

## FOREWORD

This Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) examines the New York City Department of Environmental Protection's (NYCDEP) proposed Ultraviolet Light Disinfection Facility (UV Facility) for the Catskill and Delaware (Catskill/Delaware) Water Supply System. NYCDEP is required to design, construct, and place into operation the UV Facility in accordance with the terms of the 2002 Filtration Avoidance Determination (FAD) issued by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). See [Section 1, Introduction and Project Background](#), for more details about the FAD and the background of the project, and [Section 2, Purpose and Need](#), for a description of the project's purpose and need.

The Draft EIS was completed and distributed for public review on May 31, 2004. Comments on the Draft EIS included oral comments made at the public hearing held on September 22, 2004 at Town Hall in the Town of Mount Pleasant, and written comments submitted to NYCDEP between May 31, 2004 and October 4, 2004. This Final EIS addresses all of the potential environmental concerns that were identified during the public review process.

As discussed in [Section 4.1, Ultraviolet Light Disinfection Facility](#), the proposed project would be constructed on City-owned property (Eastview Site) within the Towns of Mount Pleasant and Greenburgh in Westchester County, New York. The potential environmental impacts of the proposed UV Facility at this site are assessed in Sections 4.2 through 4.21. In addition, as part of the proposed project, construction work would need to take place off-site along the Catskill Aqueduct in Mount Pleasant, between the Eastview Site and Kensico Reservoir. This work would entail refurbishment/rehabilitation of the aqueduct (in order to pressurize the aqueduct so that it can deliver water to the Eastview Site at the proper hydraulic grade), construction of a new screen chamber at Kensico Reservoir, and filling the aerators at Kensico Reservoir with excavated material from the Eastview Site. The potential environmental impacts of this off-site work are presented in [Section 5.1, Off-Site Facilities](#). The Draft EIS also analyzed the installation of water distribution lines and a pump station for the Town of Mount Pleasant, in order to provide continuous water service to the Town during the Catskill Aqueduct Pressurization work and provide UV treated water to the Town once the UV Facility is placed into operation.

The following modifications to the design elements of the proposed off-site work have been made since the issuance of the Draft EIS:

- To provide water to the Town of Mount Pleasant and Westchester County Water District No. 3 during the pressurization work on the Catskill Aqueduct, a separate UV facility could be constructed for the Town of Mount Pleasant to the southeast of the existing Stevens Avenue Storage Tanks, within a new stand-alone building on Town owned property. The Town would have the ability to draw from either the Catskill or Delaware Aqueducts through the existing Commerce Street Pumping Station from either: (1) the Delaware Aqueduct via a 30-inch gravity

feed connection from Delaware Shaft No. 18, which could be installed for supplying Delaware Aqueduct water to the Town during extended shutdowns of the Catskill Aqueduct for pressurization work, or (2) from the Town's existing connection to the Kensico Siphon of the Catskill Aqueduct.

- Work could take place at the Delaware Aqueduct Shaft No. 18 prior to the pressurization of the Catskill Aqueduct, to establish a water main from Shaft No. 18 to the Commerce Street Pumping Station. Westchester County Water District No. 3 would still have access to water through their connections to the Town of Mount Pleasant's and Greenburgh's systems.

The option of providing continuous water service to the Town during the Catskill Aqueduct Pressurization work and providing UV treated water to the Town once the UV Facility is placed into operation from a pumping station at the Eastview Site is still under consideration in the Final EIS (see [Section 7, Alternatives](#)).

The following traffic analyses for off-site work were also conducted since the issuance of the Draft EIS:

- Three truck routes were considered in the Draft EIS (Options A, B, and C) for the transportation of excavated material from the Eastview Site to the Kensico campus, to fill the Delaware Aerator in peak construction year 2006. Two additional truck routes were investigated (Options D and E) in the Final EIS. The fourth truck route option, Option D, is a combination of earlier Options A and B. Option D involves all trucks destined to Kensico from Eastview would make a left turn from Grasslands onto Bradhurst to Lakeview Avenue to Columbus to West Lake Drive. Return trips to Eastview would make a left turn from Lakeview onto Commerce Street with a right turn onto Legion Drive, followed by a right turn onto Grasslands Road. Option D is essentially a circular route and has been identified by NYCDEP as the preferred truck route for transferring fill to the Aerators. For the fifth truck route option, Option E, all trucks destined to Kensico from Eastview would use Walker Road to Dana Road to Route 9A to Route 141 to Kensico Road to Columbus Avenue to West Lake Drive. On the return trip, trucks would make a right turn onto Columbus Avenue to Kensico Road to Route 141 to Route 9A to Dana Road to Walker Road. Option E is a longer route than any of the other options presented.
- In conjunction with the traffic analysis conducted for these additional options, impacts on air quality and noise were also assessed. Where adverse impacts were identified, mitigation measures were proposed.

