

**FINAL SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE  
CROTON WATER TREATMENT PLANT  
METHODOLOGIES**

4.4.	COMMUNITY FACILITIES .....	1
4.4.1.	Introduction.....	1
4.4.2.	Baseline Conditions .....	2
4.4.2.1.	Existing Conditions.....	2
4.4.2.2.	Future Without the Project.....	2
4.4.3.	Potential Impacts.....	2
4.4.3.1.	Potential Project Impacts .....	2
4.4.3.2.	Potential Construction Impacts .....	3
4.4.4.	Mitigation.....	3

## **4.4. COMMUNITY FACILITIES**

### **4.4.1. Introduction**

Community facilities include schools, libraries, health care facilities, ambulance services, day care centers, senior citizen centers, community centers, fire and police protection and other emergency services. Other community facilities such as jails, colleges and universities, or religious and cultural facilities, are usually not analyzed unless the facility is the subject of the proposed project, or if the facility would be physically displaced or altered. The proposed project would not physically displace or alter any community facilities. However, the proximity of some facilities to the project sites could raise concerns about potential impacts from the construction-related and operational activities. The proposed project may also have a potential indirect impact by increasing demand for community facilities. The guidelines for analysis of community facilities are described below. These criteria provide thresholds for determining when and where detailed community facility analyses are required.

Detailed analyses are required when the following thresholds are exceeded:

- Schools – Introduction of more than 50 elementary/middle school students or 150 high school students.
- Libraries – Greater than a five percent increase in ratio of residential units to libraries in a Borough.
- Hospitals and Public Health Facilities – More than 600 low- to moderate-income units will be added.
- Day Care Centers (publicly funded) – More than 50 eligible children based on the number of low/moderate income units by Borough (although there is no threshold for upstate communities, this threshold was used for the upstate analysis).
- Fire Protection – No quantitative thresholds; however, direct effects on the station facility and response times will be analyzed.
- Police Protection – No quantitative thresholds; however, direct effects on the station facility and response times will be analyzed.

Baseline conditions, including existing and future conditions without the project, are described for each type of community facility. The study area for each project site was generally established as one-half mile from the boundaries of the project site. Study areas were expanded on an individual basis if the jurisdiction or service area of a community facility included the project site or if a community facility could be indirectly affected by activities at the project site.

## **4.4.2. Baseline Conditions**

### **4.4.2.1. Existing Conditions**

For the Mosholu Site, Harlem River Site, and off-site facilities located within New York City, field surveys were conducted within each study area to identify existing community facilities. Organizations servicing the study areas were contacted in order to obtain information on usage levels and capacities of community facilities within the study area. Relevant Town and City worldwide websites were reviewed for information. Publications containing information about community facilities within the study area were also examined.

For the Eastview Site and off-site facilities located in Westchester County, department heads from each municipality were contacted to characterize existing conditions, including police commissioners, fire chiefs, and ambulance corps captains. Information concerning their existing capacity to provide service (or “level of service”) and their overall scope of service delivery was requested and then summarized, including geographic jurisdiction, number and frequency of calls for service (i.e., demand), staffing levels, equipment, and facilities. The one-half-mile study area was also visually inspected for community facilities as part of the land use task described above.

### **4.4.2.2. Future Without the Project**

Appropriate organizations and agencies were contacted to obtain information on plans for new facilities or modifications to existing facilities. The New York City Citywide Statements of Needs for Fiscal Years 1999, 2000, 2003, and 2004 were also reviewed to determine if any City facilities were proposed within the Mosholu Site, Harlem River Site and off-site facilities study areas.

## **4.4.3. Potential Impacts**

### **4.4.3.1. Potential Project Impacts**

Based on the development of a water treatment plant at the Eastview Site, Mosholu Site or the Harlem River Site and the rehabilitation/modification of the off-site facilities, the potential demand on community services and the potential direct and/or indirect impact of providing services to these sites was determined. Workers at the site(s), vendors, and service companies could generate new demands, as could new residents attracted by the jobs at the water treatment plant. The determination of a potential adverse impact was based on whether or not the population in the service area would have adequate delivery of services in the Future With the Project.

#### **4.4.3.2. *Potential Construction Impacts***

An evaluation of the level of disruption caused by the delivery of services during construction activities associated with the water treatment plant and off-site facilities to the operation of community facilities was conducted in order to determine the effects of construction activity on community facilities within the study area.

#### **4.4.4. Mitigation**

Mitigation actions were developed if significant adverse impacts to a community facility were identified. In most cases, mitigation measures required cooperation and commitment from the agency with jurisdiction over the affected facility.