MEMORANDUM

To: Mamaroneck Village Planning Board

From: Stuart Mesinger

cc: Bob Galvin, Les Steinman, Betty Ann Sherer

Date: February 26, 2016

Re: Response to February 2, 2016 VHB Letter Regarding Hampshire Country Club DEIS Approach

Job #: 81540.0

We are in receipt of the February 2, 2016 letter from VHB requesting review of the methodology and approach to analysis of several subjects in the Hampshire Country Club DEIS. We offer the following in response.

<u>Traffic</u>

A. Traffic Counts

1. We agree with the vehicle classification categories presented, with the comment that two axle trucks should be included in the car category.

2. We agree with the count time periods presented.

3. We agree that the busiest hour for each time period should be evaluated.

4. We agree that the busiest hours will be based on Peak-Hour-Factor adjusted volumes.

B. Study Intersections

1. We agree that Synchro 8 can be used to determine levels of service and queuing for each study intersection.

C. Future Without The Project

1. We agree with the use of a 0.25% background traffic growth rate.

2. The attached figure illustrates developments recently proposed or approved that should be included in the traffic impact study. Traffic impact studies were previously prepared for the projects at 422 W. Boston Post Road and 690 Mamaroneck Avenue. Copies of these studies are available from the Village Planning Department.

3. We do not agree with the proposed assignment of Levels of Service to intersection volumes because the assignments proposed are not supported by the Highway Capacity Manual. The applicant should provide a qualitative assessment of these intersections as provided for in the Final Scope.

<u>Visual</u>

In addition to the responses below, we recommend that the applicant notify the Planning Board and its consultant of the date and time of the proposed balloon test and that such notification be made at least one week in advance of the test date so that it may be posted on the Village's web site.

A. GIS Visibility

1. We agree that only available GIS data need be used. No new data need be created.

2. We agree that public viewpoints are the highest concern for visual impact.

B. Field Visibility

1. We agree that one balloon is sufficient to determine visibility during the field test.

2. We agree that the balloon location need not necessarily be in the center of the property. However, we would like to review the balloon location in the field at the time of the test.

3. We agree that visibility need not be recorded from private properties (other than existing private roads running through or in the immediate vicinity of the property) unless there are cases where significant visibility occurs on such properties which cannot be assessed from a nearby road or other public location. During the course of the balloon test we will confirm areas of visibility and determine whether such areas

exist. If they do, permission to record visibility from such properties should be requested.

4. Visibility from Long Island Sound may be represented from an area near the water such as a beach provided that such location provides a substantially similar view as would be obtained from the Sound. If not, then a view from the Sound should be obtained. We will assess this during the balloon test.

C. Photo Simulations

1. We will review the GIS visibility findings in advance of the balloon flight and preliminarily approve of the photo simulation viewing points. However, it is our experience that, on occasion, areas of public visibility not anticipated by the GIS analysis are discovered during the balloon test. Thus we wish to attend the test and confirm areas of visibility in the field while the test is underway.

2. We agree that a leaf-on balloon test is not required and that the balloon reference can be superimposed on the leaf-on photos.

<u>Wetlands</u>

1. We agree that *A Rapid procedure for Assessing Wetland Functional Capacity Based on Hydrogeomorphic (HGM) Classification* may be used for the functional wetland analysis.

<u>Flood Analysis</u>

1. We agree with the proposed modeling procedure. We would like to review the proposed transect locations before they are finalized.

<u>Zero Fill Alternative</u>

1. We are not in agreement with the proposed approach which appears to involve first excavating soil from the site to build up development pads and then importation of additional structural fill. The applicant should analyze the “No Fill” alternative as it is outlined in the Final Scope. That is, under this alternative, <u>no</u> fill would be imported to the site.

Tree Survey

1. We agree that only trees over 8” diameter measured three feet above the trunk base need be identified and that an arborist need not be employed. All such trees within the development footprint, whether proposed for removal or not, should be identified.