In the Final EIS, it was assumed that the proposed UV Facility would be constructed from 2005 through 2009, with start-up in September 2009. The EIS analyzed the peak construction years (2006 and 2008 for the UV Facility at Eastview, and 2006 and 2010 for the off-site work), as well as the facility's first full year of operation (2010). In anticipation of a potential extension to the construction schedule, the Final EIS also examined the potential environmental impacts of an alternative schedule, which assumed the USEPA would grant NYCDEP an additional 18 months to construct the project.

The individual Final EIS analyses consider not only the proposed UV Facility but also other NYCDEP projects that could be undertaken at the Eastview Site, including the Croton Water Treatment Plant (Croton project), Police Precinct, a possible Administration Building, and the Kensico-City Tunnel.

Of the three sites being considered for the Croton project, NYCDEP formally accepted the Mosholu Site in the Bronx. This decision was made after the preparation of the Draft EIS for the UV Facility. The Final EIS for the proposed UV Facility considers the possibility of the Croton Project being located on the Eastview Site since the Eastview Site must be considered as a potential alternative until all legal issues surrounding the Mosholu Site are resolved.

Although NYCDEP may undertake one or all of the projects mentioned above at the Eastview Site, during the same general timeframe, the projects are functionally independent and they are not part of the same plan. In addition, the projects are subject to their own separate independent environmental reviews.

Given the uncertainty about the other NYCDEP projects, this Final EIS analyzes all of the potential projects, to the extent to which information is available, in the following manner:

- Each analysis, from Section 4.2 through Section 4.19, includes a Future Without the Project condition (the conceptual “baseline” against which the incremental impacts of the proposed UV Facility are assessed) that considers two possible scenarios: one in which the Croton project would not be located on the Eastview Site and one in which the Croton project would be located on the Eastview Site, specifically in the northwestern corner.
- In **Section 4.21, Combined Impacts**, a separate analysis of potential combined impacts is presented, where the impacts from both the proposed UV Facility and the Croton project, together, are compared to a Future Without the Project condition in which the Eastview Site remains relatively undeveloped, with the exception of the Police Precinct, Administration Building, and Kensico-City Tunnel. Section 4.21 also describes potential mitigation measures, where the potential combined impacts would be significant and adverse.

Given the complexity of the EIS analyses, flowcharts showing the framework of analysis are provided to assist the reader, specifically in Section 4.9, Traffic and Transportation, Section 4.10, Air Quality, and Section 4.11, Noise. Immediately following this Foreword is a comprehensive Table of Contents, and the Executive Summary. The Summary provides a brief overview of the proposed project and its potential significant or temporary adverse impacts and proposed mitigation, for the UV Facility (with and without the Croton project) and the combined scenario (both the UV Facility and Croton project).

Where the proposed UV Facility would potentially result in significant or temporary adverse impacts, as projected in Sections 4.2 through 4.19, mitigation measures have been developed and are presented in [Section 6, Mitigation of Potential Significant Temporary or Adverse Impacts](#). In [Section 4.20, Permits and Approvals](#), a list of the anticipated ministerial and discretionary approvals/permits required for the proposed UV Facility is provided.

Pursuant to the requirements of the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) and the City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR), [Section 7](#) of this Final EIS includes an analysis of alternatives that reduce or eliminate project impacts while substantively meeting project goals and objectives. In this section, a full build-out site plan for the Eastview Site is presented, including NYCDEP's potential short-term projects for the site (i.e., those that could be constructed through 2010, as identified above) and one potential long-term project (the Catskill/Delaware Water Treatment Plant), should filtration of the Catskill/Delaware System be needed in the future. Also pursuant to SEQRA/CEQR, the Final EIS contains a summary of the proposed project's unavoidable adverse impacts, irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources, and use and conservation of energy (see [Section 8, Unavoidable Adverse Impacts, Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources, and Use and Conservation of Energy](#)).

[Section 9](#) provides a preliminary environmental justice analysis. The environmental justice analysis comprises a preliminary screening analysis, which includes the establishment of the potentially affected area and the identification of potential adverse environmental impacts of the proposed project; positive benefits of the proposed project; a conclusion; and the enhanced public participation plan implemented to date.

A list of acronyms and a glossary of terms used through the Final EIS is provided in [Section 10, Acronyms and Glossary](#).

The Final EIS identifies all comments received during the public review period and provides detailed responses in [Section 11, Response to Comments](#). Text that has been changed or revised between the issuance of the Draft and Final EIS is indicated by a line marked on the outside border of the left margin.

Appendices A through H to the Final EIS include all of the studies conducted for the EIS. These have been updated for the Final EIS as necessary to reflect modifications to project elements.