if the project is approved, or new water and sewer districts will need to be created. The overall project master plan will address the future development density of the property as well as the placement of any public or private roadways and utilities.

Project Location (include street address/municipality): 191-200 Blue Point Road, Town of Lloyd, Ulster County, New York 12528

Contact Person: Paul Hansut, Town Supervisor

Address: 12 Church Street City: Highland State: NY Zip: 12528

Phone: (845) 691-2144 Fax: (845) 691-7417 E-mail: _____

For Draft Negative Declaration / Draft EIS: Public Comment Period ends: 04 / 17 / 14

For Public Hearing or Scoping Session: Date: 03 / 19 / 14 Time: 6 : pm am/pm

Location: own of Lloyd Town Board 12 Church Street Highland, NY 12528

A hard copy of the DEIS/FEIS is available at the following locations:
Town of Lloyd Town Board 12 Church Street Highland, NY 12528

The online version of the DEIS/FEIS is available at the following publically accessible web site:
http://www.townoflloyd.com/pages/LloydNY_LegalNotices/HudsonValleyWineVillageDGEIS/

For Conditioned Negative Declaration: In summary, conditions include: