

A. INTRODUCTION

This Response to Comments section of this Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) responds to public's comments on the St. Paul's School Demolition for Additional Open Space Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), that was distributed for public review by the lead agency, the Village Board of the Incorporated Village of Garden City, on June 17, 2010. Public comments were received in writing, by e-mail, and at two public hearing sessions (August 19, 2010 and September 30, 2010).

Listed below are the names of individuals who commented, either orally or in writing, on the DEIS. Where comments were made on the same subject by more than one person, they are summarized into a single comment. Following each comment is the name of the commenter(s).

B. COMMENTERS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**SPEAKERS AT THE AUGUST 19, 2010 PUBLIC HEARING**

1. Muriel Urban (Urban)
2. Christine Rio (Rio)
3. Tricia Schettino (T. Schettino)
4. Jackson Goddard (Goddard)
5. George Salem (Salem)
6. Mary Delman (Delman)
7. Frank McDonough (F. McDonough)
8. James Gray (Gray)
9. Francine Ryan (Francine Ryan)
10. Bernard Marson (Marson)
11. Arlene Chianise (Chianise)
12. Ronald Young (R. Young)
13. David Hegarty (David Hegarty)
14. Kathleen Sweeney (Sweeney)
15. Mort Yuter (Yuter)
16. Peter Negri (Negri)

St. Paul's School Demolition for Additional Open Space

17. Tom Rechner (Rechner)
18. Dorothy Habben (Habben)
19. Edward Castagna (E. Castagna)
20. Betsy Andromidas (Andromidas)
21. Mike Fontanetta (Fontanetta)
22. William Eckel (Eckel)
23. John Boyle (J. Boyle)
24. Cathy Wood (Wood)

SPEAKERS AT THE SEPTEMBER 30, 2010 PUBLIC HEARING

25. Robert Rymers (Rymers)
26. Christine Mullaney (Mullaney)
27. Frederick Duncan (Duncan)
28. John McGowan, former Mayor (McGowan)
29. Mark Ryan (Ryan)
30. Mathilde Bellmer (Bellmer)
31. Jamie Gans (Gans)
32. Robert Stark, Jr. (Stark)
33. Allison Sparacino (Sparacino)
34. Bob Orosz (Orosz)
35. Arnold Finamore (Finamore)
36. Brian Pinnola, for Edgar Alzner (Pinnola)
37. Walter McKenna, Director, Eastern Property Owners' Association (McKenna)
38. Albert Intreglia, for Robert Catell, Garden City Historical Society (Intreglia)
39. Alexandra Parsons Wolfe, Society for the Preservation of Long Island Antiquities (Wolfe)
40. Francine Ryan, Committee to Save St. Paul's (CSSP), Eastern Property Owners' Association to Save St. Paul's (F. Ryan)
41. Peter D'Angelo (D'Angelo)
42. Jonathan Schwieger (Schwieger)
43. Rob Alvey, President, Bird Sanctuary (Alvey)
44. John DeMaro, President, Eastern Property Owners' Association (DeMaro)
45. Patricia Schettino (Schettino)
46. Franklin Perrell, Executive Director, Roslyn Landmark Society (Perrell)

47. Judith Cashman (Cashman)
48. Joseph Ferrara (Ferrara)
49. Gregory Cavaluzzo (Cavaluzzo)
50. David Foxen (Foxen)
51. John Rhein (Rhein)
52. Ronald Young (Young)
53. Andrew Shumelda (Shumelda)
54. Patty Knap (Knap)
55. Pat Dimattia (Dimattia)
56. Harrison Oellrich (Oellrich)
57. Leo Stimmler (Stimmler)
58. Regina Hegarty (Hegarty)
59. David Hegarty (D. Hegarty)
60. Tom Logan, Director, EPOA (Logan)
61. Rachel Cashwell (Cashwell)
62. Frank McDonough (McDonough)
63. Kris Harder (Harder)
64. Mike Zack (Zack)
65. Issac Kremer (Kremer)
66. Mr. Boyle (Boyle)
67. Tom Whalen (Whalen)
68. Edward Castagna (Castagna)

INDIVIDUALS WHO SUBMITTED E-MAIL COMMENTS

69. Jmjac@optonline.net, September 9, 2010 (jmjac)
70. Raymond Loew, September 8, 2010 (Loew)
71. Evelyn Fasano, September 10, 2010 (Fasano)
72. Ryan Patrick Donnelly, Vice President, Coach Realtors, October 1, 2010 (Donnelly)
73. Grammylo6@aol.com, October 1, 2010 (grammylo6)
74. Russ and Nancy Josephs, October 1, 2010 (Josephs)
75. Kennedy Boardman II, July 1, 2010 (Boardman)
76. Kathleen Sweeney, July 6, 2010 (K. Sweeney)
77. James Bauer, July 8, 2010 (Bauer)

St. Paul's School Demolition for Additional Open Space

78. Patty McEntee Knap, July 1, 2010 (Knap)
79. Nick Carr, July 7, 2010 (Carr)
80. Ray Ann Havasy, Executive Director, Center for Science Teaching and Learning, July 8, 2010 (Havasy)
81. M. V. Huang and J. Ang, July 8, 2010 (Ang)
82. Fr. Thomas Vassalotti, St. Agatha's Church, July 31, 2010 (Vassalotti)
83. Mark Fragale, July 31, 2010 (Fragale)
84. Francine Ryan, August 8, 2010 (Francine R.)
85. Bob Graf, August 13, 2010 (Graf)
86. Demetria Cocheres Grieve, August 13, 2010 (Grieve)
87. Paul O'Donnell, August 13, 2010 (O'Donnell)
88. Elizabeth Gilgan, August 13, 2010 (Gilgan)
89. Steven P. Solferino, August 13, 2010 (Solferino)
90. Matt Becker, August 13, 2010 (Becker)
91. Roxanne Lott, August 15, 2010 (Lott)
92. Mary T. DeFesi Delman, August 16, 2010 (M. Delman)
93. Anthony Dalto, August 16, 2010 (Dalto)
94. Master Sergeant Peter Demakis, August 16, 2010 (Demakis)
95. Paul Pitsironis, August 16, 2010 (Pitsironis)
96. Robert Petzinger, August 16, 2010 (Petzinger)
97. Mark LaBianca, August 16, 2010 (LaBianca)
98. Tom Brosnan, August 18, 2010 (Brosnan)
99. James Bauer, August 18, 2010 (J. Bauer)
100. Katie DeFesi Tartamella, August 18, 2010 (Tartamella)
101. Ronda D'Antonio, August 18, 2010 (D'Antonio)
102. Daphne Alvarado, August 18, 2010 (Alvarado)
103. J. Gregory Griffis, August 18, 2010 (Griffis)
104. Pauline Seremetis, August 19, 2010 (Seremetis)
105. Wayne Huneke, August 19, 2010 (Huneke)
106. Betsy and Peter Andromidas, August 19, 2010 (B. Andromidas)
107. Tom Raftery, August 19, 2010 (Raftery)
108. Brian and Beverly Hegarty, August 19, 2010 (B. Hegarty)
109. Julia Lamanna, Esq., August 19, 2010 (Lamanna)

110. Gail Di Palma, August 19, 2010 (Di Palma)
111. Robert Gamer, August 25, 2010 (Gamer)
112. Jack Cunningham, August 28, 2010 (Cunningham)
113. Peter Egan, August 30, 2010 (Egan)
114. Peter Bee, Former Mayor of Garden City, September 30, 2010 (Bee)
115. Dr. and Mrs. Robert D'Esposito, September 30, 2010 (D'Esposito)
116. Patricia Mendizabal, September 30, 2010 (Mendizabal)
117. Gale Peck Beyea, September 30, 2010 (Beyea)
118. Richard D. Rasor, September 30, 2010 (Rasor)
119. Schuyler and Patrica Smith, September 30, 2010 (Smith)
120. The Reverend Jerome B. Stretch, September 30, 2010 (Stretch)
121. Janet E. Stroble, September 30, 2010 (Stroble)
122. Janet and Ted Chereskin, October 3, 2010 (Chereskin)
123. May Conti, October 2, 2010 (Conti)
124. Judy Cotter, October 5, 2010 (Cotter)
125. Celeste Cutrone, October 4, 2010 (Cutrone)
126. Sue Ellen Davis, October 4, 2010 (Davis)
127. Joseph E. Davis, October 5, 2010 (J. Davis)
128. Bill Garry, October 5, 2010 (Garry)
129. Carol Mayo, October 5, 2010 (Mayo)
130. Jeff Powers, October 4, 2010 (Powers)
131. Christine T. Rio, October 6, 2010 (C. Rio)
132. Judy and Ed Alzner, October 10, 2010 (Alzner)
133. Elizabeth M. Bailey, October 11, 2010 (Bailey)
134. Joseph and Cathleen Perini, October 8, 2010 (Perini)
135. Denis Collins, October 11, 2010 (Collins)
136. Dave Connors, October 8, 2010 (Connors)
137. Rod Cooney, October 11, 2010 (Cooney)
138. John M. Delany, October 11, 2010 (Delany)
139. Frank Demaio, October 8, 2010 (Demaio)
140. Barbara and John Edwards, October 11, 2010 (Edwards)
141. Dorothy M. Episcopia, October 12, 2010 (Episcopia)
142. Nicholas Episcopia, October 12, 2010 (N. Episcopia)

St. Paul's School Demolition for Additional Open Space

143. Dorothy (Fry) Fricker, October 10, 2010 (Fricker)
144. David Hegarty, October 12, 2010 (David H.)
145. Regina Hegarty, October 11, 2010 (R. Hegarty)
146. Frank J. Livoti and Margaret M. Mulrooney, October 11, 2010 (Mulrooney)
147. Alison Metzler, October 12, 2010 (Metzler)
148. William Metzler, October 12, 2010 (W. Metzler)
149. Joyce Molloy, October 10, 2010 (Molloy)
150. J. Patrick Moore, October 10, 2010 (J. Moore)
151. Anthony Morgano, October 10, 2010 (Morgano)
152. Christine and Tom Mullaney, October 10, 2010 (C. Mullaney)
153. Mr. and Mrs. John Puccio, October 11, 2010 (Puccio)
154. Karl H. Schmidt, October 7, 2010 (Schmidt)
155. Theodora A. Marangas (Tomao), October 11, 2010 (Marangas)
156. Owen Voelker, October 9, 2010 (Voelker)
157. John and Cathy Walsh, October 10, 2010 (Walsh)
158. J. Daniel Ballard, September 13, 2010 (Ballard)
159. Katie Barbatsuly, September 28, 2010 (Barbatsuly)
160. Avery Barnes Costigan, September 20, 2010 (Costigan)
161. Debra Behnke, September 13, 2010 (Behnke)
162. Karen Blanco-Mood, September 18, 2010 (Blanco-Mood)
163. Andrew and Susanne Boera, September 22, 2010 (Boera)
164. Patti Brashears, September 27, 2010 (Brashears)
165. J. Frank and Edith Brennan, September 18, 2010 (Brennan)
166. Lea Brunetti, September 25, 2010 (Brunetti)
167. Graziella Brunetti-Huneke, September 17, 2010 (Brunetti-Huneke)
168. Lia Buffa, September 19, 2010 (Buffa)
169. Jennifer Carroll, September 17, 2010 (Carroll)
170. Heather Carruthers Hall, September 26, 2010 (Hall)
171. David Carter, September 13, 2010 (Carter)
172. Vincent Cashman, Jr., September 24, 2010 (Cashman, Jr.)
173. Maura Cashman Bednarczyk, September 25, 2010 (Bednarczyk)
174. Rachel Cashwell, September 16, 2010 (R. Cashwell)
175. Gregory Cavaluzzo, September 16, 2010 (G. Cavaluzzo)

176. Michael Chernick, September 26, 2010 (Chernick)
177. Chris Clark, September 23, 2010 (Clark)
178. Beth Cliff, September 23, 2010 (Cliff)
179. Helen Clissold, September 17, 2010 (Clissold)
180. Stewart Coddington, September 30, 2010 (Coddington)
181. Lauren Cohen, September 21, 2010 (Cohen)
182. Jack Cunningham, August 28, 2010 (J. Cunningham)
183. Jeff Dean, September 13, 2010 (Dean)
184. Alex and Elizabeth deLaricheliere, September 22, 2010 (deLaricheliere)
185. Elizabeth deLaricheliere, September 23, 2010 (E. deLaricheliere)
186. Donald DePol, September 22, 2010 (DePol)
187. David Dillmeier, September 20, 2010 (Dillmeier)
188. Nick Dominguez, September 13, 2010 (Dominguez)
189. Candyce Edelen, September 13, 2010 (Edelen)
190. David Ellison, September 14, 2010 (Ellison)
191. Peggy Emslie, September 17, 2010 (Emslie)
192. Melva Fager Okun, September 20, 2010 (Okun)
193. Kerry Fischer, September 20, 2010 (Fischer)
194. Sue Funke, September 16, 2010 (Funke)
195. Brian Gemmell, September 27, 2010 (Gemmell)
196. Bette Goos, September 20, 2010 (Goos)
197. Maria Gorshin, September 21, 2010 (Gorshin)
198. Susan Guissing, September 17, 2010 (Guissing)
199. Barbara B. Guy, September 17, 2010 (Guy)
200. Marissa Hansson, September 17, 2010 (Hansson)
201. Laura Harder Wall, September 13, 2010 (Wall)
202. Gidn Hendriksen, September 14, 2010 (Hendriksen)
203. Judy (Hoffman) Connick, September 16, 2010 (Connick)
204. Nancy Holguin, September 30, 2010 (Holguin)
205. Lisa Sue Hoofnagle, September 13, 2010 (Hoofnagle)
206. Laurie Jessop, September 27, 2010 (Jessop)
207. Alison Keith, September 13, 2010 (Keith)
208. Ben King, September 13, 2010 (King)

St. Paul's School Demolition for Additional Open Space

209. Marc Lallanilla, September 18, 2010 (Lallanilla)
210. Cara Lipari, September 22, 2010 (Lipari)
211. Dottie Lloyd, September 16, 2010 (Lloyd)
212. Kate Lowenstein, September 16, 2010 (Lowenstein)
213. Paul Malvese, September 26, 2010 (Malvese)
214. Benjamin Marcus, September 13, 2010 (Marcus)
215. Russell Martilla, September 16 (Martilla)
216. Bill McCabe, September 17, 2010 (McCabe)
217. Tim McCabe, September 17, 2010 (T. McCabe)
218. Peter H. McGlynn, September 22, 2010 (McGlynn)
219. Pat McLean, September 21, 2010 (McLean)
220. Rob Miller, September 22, 2010 (Miller)
221. Ben Millstein, September 23, 2010 (Millstein)
222. Lofton S. Moore, September 20, 2010 (L. Moore)
223. James Mudford, September 24, 2010 (Mudford)
224. Bill Mulroney, September 17, 2010 (Mulroney)
225. Arleen Munz Havern, September 20, 2010 (Havern)
226. Theri Negretti, September 27, 2010 (T. Negretti)
227. Janet Neumann Wildermuth, September, 27, 2010 (Wildermuth)
228. John Newcomb, September 24, 2010 (Newcomb)
229. Jennifer O'Neill, September 23 and 24, 2010 (O'Neill)
230. Sandy Orr Fajans, September 21, 2010 (Fajans)
231. Angela Papadeas Sabato, September 19, 2010 (Sabato)
232. Bonnie Parker, September 25, 2010 (Parker)
233. Pam Patterson, September 23, 2010 (Patterson)
234. Ann Paulson, September 17, 2010 (Paulson)
235. H.G. Pennypacker, September 13, 2010 (Pennypacker)
236. Dr. and Mrs. Martin Petrella, September 20, 2010 (Petrella)
237. Bob Peyton, September 27, 2010 (Peyton)
238. Mary M. Peyton, September 27, 2010 (M. Peyton)
239. Jennifer Peyton Monteverde, September 22, 2010 (Monteverde)
240. Jane Pinckney, September 23, 2010 (Pinckney)
241. James Prochnik, September 13, 2010 (Prochnik)

242. Steve Protz, September 17, 2010 (Protz)
243. Shannon Reed, September 13, 2010 (Reed)
244. Christine Reilly, September 23, 2010 (Reilly)
245. Cassie Reynolds, September 16, 2010 (Reynolds)
246. John Rhein, September 27, 2010 (J. Rhein)
247. Cheri Robartes, September 17, 2010 (Robartes)
248. Reed Robins, September 13, 2010 (Robins)
249. Lisa Rodilosso-Smer, September 23, 2010 (Rodilosso-Smer)
250. Susie Gravelle, September 16, 2010 (Gravelle)
251. Donald Rose, September 13, 2010 (Rose)
252. Dan Rubinstein, September 13, 2010 (Rubinstein)
253. Donna Rutlin, September 27, 2010 (Rutlin)
254. Thomas Rye, September 16, 2010 (Rye)
255. Kerrie Sansky, September 21, 2010 (Sansky)
256. Sara, September 19, 2010 (Sara)
257. Haun Saussy, September 13, 2010 (Saussy)
258. Peter D. Sayer, September 24, 2010 (Sayer)
259. Kathi Scarce, September 13, 2010 (Scarce)
260. Ann Scheer-Forcier, September 18, 2010 (Scheer-Forcier)
261. Tom Schenck, September 21, 2010 (Schenck)
262. Tara Schmitt, September 28, 2010 (Schmitt)
263. Arden Schrader Schonau, September 21, 2010 (Schonau)
264. Remington Scott, September 24, 2010 (Scott)
265. Karen Scrivano, September 16, 2010 (Scrivano)
266. Walter and Roseanne Seebeck, September 17, 2010 (Seebeck)
267. Frank Sena, September 16, 2010 (Sena)
268. Paula Sessa, September 17, 2010 (Sessa)
269. Marty and Mari Shea, September 28, 2010 (Shea)
270. Randy Sheets, September 16, 2010 (Sheets)
271. Scott Sheets, September 16, 2010 (S. Sheets)
272. Antonia Sisti, September 18, 2010 (Sisti)
273. Isabelle Smith, September 19, 2010 (I. Smith)
274. Robert Snowden, September 26, 2010 (Snowden)

St. Paul's School Demolition for Additional Open Space

275. Martha Steel Marmouze, September 19, 2010 (Marmouze)
276. Elizabeth Stewart, September 13, 2010 (Stewart)
277. Glenna Stewart, September 15, 2010 (G. Stewart)
278. Delia Sweeney, September 16, 2010 (D. Sweeney)
279. Bill Sweeney, September 24, 2010 (B. Sweeney)
280. Bebe T. Ventura, September 20, 2010 (Ventura)
281. Cheryl Voelker, September 24, 2010 (C. Voelker)
282. Owen Voelker, September 26, 2010 (O. Voelker)
283. Srdjan Vukovic, September 19, 2010 (Vukovic)
284. Becky Arnold LeBuhn, September 29, 2010 (LeBuhn)
285. Joel Baehr, September 30, 2010 (Baehr)
286. Holly Battista-Resignolo, September 29, 2010 (Battista-Resignolo)
287. John D. Bickford, September 29, 2010 (Bickford)
288. Todd Boysen, September 29, 2010 (Boysen)
289. Doris Brevoort, September 30, 2010 (Brevoort)
290. Roger A. Brevoort, September 29, 2010 (R. Brevoort)
291. Donna Ceriano, September 28, 2010 (Ceriano)
292. Ted Chambers, September 30, 2010 (Chambers)
293. Linda Compitello, September 28, 2010 (Compitello)
294. May Conti, September 29, 2010 (M. Conti)
295. Carol Corroon Pratt, September 30, 2010 (Pratt)
296. Judy Courtney, September 29, 2010 (Courtney)
297. Richard Ellis, September 29, 2010 (Ellis)
298. Stephen Fuchs, September 29, 2010 (Stephen Fuchs)
299. Elisa Galli, September 29, 2010 (Galli)
300. Stephen Garvey, September 29, 2010 (Garvey)
301. Kristopher Gasch, September 29, 2010 (Gasch)
302. Peggy Healy, September 29, 2010 (Healy)
303. Donald F. Hnis, September 29, 2010 (Hnis)
304. Robert Hugel, September 30, 2010 (Hugel)
305. Lynn Jeffrey, September 28, 2010 (Jeffrey)
306. Dominique Wagner, September 22, 2010 (Wagner)
307. Annie Wall, September 16, 2010 (A. Wall)

- 308. Pat Weidner, September 20, 2010 (Weidner)
- 309. Justine Woodfield Groarke, September 19, 2010 (Groarke)
- 310. Gordon S. Ziegler, Jr., September 28, 2010 (Ziegler)
- 311. Elizabeth Langmore Birchenough, September 30, 2010 (Birchenough)
- 312. Peter G. C. Langmore, September 29, 2010 (Langmore)
- 313. Emily Lin, September 29, 2010 (Lin)
- 314. Gerard P. Lundquist, September 29, 2010 (Lundquist)
- 315. Bill Lynch, September 29, 2010 (Lynch)
- 316. Robert L. Martin, September 29, 2010 (Martin)
- 317. Walter McKenna, President, EPOA, September 29, 2010 (W. McKenna)
- 318. Tara Mendizabal, September 30, 2010 (T. Mendizabal)
- 319. Minnie300mac@aol.com, September 29, 2010 (Minnie300mac@aol.com)
- 320. George Morgano, September 29, 2010 (Morgano)
- 321. S. Benjamin Murolo, September 29, 2010 (Murolo)
- 322. Beverly and Jim Murphy, September 29, 2010 (Murphy)
- 323. Marge Musil, September 29, 2010 (Musil)
- 324. George and Joan Nebel, September 29, 2010 (Nebel)
- 325. Jennifer O'Hanlon, September 30, 2010 (O'Hanlon)
- 326. Neil Outcalt, September 29, 2010 (Outcalt)
- 327. Nancy Poz, September 29, 2010 (Poz)
- 328. Chris Richardson, September 28, 2010 (Richardson)
- 329. Jonathan Rizzo, September 29, 2010 (Rizzo)
- 330. Robert Rymers, September 29, 2010 (R. Rymers)
- 331. Tricia Schettino, September 28, 2010 (Tricia Schettino)
- 332. Kathy Stanco, September 29, 2010 (Stanco)
- 333. Andrew Tarmin, September 29, 2010 (Tarmin)
- 334. Ned and Cynthia Welch, September 29, 2010 (Welch)
- 335. Brad Wells, September 29, 2010 (Wells)
- 336. Bob Graf, August 13, 2010 (Graf)
- 337. Kay Savage Burd, September 18, 2010 (Burd)

INDIVIDUALS WHO SUBMITTED WRITTEN COMMENTS

- 338. Lofton S. Moore, August 10, 2010 (Moore)

St. Paul's School Demolition for Additional Open Space

339. David J. Sutton, August 19, 2010 (Sutton)
340. Charles Gauphen Wren III, October 22, 2010 (Wren)
341. Alfred Kohart, October 25, 2010 (Kohart)
342. Glenn and Coleen Martucci, October 22, 2010 (Martucci)
343. Jonathan Schwieger, October 1, 2010 (J. Schwieger)
344. Former Mayors (Peter A. Bee, Brian T. Deveney, Harold P. Hecken, Gerard Lundquist, Allen S. Mathers, John McGowan, Frank Tauches), October 6, 2010 (Former Mayors)
345. Carol and George Efthimiou, September 30, 2010 (Efthimiou)
346. Jon P. Flynn, September 29, 2010 (Flynn)
347. Pat and Bob Kaliban, October 1, 2010 (Kaliban)
348. Marian Michl, September 29, 2010 (Michl)
349. AnnMarie Negretti, September 27, 2010 (Negretti)
350. Grace F. Scarantino, September 29, 2010 (Scarantino)
351. David A., Member, Garden City Historical Society, October 2, 2010 (David A.)
352. Nell Gubner, October 1, 2010 (Gubner)
353. Douglas Hoffmann, October 1, 2010 (Hoffmann)
354. Blossom and Gil Reitman, October 3, 2010 (Reitman)
355. Kathleen McClelland Stimmler, October 1, 2010 (K. Stimmler)
356. Leo V. Stimmler, September 30, 2010 (L. Stimmler)
357. Adrienne M. Cosgrove and John P. Cosgrove, October 8, 2010 (Cosgrove)
358. Nelson DeMille, October 8, 2010 (DeMille)
359. Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Hayes, October 7, 2010 (Hayes)
360. Andy and Cathy Macyko, October 10, 2010 (Macyko)
361. John Mulford, October 8, 2010 (Mulford)
362. Stephen C. Pinzino, October 12, 2010 (Pinzino)
363. Jean P. Taylor, October 9, 2010 (Taylor)
364. Maureen Traxler, Member of Board of Directors, Garden City Historical Society, October 7, 2010 (Traxler)
365. Brian C. Daughney, October 10, 2010 (Daughney)
366. Michael J. Holland, October 8, 2010 (Holland)
367. Anthony and Irma Annunziato, September 28, 2010 (Annunziato)
368. Suzanne and John Blair, October 1, 2010 (Blair)
369. Richard Culhane, October 1, 2010 (Culhane)

- 370. Elizabeth Doran, October 1, 2010 (Doran)
- 371. Sandra Engelke, October 1, 2010 (Engelke)
- 372. Joseph Farrell, October 1, 2010 (Farrell)
- 373. Kathy Harder, October 1, 2010 (Hardes)
- 374. Barbara C. Waynes, October 1, 2010 (Waynes)
- 375. Joan C. Hildreth, October 1, 2010 (Hildreth)
- 376. Ronald B. Hildreth, October 1, 2010 (R. Hildreth)
- 377. Brian Pinnola, October 1, 2010 (B. Pinnola)
- 378. Paula P. Rega, October 1, 2010 (Rega)
- 379. John and Michaela Simone, October 1, 2010 (Simone)
- 380. Arlene and John Chianese, October 1, 2010 (Chianese)
- 381. Kathy and Greg Chianese, October 1, 2010 (K. Chianese)
- 382. Tom and Elizabeth Efthimiou, October 1, 2010 (T. Efthimiou)
- 383. Susan Gaugler, October 1, 2010 (Gaugler)
- 384. Sean Fochr, October 1, 2010 (Fochr)
- 385. Danielle and Joe Griffin, October 7, 2010 (Griffin)
- 386. Jennifer Gibbons, October 4, 2010 (Gibbons)
- 387. Grace Kelly, October 4, 2010 (Kelly)
- 388. Rosemary Lewis, October 4, 2010 (Lewis)
- 389. Sharon and Michael McDonald, October 4, 2010 (McDonald)
- 390. Kristen and Michael Korton, October 4, 2010 (Korton)
- 391. Brice O’Keeffe, October 4, 2010 (O’Keeffe)
- 392. Jane O’Keeffe, October 4, 2010 (J. O’Keeffe)
- 393. Dorothy Rupp, October 4, 2010 (Rupp)
- 394. Ann Simone, October 4, 2010 (A. Simone)
- 395. C. Bruce Till, October 4, 2010 (Till)
- 396. Anthony Dalto, August 17, 2010 (A. Dalto)
- 397. Stephanie Dobrinin (no date) (Dobrinin)
- 398. Janet Jerina, September 21, 2010 (Jerina)
- 399. Gary Kahn, President, Central Property Owners’ Association, September 17, 2010 (Kahn)
- 400. Thomas C. Kriby, September 25, 2010 (Kriby)
- 401. Hugh and Ruth Lacy, September 17, 2010 (Lacy)

St. Paul's School Demolition for Additional Open Space

402. William Lawry, September 21, 2010 (Lawry)
403. Vivienne Lewis, September 28, 2010 (V. Lewis)
404. C. Anthony Maniaci, September 27, 2010 (Maniaci)
405. Sonia Maniaci, September 27, 2010 (S. Maniaci)
406. Alexandra Parsons Wolfe, Director of Preservation Services, Society for the Preservation of Long Island Antiquities, September 27, 2010 (A. Wolfe)
407. Thomas Regan, no date (Regan)
408. Michelle Roller, October 2, 2010 (Roller)
409. Patricia G. Scarantino, September 16, 2010 (P. Scarantino)
410. Stephen E. Scarantino, MD, August 30, 2010 (S. Scarantino)
411. Stephanie Schaff Fortunato, August 19, 2010 (Fortunato)
412. Roberto Schettino, August 17, 2010 (R. Schettino)
413. John Shaughnessy, September 20, 2010 (Shaughnessy)
414. Thomas E. Sullivan, September 30, 2010 (Sullivan)
415. Judy and Ed Atzner, no date (Atzner)
416. Grace and Anthony Avellino, no date (Avellino)
417. Greta and Chris Besendorfer, no date (Besendorfer)
418. Joe and Linda Crapotta, no date (Crapotta)
419. Jeanne Esposito, no date (Esposito)
420. Alexis Hardy, no date (Hardy)
421. Joseph and Jessica Koczko, no date (Koczko)
422. Thomas Nestasi, no date (Nestasi)
423. Kelly and Chris Overbeck, no date (Overbeck)
424. Arnold Finamore and Thomas Whalen, no date (A. Finamore)
425. Fred Rustmann, September, 27, 2010 (Rustmann)
426. Jonathan Schwieger, September 18, 2010 (Jonathan Schwieger)
427. Ted Chambers, September 25, 2010 (Chambers)
428. Brian T. Deveney, no date (Deveney)
429. Barry Lemieux, September 28, 2010 (Lemieux)
430. Theresa Chambers, September 24, 2010 (T. Chambers)
431. Pat DiMattia, September 27, 2010 (P. DiMattia)
432. Matthew Fuchs, September 23, 2010 (Fuchs)
433. Stephen Fuchs, September 22, 2010 (S. Fuchs)

- 434. Robert Vassalotti, July 26, 2010 (R. Vassalotti)
- 435. Robert Rushmore, August 5, 2010 (Rushmore)
- 436. Kristina Vieira, August 10, 2010 (Vieira)
- 437. Regina Hegarty, August 19, 2010 (Regina Hegarty)
- 438. Louise Abitahile [sp], October 12, 2010 (Abitahile)
- 439. Joanne Adams, October 12, 2010 (Adams)
- 440. Arthur Anderson, October 15, 2010 (Anderson)
- 441. Mr. and Mrs. Richard Bankosky, October 12, 2010 (Bankosky)
- 442. Cathryn H. Bertolas, October 8, 2010 (Bertolas)
- 443. Mr. and Mrs. Bill Brunner, October 12, 2010 (Brunner)
- 444. Eleanor Burgio, October 12, 2010 (Burgio)
- 445. Mr. and Mrs. Gregory Burke, October 12, 2010 (Burke)
- 446. Mary Jane Caldwell, October 12, 2010 (Caldwell)
- 447. Albert Centrella, October 12, 2010 (Centrella)
- 448. Dr. Prem M. Chauhan, October 12, 2010 (Chauhan)
- 449. Peter Chianese, October 13, 2010 (P. Chianese)
- 450. Jane D. Colahan, October 8, 2010 (Colahan)
- 451. Mary Ellen Conrad, October 12, 2010 (Conrad)
- 452. Ann V. Conroy, October 12, 2010 (Conroy)
- 453. Christine Cudahy, October 12, 2010 (Cudahy)
- 454. Mr. and Mrs. Albert D'Agostino, October 12, 2010 (D'Agostino)
- 455. Henrietta deBellegarde, October 12, 2010 (deBellegarde)
- 456. Walter Delaney, October 12, 2010 (Delaney)
- 457. Carol Dell'Olio, October 13, 2010 (Dell'Olio)
- 458. Mary Denner, October 12, 2010 (Denner)
- 459. Martha Derderian, October 12, 2010 (Derderian)
- 460. Pat Dickson, October 12, 2010 (Dickson)
- 461. Christine Diller, October 15, 2010 (Diller)
- 462. Regina Dowling, October 12, 2010 (Dowling)
- 463. Lauren Fahey, October 13, 2010 (Fahey)
- 464. Sally Falk, October 13, 2010 (Falk)
- 465. Patricia Fay, October 12, 2010 (Fay)
- 466. Marie Therese Ferrari, October 12, 2010 (Ferrari)

St. Paul's School Demolition for Additional Open Space

467. Patricia Fleck, October 12, 2010 (Fleck)
468. Kate Frey, October 13, 2010 (Frey)
469. Michael Frey, October 12, 2010 (Frey)
470. Claudia Galvin, October 12, 2010 (Galvin)
471. William P. Garry, October 15, 2010 (Garry)
472. William J. Harder, October 15, 2010 (Harder)
473. Fortune Heaney, October 12, 2010 (Heaney)
474. Patricia Hoban Scott, October 15, 2010 (Scott)
475. Dan Hugo, October 12, 2010 (Hugo)
476. Carmine R. Inserra, October 12, 2010 (Inserra)
477. Adele Jaeger, October 12, 2010 (Jaeger)
478. Gloria Jones, October 12, 2010 (Jones)
479. Maura Joyce, October 13, 2010 (Joyce)
480. Priscilla Kiminger [sp], October 12, 2010 (Kiminger)
481. Robert Kloepfer, October 15, 2010 (Kloepfer)
482. Joyce M. Krug, October 12, 2010 (Krug)
483. Ruth LaBosco, October 12, 2010 (LaBosco)
484. Kenneth P. Mahon, October 12, 2010 (Mahon)
485. Elizabeth Mahoney, October 15, 2010 (Mahoney)
486. Mary Mahoney, October 14, 2010 (M. Mahoney)
487. William Mahoney, October 12, 2010 (W. Mahoney)
488. Clare McCarthy, October 8, 2010 Moshensky (Moshensky)
489. Beth McGovern, October 12, 2010 (McGovern)
490. William McGovern, October 12, 2010 (W. McGovern)
491. Christopher B. Miller, October 12, 2010 (C. Miller)
492. Mr. and Mrs. Mark Mundy, October 8, 2010 (Mundy)
493. John F. Munkenbeck, October 12, 2010 (Munkenbeck)
494. Robert O'Halpin, October 13, 2010 (O'Halpin)
495. Arline L. Palmer, October 12, 2010 (Palmer)
496. Rose Pellicano, October 12, 2010 (Pellicano)
497. William J. Poisson, October 12, 2010 (Poisson)
498. Tom Rechner, October 12, 2010 (T. Rechner)
499. Mr. and Mrs. James Record, October 12, 2010 (Record)

- 500. Stephen A. Ripp, October 12, 2010 (Ripp)
- 501. Kathleen Roberts, October 15, 2010 (Roberts)
- 502. Carol Rosow, October 12, 2010 (Rosow)
- 503. Cynthia Rudolph, October 12, 2010 (Rudolph)
- 504. Rachel A. Ruotolo, October 12, 2010 (Ruotolo)
- 505. Mark Ryan, October 12, 2010 (M. Ryan)
- 506. Dr. E. Sair, October 15, 2010 (Sair)
- 507. Patricia Sheehan, October 12, 2010 (Sheehan)
- 508. Joseph Stanco, October 12, 2010 (Stanco)
- 509. Joseph I. Tarulli, October 12, 2010 (Tarulli)
- 510. James Tubbs, October 12, 2010 (Tubbs)
- 511. Jessica Tubbs, October 12, 2010 (J. Tubbs)
- 512. Melissa Tubbs, October 12, 2010 (M. Tubbs)
- 513. Terry Uellendahl, October 12, 2010 (Uellendahl)
- 514. Willa Ward, October 12, 2010 (Ward)
- 515. Beth Watras, October 12, 2010 (Watras)
- 516. Mr. and Mrs. Rodney Williams, October 12, 2010 (Williams)
- 517. Illegible name, October 12, 2010 (Illegible name)
- 518. Melanie Henderson, October 19, 2010 (Henderson)

C. COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

COMMENTS ON PROPOSED ACTION

Comment 1: There should be a public vote for residents on a Bond Referendum which must include a specified amount for demolition, and which would authorize the Board to issue bonds for the demolition of the St. Paul's Main Building and Ellis Hall. A referendum will allow voters to formally say whether or not they approve the amount that will officially be on the ballot. The contractor will be chosen by a formal bid process. A positive vote would authorize the Board to issue bonds, up to the specified amount; it does not order the Board to immediately do so; in fact, the Board has 10 years to issue the bonds for demolition. (Rymers, Mullaney, McGowan, Bellmer, Gans, Stark, Sparacino, Orosz, Finamore, McKenna, F. Ryan, D'Angelo, Schwieger, DeMaro, Ferrara, Foxen, Oellrich, Stimmler, Logan, Zack, Rio, Goddard, Josephs, Egan,

St. Paul's School Demolition for Additional Open Space

Bee, Former Mayors, Davis, J. Davis, C. Rio, Gubner, Hoffmann, K. Stimmler, L. Stimmler, Cosgrove, Macyko, Mulford, Taylor, Bailey, Perini, Collins, Connors, Cooney, Delany, Demaio, Episcopia, N. Episcopia, Holland, Mulrooney, Molloy, J. Moore, Morgano, C. Mullaney, Puccio, Voelker, Walsh, Malvese, Shea, M. Conti, Deveney, Lundquist, Martin, W. McKenna, Murolo, O'Hanlon, R. Rymers, Seitz, Welch)

Response: Comment noted. The Village made public a Request for Proposals to obtain the actual cost for environmental abatement and demolition of the Main Building and Ellis Hall, including grading and replanting the area with grass. The costs proposed by the bidders are set forth in Appendix J and range from \$3.1 to \$4.6 million. Additional expenses would include construction and health and safety oversight, legally mandated third party air monitoring, archaeological testing, and any mitigation. See Appendices J, M, and O. The bond resolution would identify the amount of bonds to be issued to fund the proposed action. The bond resolution would also be subject to a public referendum.

Comment 2: Could demolition costs be biased once the bidder knows a bond issue has been approved? (Mulford)

Response: The Village has recently solicited and obtained competitive bids in advance of any bond referendum which eliminates the commenter's suggested potential for any bias.

Comment 3: Save St. Paul's. Do not demolish the building. Vote against demolition. Support stabilization, preservation, and/or adaptive reuse, which would be beneficial to the community. It is the commenter's opinion that the DEIS concludes that there will be adverse impacts associated with demolition that outweigh any associated benefits. In general, there would be more benefits from preservation than from demolition. St. Paul's has beneficial historic and aesthetic properties that would be lost if demolished. Demolition would result in adverse impact on historic and aesthetic resources and community character. Do not let what happened to the Garden City Hotel happen to St. Paul's. The Village should not be guided by short-term economics. (Duncan, Bellmer, Ryan, Pinnola, Intreglia, Wolfe, D'Angelo, Alvey, Schettino, Perrell, Cashman, Ferrara, Cavaluzzo, Rhein, Young, Shumelda, Knap, Dimattia, Hegarty, McDonough, Kremer, Boyle, Urban, T. Schettino, Salem, Delman, Gray, Francine Ryan, Marson, Chianise, R. Young, David Hegarty, Yuter, Rechner, Habben, E. Castagna, Andromidas, Fontanetta, Eckel, J. Boyle, Wood, Fasano, Donnelly, grammylo6, Boardman, Knap, Carr, Vassalotti, Fragale, Moore, Graf, Grieve,

O'Donnell, Gilgan, Solferino, Becker, Lott, M. Delman, Dalto, Demakis, Pitsironis, Petzinger, LaBianca, Tartmella, Alvarado, Griffis, Seremetis, Huneke, Raftery, B. Hegarty, Lamanna, Di Palma, Gamer, Cunningham, Wren, Kohart, Martucci, D'Esposito, Mendizabal, Beyea, Razor, Smith, Stretch, Stroble, Chereskin, Cotter, Cutrone, Garry, Mayo, Powers, Efthimiou, Flynn, Kaliban, Michl, Negretti, Scarantino, David A., Reitman, DeMille, Pinzino, Traxler, , Alzner, Edwards, Fricker, Metzler, W. Metzler, Schmidt, Marangas, Annunziato, Blair, Culhane, Doran, Engelke, Farrell, Harder, Waynes, R. Hildreth, B. Pinnola, Rega, Simone, Chianese, K. Chianese, T. Efthimiou, Gaugler, Fochr, Griffin, Gibbons, Kelly, Lewis, McDonald, Korton, O'Keeffe, J. O'Keeffe, Rupp, Simone, Till, A. Dalto, Jerina, Kahn, Kriby, Lacy, V. Lewis, Maniaci, S. Maniaci, A. Wolfe, Roller, P. Scarantino, S. Scarantino, Fortunato, R. Schettino, Shaughnessy, Sullivan, Atzner, Avellino, Besendorfer, Crapotta, Esposito, Hardy, Koczko, Nestasi, Overbeck, Ballard, Barbatsuly, Costigan, Behnke, Blanco-Mood, Boera, Brashears, Brennan, Brunetti, Brunetti-Hueneke, Buffa, Carroll, Hall, Carter, Cashman, Jr., Bednarczyk, R. Cashwell, G. Cavaluzzo, Chernick, Clark, Cliff, Clissold, Coddington, Cohen, J. Cunningham, Dean, deLaricheliere, DePol, Dillmeier, Dominguez, Edelen, Ellison, Emslie, Okun, Fischer, Funke, Goos, Gorshin, Guissing, Guy, Hansson, Wall, Hendriksen, Connick, Holguin, Hoofnagle, Jessop, Keith, King, Lallanilla, Lipari, Lloyd, Lowenstein, Marcus, Martilla, McCabe, T. McCabe, McGlynn, McLean, Miller, Millstein, L. Moore, Mudford, Havern, T. Negretti, Wildermuth, Newcomb, O'Neill, Fajans, Sabato, Parker, Patterson, Paulson, Pennypacker, Petrella, Peyton, M. Peyton, Monteverde, Pinckney, Prochnik, Protz, Reed, Reilly, Reynolds, J. Rhein, Robartes, Robins, Rodilosso-Smer, Gravelle, Rose, Rubinstein, Rustmann, Rutlin, Rye, Sansky, Sara, Saussy, Sayer, Scarce, Scheer-Forcier, Schenck, Schmitt, Schonau, Scott, Scrivano, Sena, Sessa, Sheets, S. Sheets, Sisti, I. Smith, Snowden, Marmouze, Stewart, G. Stewart, D. Sweeney, B. Sweeney, Ventura, C. Voelker, Vukovic, Chambers, T. Chambers, P. DiMattia, Fuchs, S. Fuchs, LeBuhn, Baehr, Battista-Resignolo, Bickford, Boysen, Brevoort, R. Brevoort, Ceriano, Ted Chambers, Compitello, Pratt, Ellis, Stephen Fuchs, Galli, Garvey, Gasch, Healy, Hnis, Jefferey, Wagner, A. Wall, Weidner, Groarke, Ziegler, Birchenough, Langmore, Lemieux, Lia, Lynch, T. Mendizabal, minnie300mac@aol.com, Murphy, Musil, Nebel, Poz, Richardson, Rizzo, Tricia Schettino, Stanco, Tarmin, Welch, Wells, R. Vassalotti, Rushmore, Vieira, Graf, Regina Hegarty, Abitahile, Adams, Anderson, Bankosky, Bertolas, Brunner, Burgio, Burke, Caldwell, Centrella, Chauhan, P. Chianese, Colahan, Conrad, Conroy, Cudahy, D'Agostino, deBellegarde, Delaney, Dell'Olio, Denner, Derderian, Dickson, Diller, Dowling, Fahey, Falk, Fay, Ferrari,

St. Paul's School Demolition for Additional Open Space

Fleck, Frey, M. Frey, Galvin, Garry, Harder, Heaney, Scott, Hugo, Jaeger, Jones, Joyce, Kiminger, Kloepfer, Krug, LaBosco, Mahon, Mahoney, M. Mahoney, W. Mahoney, Moshensky, McGovern, W. McGovern, C. Miller, Mundy, Munkenbeck, O'Halpin, Palmer, Pellicano, Poisson, T. Rechner, Record, Ripp, Roberts, Rosow, Rudolph, Ruotolo, M. Ryan, Sair, Sheehan, Stanco, Tarulli, Tubbs, J. Tubbs, M. Tubbs, Uellendahl, Ward, Watras, Williams, Illegible name, Henderson, Burd)

Response:

The Proposed Action would have significant adverse impacts on historic resources, aesthetic resources, and community character as it relates to both historic and aesthetic resources. It would however have the benefit of avoiding substantial future expenses to Village taxpayers. In addition, if approved, the Proposed Action would provide valuable open space for use by all Village residents. Finally, although not constituting complete mitigation of the significant adverse impacts, the impacts could be partially mitigated by implementation of the mitigation set forth in the EIS.

As stated on page 1-13 of the EIS,

“Given the Village’s inability to facilitate the preservation of the building through adaptive reuse over the last 17 years, the purposes of the Proposed Action, which is the subject of this EIS, are to relieve the Village of a considerable financial cost and potential liability, while creating additional open space. Because of the restrictions on use of the property to park uses and the prohibitive cost of renovating the Main Building for municipal use, the Village has proposed demolition consistent with the purposes of initial acquisition of the property and consistent with its designation as parkland, i.e., public recreational space. Demolishing the Main Building and Ellis Hall would therefore allow this property to become part of the recreational amenity provided by the remainder of the former campus and would fulfill the public use objectives for which the property was originally acquired and designated as parkland.”

The Proposed Action would avoid the cost of future capital expenses associated with the stabilization and/or renovation and of ongoing maintenance (estimated to range from approximately \$8 million as presented in the CSSP’s “Alternative Proposal to Save St. Paul’s,” to up to \$13.9 million for stabilization and \$26 to 50 million for complete stabilization and renovation, plus maintenance and operating costs of up to \$165,000 per year as stated on page 1-13 of the EIS) (see Appendices C, H, I, and M).

It should be noted that demolition of the Garden City Hotel was a private undertaking with no municipal involvement.

Comment 4: In this year, considering the state of the economy, suggesting a bond or increasing taxes to pay for the demolition of the building is not appropriate, and any vote on this issue should be deferred until the economy improves. (Finamore)

Response: Under the Proposed Action, the citizens would have the right to vote on whether bonds should be issued with the associated cost to taxpayers.

Comment 5: What is the meaning of acquiring the building and holding on to it for so long only to demolish it? (Lin)

Response: As discussed in Chapter 1, “Project Description,” of the EIS, in 1993, the Village acquired the entire St. Paul’s property for Village purposes, including recreational purposes, and to prevent an undesirable use of the property. Since acquisition by the Village, the majority of the property has been used for a variety of Village purposes, including field and indoor recreation, special events, exhibitions, and other general recreational and cultural community uses. Since its acquisition of the property, the Village has studied numerous options for adaptive reuse of the various buildings, including the historic Main Building. Over the last 17 years, numerous proposals for reuse of the property have all proved economically infeasible or have been rejected because community consensus could not be achieved. Garden City’s State representatives have repeatedly indicated that they will not support the required legislation for private reuse of the property unless consensus is reached. In addition, no entity has come forth with the necessary funds for any charitable use.

Comment 6: Create an independent, non-profit Village Conservation Board (or a St. Paul’s Conservancy) which would be permitted to raise funds for preservation of the building. It is not appropriate to force taxpayers to pay. One option is for the Village to deed the building to a yet to be established conservancy for a nominal payment and the conservancy could then renovate the space as funds become available from grants and contributions. (Alvey, Whalen, David Hegarty, E. Castagna, A. Finamore, L. Moore, J. Schwieger, Henderson)

Response: Comment noted. Chapter 11, “Alternatives,” has been modified to include the commenter’s suggestions. Over the past 17 years, however, no entity other than the Village has come forth with or committed funds sufficient to provide for the preservation and ongoing maintenance of St. Paul’s. Moreover, no entity has been established that has the capacity to accomplish the commenter’s proposal without reliance on significant Village funds. In order to relieve taxpayers of the tax burden

St. Paul's School Demolition for Additional Open Space

of future stabilization, restoration, and maintenance, demolition is proposed, which would be subject to a bond referendum.

Comment 7: In addition to being able to vote on the bond issue authorizing demolition, the public should have the option to vote yes or no on a bond to preserve the building. (Ferrara, Oelrich, Zack, Andromidas, Roller, Gemmell, Birchenough, Hugel, Courtney)

Response: If there is a referendum on a bond issuance for demolition and it is defeated, the Board may consider a bond issuance for preservation.

Comment 8: The Village has other options for saving money than demolishing St. Paul's, such as by cutting expenses (e.g. cut police and fire salaries by 20 percent or more and hold that cut for at least two or three years, which would result in surpluses and about \$350,000 per year could be allocated to maintain St. Paul's). (Young)

Response: Comment noted.

Comment 9: The DEIS is complete and sufficient. It is time to accept and finalize the EIS. It is very thorough and covers the impact of demolition on the community. (Urban, C. Rio, Perini, Episcopia, N. Episcopia, Holland, Mulrooney, J. Moore, C. Mullaney, Welch, Former Mayors)

Response: Comment noted.

Comment 10: The building should be demolished or sold. Additional open space would be beneficial to the community. The Village and taxpayers should not have to carry the burden of the expense of upkeep. There is no viable reuse option. (Rio, Goddard, jmjac, Loew, Egan, Conti, C. Rio, Hayes, Taylor, Collins, Seebeck, O. Voelker, Morgano, Outcault, Seitz, Loew, Bankosky)

Response: Comment noted. See the response to comments in "Chapter 11: Alternatives," below.

Comment 11: If the bond issue is approved, then the Trustees are required to approve the demolition, with such demolition to commence within not less than 365 days from the approval of the bond issue. Language to this effect should be incorporated into the bond issue. If this is not legally permissible, then the Trustees should vote prior to bond issue on a resolution which, in essence, states that the Trustees have hereby voted for the demolition, if the bond issue is approved with the bonds to be issued and demolition to commence within 365 days of the bond issue being approved. To the extent legally permissible, the bond issue should

contain language that makes an affirmative, bond-issue vote unappealable or that if anyone appeals, the “appellant” must be made liable/accept liability for (and post a surety bond of not less than \$100 Million issued by a AAA-rated insurance company in support thereof) any and all damages sustained/suffered by the Village and its taxpayers as a result of the appeal process, including, without limitation: (i) the costs (e.g. legal and other) to the Village and its taxpayers of “defending against” the appeal; (ii) any costs (broadly defined) incurred by the Village and its taxpayers in maintaining the buildings while the appeal is pending; (iii) any incremental costs the Village and its taxpayers may incur as a result of issuing the bonds at a potentially higher interest rate (and the costs of any other unfavorable terms and conditions) than those which would have been incurred/required had the bonds been issued within 365 days of the bond-issue approval; and (iv) any additional costs the Village and its taxpayers may potentially pay for the cost of demolition in excess of those that would have been incurred had the demolition been commenced within 365 days of the bond-issue approval. To be specific, if as a result of the delay caused by an appeal, the Village and its taxpayers must pay demolition costs in excess of those that would have been required had the appeal not been filed, the appellant must pay those incremental costs up front so that the bond issue required to fund the demolition will be no larger than it would have otherwise been had no appeal been filed. (Seitz)

Response: Comment noted. If there is a bond issuance, the commenter’s suggested language will be considered. In all events, the Board of Trustees will comply with all legal requirements for issuing bonds and holding a referendum.

Comment 12: A complete copy of each of the Adelphi polls and the 2008 Property Owners’ Associations (POA) survey, with results, should be included in the FEIS, with a description of both undertakings. (Daughney)

Response: Comment noted. See Appendix G. Page 1-3 of the EIS states that in December 2008, the Village’s four property owners’ associations (POAs) conducted a vote of Village residents, which indicated that a majority disfavored the AvalonBay proposal. This result effectively precluded moving forward with that proposal. Page 1-3 of the EIS has been modified to reflect that the December 2008 POAs-sponsored Village-wide vote on St. Paul’s yielded the following results in terms of the number of residents that favored each of the three options: 1) for AvalonBay’s proposal: 873; 2) for Demolition: 2,272; and 3) for Mothballing: 1,875. Page 1-3 of the EIS was modified to reflect that in May 2004, the Garden City Property Owners’ Associations (POAs) sponsored a Village-wide opinion poll which was tabulated by Adelphi.

St. Paul's School Demolition for Additional Open Space

The "Results of Garden City Property Owners' Associations (POAs) Public Opinion Survey Regarding St. Paul's" indicated that 40 percent of respondents overall were in favor of using St. Paul's Main Building for private use as residential condominiums or an assisted living facility. The option cited second most frequently was demolition (25 percent). Threshold use and stabilization received the least support (7 percent and 4 percent, respectively).

Comment 13: A complete copy of the Report of the Mayor's Committee on St. Paul's, issued in July 2008 should be included in the FEIS along with a discussion of the report. (Daughney)

Response: A discussion of the report has been included on page 1-3 of the EIS, as follows: "In a report issued in July, 2008, the Committee recommended that AvalonBay's proposal for conversion to apartments, along with construction of additional townhouses, be accepted by the Village. It recommended this proposal over the Canus/CSSP [Committee to Save St. Paul's] proposal for a mixed residential/public use development of the Main Building only, based on the relative financial viability of the two proposals, and the relative financial risk to the Village, as reflected in a report by the Village's independent consultant. The Committee's report also included estimates prepared by a construction consulting firm for the costs of demolishing the Main Building and Ellis Hall (approximately \$5.8 million in 2009 dollars) and for demolishing Ellis Hall and stabilizing the Main Building to the extent of securing its exterior from the elements and preventing further deterioration (approximately \$13.9 million 2009 year dollars)." A copy of this report has been included in Appendix K.

Comment 14: Decide on best reuse; then go to the State Legislature and get it passed into law. (Lawry)

Response: Over the course of the past 17 years, no consensus has been reached on any reuse alternative. As stated on page 1-3 of the EIS, no private redevelopment of the Main Building can proceed without State legislation and Senator Kemp Hannon, in whose district Garden City is located, would have to support such required State legislation. Senator Hannon has stated unequivocally that he would do so only if there were 'a consensus of Village residents in favor of a specific proposal.' The Senator's website indicates that a consensus of the residents has not been attained. The results of the 2008 survey show that the demolition option gained 45.4 percent of the vote, the mothballing option gained

37.1 percent of the vote, and the Avalon Bay option gained 17.4 percent of the vote.¹ See Appendix G.

Comment 15: The December 2008 Village Survey found that more people are in favor of preservation (either with the Avalon Bay proposal or through mothballing) versus demolition. More people in general favor preservation. The 2008 Survey found that the majority of residents did not support private redevelopment. (A. Wolfe, Brunetti-Huneke, G. Cavaluzzo, E. deLaricheliere, Guy, Hendriksen, Pennypacker, Rodilosso-Smer, Rose, Rustmann, Sara, Scheer-Forcier, Jefferey, Wagner, Welch, Regina Hegarty)

Response: It is incorrect to conclude that preservation was favored over demolition based on the survey results. The preservation option included additional costs to the Village and taxpayers while the AvalonBay option would be a private undertaking. Thus, the votes in those categories can not simply be added together as indicating a majority preference for preservation. Under the proposed action, the Village residents would have a chance to vote on the referendum authorizing bonds for demolition before that action is undertaken.

Comment 16: Eskar Ltd., British Developer out of London responded to the RFP on St. Paul's in 2007, but was never interviewed and was told that their local partner lacked the proper experience. The proposal was resubmitted with a few changes to the local partner and other proposed changes, but the proposal was still dismissed and the firm never had the opportunity to discuss it with the Village. This proposal was better than any of the previously short-listed developer proposals and would generate revenue over the proposed demolition. (Marson)

Response: The EIS contains an analysis of a reasonable range of alternatives including a No Action Alternative as required by SEQRA, and three adaptive reuse alternatives. The FEIS's analyses of the Adaptive Reuse For Senior Housing Alternative has been modified to address the commenter's proposal. The commenter's proposal falls within the infinite spectrum of potential alternatives, which are reasonably encompassed by those analyzed in the EIS. The Eskar proposal is also very similar to the "Adaptive reuse of the buildings by a private entity for market rate housing with new residential construction on site and some public space" alternative analyzed in the EIS. While the Eskar proposal has some programmatic and physical differences from this alternative, including the age restrictions on 75 percent of the units and

¹ <http://www.kemphannon.com/article.php?article=12>, last accessed on December 13, 2010.

St. Paul's School Demolition for Additional Open Space

the total number of units (54 rental apartments including 8 “middle-income” and 10 townhouses under the Eskar proposal compared with 67 rental units and 37 townhouses under the market-rate housing alternative analyzed in the EIS), it still constitutes a private development with an additional building. Thus it would have the same type of impacts on historic resources, construction, land use, traffic and parking, aesthetic resources, community character, and community services, as are identified in Chapter 11, “Alternatives,” for the market rate and senior housing alternatives, although the magnitude of some of the impacts would be somewhat less given the lesser number of proposed rental units and amount of new construction. For example, since 75 percent of the rental apartments proposed under the Eskar proposal would be marketed for people over 55 without school-age children, this alternative would have a lesser impact on schools than the market-rate housing alternative analyzed in the EIS.

While under the Eskar proposal, like the senior housing and market-rate housing alternatives analyzed in the EIS, the Main Building would be preserved on the exterior, significant features in the interior would be lost during the conversion to apartments. Thus, there would still be significant adverse impacts to architectural and historical resources. There would also be significant adverse visual impacts due to the construction of a new building which would block view corridors of the Main Building from public areas. Thus, the Eskar proposal would not avoid all of the significant adverse environmental impacts caused by the Proposed Action. The Eskar proposal would also not provide the new open space that would be provided to all Village Residents under the Proposed Action. Lastly, while there may be some financial benefit to the Village if the Eskar proposal were successful, the multiple public opinion polls taken to date do not indicate there would be a public consensus sufficient to obtain the State Legislation required to facilitate the disposition of the Property.

Comment 17: Before a decision is made to demolish the historic Main Building, more information is needed. Spending \$8-\$10 million for 5 acres of seemingly needless open space does not seem to justify the conceded “adverse impact” demolition will have on the Village. (Sutton)

Response: Subsequent to the issuance of the DEIS, the Village conducted a Request for Proposals to obtain the actual costs for environmental abatement and demolition. The cost for demolition and abatement of the Main Building and Ellis Hall would be approximately \$3.5 million plus the cost of any mitigation. The EIS has been updated on pages 1-3 and 1-14 to reflect the projected cost of the Proposed Action. See Appendix J. Equating the cost of demolition with that of solely acquiring open

space is incorrect because the Village taxpayer's liability associated with a vacant building and for potentially tens of millions of dollars in future stabilization, restoration, and maintenance expenses would be entirely eliminated under the Proposed Action. The Village's open space areas are highly used (see Appendix F) and the additional open space would be a valued amenity to Village residents.

Comment 18: The main goal of the purchase of the St. Paul's property was the acquisition of the much needed playing fields. Although it was hoped that the main building could be converted for public use, in 1993 there was no such plan in place. In fact, preserving the green space and fields was the primary purpose of the purchase. Preserving the building for public use was to be done if feasible. And the Village has spent the last 17 years studying the feasibility with no solution. (Former Mayors)

Response: Comment noted.

Comment 19: In 2005, a Village-wide public opinion poll, sponsored by all four Property Owners' Associations and tabulated by Adelphi University, showed that the majority of the several thousand participants did not want to spend tax dollars on the building for public use. With the results of that poll in mind, coupled with the results of the Village-wide public opinion poll held by the Eastern and Estates POAs in December 2008, pursuant to law, the Village Board took the first steps towards holding a formal bond referendum for the purpose of demolition of the main building and Ellis Hall by authorizing an Environmental Impact Statement on the Demolition for Additional Open Space. All comments on the DEIS will be included in the required Statement of Findings which will be considered before the Board votes to authorize a bond referendum. (Former Mayors)

Response: Comment noted. This FEIS includes and responds to comments on the DEIS. Any Statement of Findings would be based on consideration of the FEIS.

Comment 20: The Village residents should not be asked to vote on demolition without a detailed cost figure for demolition as well as for the alternatives. If residents understood that the real cost of totally saving St. Paul's approached \$50 million (as compared with the lower cost estimate provided in the CSSP Proposal) they might be more inclined to vote for demolition. (J. Schwieger)

Response: Comment noted. The EIS has been revised on pages 1-3 and 1-14 to reflect the actual cost for demolition and estimated costs for stabilization and renovation. The actual costs to be incurred would also

St. Paul's School Demolition for Additional Open Space

be identified in any bond resolution, upon which a referendum would be held. See Appendices C, J, M, and O.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Comment S-1: There are many typographical errors in the DEIS that need to be edited. For example, on page S-5 under the heading "Hazardous Materials" the 8th word "is" should be deleted. (Daughney)

Response S-1: Page S-6 of the EIS has been revised to omit the eighth word, "is," under the heading "Hazardous Materials." The EIS has been checked for grammatical errors and revised accordingly.

Comment S-2: The second paragraph under "Proposed Action" states that demolition would occur in five phases; this is inaccurate. Historic elements might not be removed. The "historic elements" may not prove to be salvageable, or the economics of demolition and salvage might prove mitigation untenable. There are internal contradictions within the DEIS about these five phases. For example, under "Hazardous Materials" on page S-5, it states that the first phase is the removal of hazardous materials. In addition, under demolition, the Village may be able to leave certain materials such as lead in the buildings. (Daughney)

Response S-2: Comment noted. The demolition phases are proposed but may not in fact be necessary if as stated by the commenter there is no interest in salvage or it is deemed too expensive. Under all circumstances the asbestos, light ballasts, thermostats, and certain other materials in the buildings would be abated before demolition. It is true that lead based paint that would have to be abated for renovation would not be abated prior to demolition.

CHAPTER 1: PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Comment 1-1: What is the plan for the potential usage of the property after the demolition occurs? Is parkland the only potential use of the property? (Salem)

Response 1-1: Yes, parkland is the only proposal but it does not preclude any future use. Any other future use would, however, be subject to its own governmental, land use and environmental review and approval processes.

Comment 1-2: The DEIS shows no real benefit to the community from demolition. (Delman, Chianise, Sweeney, Grieve, Becker, Lott, M. Delman, Demakis, Petzinger, LaBianca, Alvarado, Seremetis, Raftery, Lamanna,

Efthimiou, Flynn, Michl, W. Metzler, Jerina, Kriby, Lacy, S. Maniaci, P. Scarantino, Fortunato, McLean, I. Smith)

Response 1-2: As stated on page 1-13 of the EIS, “Given the Village’s inability to facilitate the preservation of the building through adaptive reuse over the last 17 years, the purposes of the Proposed Action, which is the subject of this EIS, are to relieve the Village of a considerable financial cost and potential liability, while creating additional open space. Because of the restrictions on use of the property to park uses and the prohibitive cost of renovating the Main Building for municipal use, the Village has proposed demolition consistent with the purposes of initial acquisition of the property and consistent with its designation as parkland, i.e., public recreational space. Demolishing the Main Building and Ellis Hall would therefore allow this property to become part of the recreational amenity provided by the remainder of the former campus and would fulfill the public use objectives for which the property was originally acquired and designated as parkland.”

Moreover, certain future liabilities and expenses to Village taxpayers would be eliminated should the buildings be demolished. See also Response to Comment 3.

Comment 1-3: There is no need for additional open space in the Village. The benefits associated with the type and amount of open space that is proposed do not outweigh the costs. More recent studies demonstrating the need for this additional open space should be referred to in the DEIS. In short, outdated information is being utilized to justify \$8-\$10 million expenditures to increase the Village’s total open space by only 2 percent. (Knap, Sutton, Gibbons, Tricia Schettino)

Response 1-3: As stated on page 3-1 of the EIS, concerning usage of the recreational facilities on the St. Paul’s property, “Based on consultations with Village staff, overall, the facility is heavily utilized by permitted groups, including youth soccer, lacrosse, and football teams, with the parking area at or near capacity during most afternoons and weekends in the spring, summer, and fall seasons.” Appendix F of the EIS provides documentation of recreational use of the property and facility use permits. Moreover, as stated on page on 3-2 of the EIS, “In 1993, the Village Board acknowledged the need to preserve additional open space within the Village for the use and enjoyment by the Village’s residents.” Current costs for the Proposed Action are approximately \$3.5 million plus the cost of any mitigation and not \$8 to \$10 million (see pages 1-3 and 1-14 of the EIS as modified and Appendices J, M, and N). Moreover, the Proposed Action would eliminate at least approximately \$121,000 per year in future liabilities to Village taxpayers (based on the average annual operating

St. Paul's School Demolition for Additional Open Space

costs to maintain and heat the Main Building expended by the Village and the tens of millions of dollars of stabilization costs projected to be incurred in future years (see Appendix H).

Comment 1-4: The DEIS concedes that some of the “open space” created by the proposed demolition would remain a parking lot. It is suspected that the parking lot will be expanded. The current parking lot consumes approximately 2 acres of land. Thus, the additional 7 acres of open space is essentially 5 acres of open space with at least a 2-acre parking lot. (Sutton)

Response 1-4: There is no proposal to expand the parking lot. The additional 7 acres of open space consists of the footprints and areas surrounding the Main Building and Ellis Hall and does not include the existing parking lot.

Comment 1-5: On page 1-2, there are numerous references to “the Committee.” This needs to be clarified to indicate that there were several committees and Mayor’s Committees on the subject matter, consisting of different persons from time to time. (Daughney)

Response 1-5: Comment noted. Page 1-2 of the EIS has been modified to reflect the comment. A “Time Line of Committee Appointments and Proposed Uses” has been included in Chapter 1.

Comment 1-6: The DEIS should state that the purpose of the Proposed Action is not only for additional open space, but to create needed and centrally located land to potentially build a new municipal facility such as a civic or recreation center. (Daughney)

Response 1-6: There is no proposal other than parkland at this time. The Proposed Action is demolition for additional open space. The Proposed Action, however, does not preclude any other potential future use. Such a future potential use would be subject to its own governmental, land use and environmental review processes if at such time it is actually formulated and proposed.

Comment 1-7: An updated, actual cost of demolition (including removal of debris and lead-based paint removal) should be provided and compared to the cost of the other alternatives (including preservation). The cost of demolition should be projected to account for the lengthy demolition process. While some residents claim that the cost of demolition will be excessively high, there are also preliminary estimates from reputable and experienced contractors that show the cost at between \$1.2 and \$2.3 million. References in the DEIS to costs/expenses for demolition (e.g.

on page S-2) should be revised to include any updated estimates or actual bids received by the Village to date. The Village has received estimates between \$5.8 and \$13 million. The cost estimates should be presented in a chart in the FEIS (Sparacino, F. Ryan, D'Angelo, Schwieger, Dimattia, D. Hegarty, Zack, David Hegarty, J. Bauer, Griffis, Sutton, J. Schwieger, Efthimiou, Mulford, Daughney, Former Mayors)

Response 1-7: Comment noted. See Response to Comment 17 and Appendices J and N.

CHAPTER 3: OPEN SPACE

Comment 3-1: What is the meaning of “Additional Open Space” in the project name? (Salem)

Response 3-1: It is the footprint of the St. Paul’s Main Building and Ellis Hall and adjacent land, which would be graded, turned to lawn, and available as open space.

CHAPTER 4: HISTORIC AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Comment 4-1: According to the DEIS, there is no evidence of foundation damage or deterioration and the first floor is in good condition. The Village residents have been misinformed. (Francine Ryan, Tricia Schettino)

Response 4-1: The EIS has been modified to correctly describe the first floor of the Main Building. As noted in Chapter 4, “Historic Resources,” virtually some portion of every component of the first floor is in poor to severely bad condition. With the exception of some wood paneling that is in good condition, portions of every other interior wall, ceiling, and floor are severely damaged by a mix of lead based paint hazards, water, moisture, temperature fluctuation, visible mold growth, decay, and/or debris. Photographs reflecting current conditions are included in Appendix L. Aside from the interior components, many windows need replacement, masonry areas need restoration, asbestos containing materials need abatement, and structural components need to be investigated and potentially repaired or replaced. There are also inadequate HVAC and fire suppression systems and significant capital work is necessary for building code and Americans with Disability Act compliance before there can be any occupancy. The EIS has been updated on page 4-6 to reflect this.

Comment 4-2: The DEIS is rooted in historic preservation. (Habben)

Response 4-2: The EIS provides an objective analysis of impacts to historic and aesthetic resources in accordance with SEQRA.

St. Paul's School Demolition for Additional Open Space

Comment 4-3: What of historical significance happened at, or who of historical prominence graduated from St. Paul's garnering it "historical" status? (Brosnan)

Response 4-3: The building's historical status is not due to any significant event or person that graduated there. As stated on page 4-1 of the EIS, "The project site includes the Main Building of St. Paul's School, which is listed on the State/National Register of Historic Places (S/NR) as a contributing property within the A.T. Stewart Era Buildings Historic District. This historic district encompasses buildings built as part of the Garden City planned community between 1871 and 1893. The district was nominated for the S/NR as a thematic group, because the buildings do not form a contiguous grouping of buildings, but rather are separated by intervening, subsequent construction." See pages 4-4 and 4-5 of the EIS.

Comment 4-4: Get the building on the Register of Historic Places. (Holguin)

Response 4-4: As stated on page 4-1 of the EIS, "The project site includes the Main Building of St. Paul's School, which is listed on the State/National Register of Historic Places (S/NR) as a contributing property within the A.T. Stewart Era Buildings Historic District. This historic district encompasses buildings built as part of the Garden City planned community between 1871 and 1893. The district was nominated for the S/NR as a thematic group, because the buildings do not form a contiguous grouping of buildings, but rather are separated by intervening, subsequent construction."

CHAPTER 7: COMMUNITY CHARACTER

Comment 7-1: The demolition of St. Paul's Main Building will ultimately diminish the pride of the Village shared by many residents, negatively impacting the quality of life in the Village and the ambiance. (Dimattia, Schmidt)

Response 7-1: The EIS recognized that there would be significant adverse impacts on architectural, historic, and aesthetic resources and consequently, on those components of community character. There are, however, many contributing elements to quality of life and ambiance in the Village. These include the quality of the schools, their sports teams, academic achievements, public safety, governmental fiscal responsibility, religious groups and establishments, recreational amenities and clubs, residences, community groups, open spaces, retail opportunities, vegetation, transportation, location and neighborhood appearances. As stated on page 7-1 of the EIS: "Community character is an amalgam of the various elements that give communities their distinct 'personality.' These factors can include land use, aesthetic resources, historic features,

traffic volumes and circulation, noise levels, and other physical or social characteristics that define a community. Garden City is predominantly a village of single-family homes on well maintained and landscaped properties. It contains a Central Business District, which is a quintessential suburban Village center. Garden City is also home to the A.T. Stewart Era Buildings district, which comprises late 19th century residences and monumental structures, including St. Paul's School Main Building. Garden City is a community of immense civic involvement and pride. It contains significant public and private open space, including three private golf courses. Public spaces within the Village are extremely well maintained and attractive, as are the residential, commercial, and institutional developments. Residential developments surround the St. Paul's property to the south, west and north. Garden City has major streets and traffic corridors, such as Rockaway Avenue and Stewart Avenue, but is probably best typified by the quiet residential side streets with large, mature trees." If approved the potential exists that civic pride would be generated and the quality of life of the Village residents improved. This could result if a majority of Village residents are in favor of the elimination of the significant future liability on taxpayers of millions of dollars in repair, maintenance and restoration costs for a building that no acceptable or needed use has been identified for 17 years. The Proposed Action would also provide a benefit to community character in the form of additional public open space. Thus, it is speculative to conclude that civic pride, ambiance, and quality of life will, as a whole, decrease as a result of the Proposed Action.

CHAPTER 9: CONSTRUCTION

Comment 9-1: How many tons of fill would be required? (Francine R.)

Response 9-1: The exact quantity of required fill cannot yet be determined because some of the buildings' brick, stone and concrete materials would be used as fill. Any fill brought to the Property would be clean and would support lawn growth. The costs of any required fill are included in the prices set forth in Appendix J.

Comment 9-2: Are there any sites on Long Island where demolition debris can be disposed of or does it have to be carted to the mainland and, if so, has such an extra cost been assessed? (Pinnola)

Response 9-2: The majority of debris would be recycled and what cannot be recycled would be carted off of Long Island in the Tri-State Area and

St. Paul's School Demolition for Additional Open Space

Pennsylvania. The costs of disposal are included in the prices set forth in Appendix J.

Comment 9-3: The figures that have been drawn up about the cubic feet of debris that will be removed are questionable, as is the information provided as to where it will be taken. (D. Hegarty)

Response 9-3: As stated on page 16-1 of the EIS, demolition debris would be handled by private contractors and disposed or recycled at approved construction and demolition (C&D) debris landfills or registered or permitted C&D processing facilities that have adequate capacity. Brick, masonry, glass, and steel would be recycled and some wood would be recycled. The majority of debris would be recycled and what cannot be recycled would be carted off of Long Island in the Tri-State Area and Pennsylvania to licensed facilities with adequate capacity to accept the material.

Comment 9-4: The information provided as to the potential environmental effect the waste handling will have on air quality is questionable. (D. Hegarty)

Response 9-4: Fugitive dust monitoring and other control measures listed on page 9-2 of the EIS would avoid any impacts on air quality. In addition, the intensity of work activities and the number of vehicles traveling onsite would be relatively low for all tasks, buffer zones between the site structures and nearby sensitive land uses are relatively wide, and the work program is of short duration. Therefore no significant adverse impacts to air quality are anticipated.

Comment 9-5: Removal of 130,000 SF of debris would result in about 250,000 tons of debris entering the landfill and will have a negative impact. (Francine Ryan, Sweeney)

Response 9-5: Much of the materials would be recycled and the residue (remaining plaster/wood) would be landfilled in government-permitted facilities that have adequate capacity. There are many such facilities off of Long Island.

CHAPTER 10: MITIGATION MEASURES

Comment 10-1: The mitigation measures described in Chapter 10 are all insufficient relative to St. Paul's iconic status. (Wolfe, A. Wolfe)

Response 10-1: Comment noted. While none would fully mitigate all impacts from the proposed action, the identified measures would preserve forever images

and plans recording the design of the interior and exterior details of the building.

Comment 10-2: Despite comments made in the DEIS, it would not be possible to salvage and place the artifacts contained within the St. Paul’s Main Building in any place where they could possibly replicate the original structure. Destroying the artifacts would be detrimental to the historic character of the Village. (Reitman, Traxler, Maniaci, P. Scarantino, S. Scarantino, Emslie)

Response 10-2: Comment noted. The EIS recognizes that preservation of artifacts does not constitute complete mitigation of all significant adverse impacts that would be caused by the Proposed Action. Preserving such artifacts, however, is an accepted means of partially mitigating said impacts. The EIS identified, as a potential mitigation measure, allowing bona fide preservation and/or historical groups to obtain and preserve artifacts, in accordance with standard procedures and practices. While a significant adverse impact on historical resources is identified by the loss of a building listed on the State/National Register of Historic Places, the historic character of the Village would not be significantly impacted. The historic character of the Village is not defined by any single building or resource. If anything, the historic character of the Village relies most heavily on the historic and well kept residences throughout the Village, which would be untouched by the Proposed Action.

CHAPTER 11: ALTERNATIVES

Comment 11-1: The June 29th “Alternative Plan to Demolition” (i.e. “The Community First” plan) presented by the Committee to Save St. Paul’s and the Garden City Historical Society is realistic, affordable, and will accomplish what we need to accomplish. It will save the building and give us a welcoming community center. The plan should be formally addressed and considered by the Village Board. (Ryan, Pinnola, Perrell, Dimattia, Cashwell, Gray, Francine Ryan, Chianise, Negri, Habben, Andromidas, Fasano, K. Sweeney, Knap, Carr, J. Ang, Moore, Solferino, B. Andromidas, B. Hegarty, Wren, Chereskin, Garry, Flynn, David A., Reitman, Pinzino, Traxler, Doran, Waynes, B. Pinnola, Chianese, K. Chianese, T. Efthimiou, Fochr, Griffin, McDonald, Maniaci, Regan, P. Scarantino, S. Scarantino, R. Schettino, Atzner, Avellino, Besendorfer, Crapotta, Esposito, Hardy, Koczko, Nestasi, Overbeck, Dillmeier, T. McCabe, L. Moore, Reed, Galli, T. Mendizabal, R. Vassalotti, Rushmore, Vieira, Regina Hegarty, Adams, Bertolds, Burke, Caldwell, Centrella, Conroy, Delaney, Derderian, Diller, Fahey, Falk, Fleck, Frey, Harder, Inserra, Jones, Joyce, Kloefer,

St. Paul's School Demolition for Additional Open Space

Mahon, Mahoney, M. Mahoney, W. Mahoney, Moshensky, McGovern, W. McGovern, Miller, Rechner, Ripp, Rudolph, Ruotolo, M. Ryan, Stanco, Watras)

Response 11-1: Chapter 11, "Alternatives," has been modified to include the June 29, 2010 "Alternative Plan to Demolition" presented by the Committee to Save St. Paul's (CSSP) and the Garden City Historical Society as an alternative to the Proposed Action. A copy of the CSSP's latest proposal is included in Appendix I. See also the analyses contained in Appendices I, J, and M.

Comment 11-2: References to "yearly operating costs" should reflect that these figures are based on a specified time period and do not include any "one time" events requiring major repairs. To the extent that there have been expenditures for extraordinary items, these costs should be stated in the FEIS. (Daughney)

Response 11-2: Comment noted. The Village's "Annual Maintenance Expenses" have been added as Appendix H to set forth the costs expended yearly since the acquisition of the Property.

Comment 11-3: On page 11-2, the DEIS indicates that the Stabilization and Preservation Alternative places the Village solely responsible for rehabilitation of the building. This need not be the case. Developing a partnership will build greater opportunities for public assistance. Public endorsements will also further potential investment from potential investors. The public should be involved in the initial planning process and the Village should commit to a project that will develop over time. There are organizations, alumni, and agencies out there that would contribute to funding the preservation of the building. Form a working group composed of Trustees, Village Administration, CSSP, and GCHS to meet over the course of some months, provide as much information to the public as possible, and formulate a plan to go forward. (Wolfe, Perrell, Cashman, Harder, Castagna, Delman, Negri, Fasano, Grieve, O'Donnell, Gilgan, Becker, Lott, M. Delman, Demakis, Tartamella, Alvarado, Seremetis, Huneke, Raftery, Lamanna, J. Schwieger, Efthimiou, Michl, Reitman, Traxler, Metzler, W. Metzler, Jerina, Kahn, Kriby, Lacy, Maniaci, S. Maniaci, A. Wolfe, P. Scarantino, Fortunato, T. McCabe, McLean, L. Moore, Havern, Rustmann, I. Smith, B. Sweeney, P. DiMattia, Brevoort, R. Brevoort, Galli, Ziegler, Lemieux, R. Vassalotti, Vieira)

Response 11-3: Comment noted. No entity over the last 17 years has provided sufficient funds to the Village for preservation. Moreover, notwithstanding the effort of community groups, the Village Board of Trustees, and the various Village-sponsored committees over the last 17 years, no

consensus has ever been reached on any specific proposal for the preservation and reuse of the Main Building. Thus, a multiplicity of public, private, and charitable uses have all been considered and rejected by one or more critical constituencies.

Comment 11-4: Consider partial demolition of the St. Paul’s building (e.g. two wings). Consider partial preservation of the St. Paul’s building. Partial preservation would be less costly than preservation of the entire building. (Schwieger, J. Schwieger, R. Hildreth, Jonathan Schwieger, Bauer, Vassalotti, J. Bauer, David H., R. Hegarty, Dobrinin, Lemieux, Bankosky)

Response 11-4: This is not a reasonable alternative or mitigation measure because it is expensive and would also have significant adverse impacts on historic resources. The historic views from public areas would be eliminated, the historic elements within the wings would be lost, and the intended “E” shape of the building irretrievably altered. While constituting partial mitigation, reconstructing the openings left by partial demolition in a historically correct way would require significant expenditures (see Appendices C, J, N and M) and not avoid the costs of stabilizing and maintaining the remainder of the building.

Comment 11-5: It would be fine to demolish Ellis Hall. (R. Vassalotti, Vieira)

Response 11-5: Comment noted.

Comment 11-6: Why not spend the \$200K to keep St. Paul’s than the \$6 million on demolition? It would be less costly to retain St. Paul’s than to demolish it, as evidenced in the CSSP Plan. (A. Wall, Regina Hegarty)

Response 11-6: As explained in the CSSP’s “An Alternative Proposal to Save St. Paul’s,” and in the EIS, Chapter 1, “Project Description,” and in Appendices C, I, and M, at least \$2 million and more likely approximately \$9 to \$13.9 million is needed for stabilization. The roof is severely damaged, the building needs extensive masonry repointing and repair and many windows need to be recaulked, repaired, or replaced. Expending \$200,000 per year would not eliminate the liability to Village taxpayers of these required expenditures but merely would buy additional time and simultaneously facilitate the continued decay of the Building. The CSSP proposal also includes approximately \$6 million for interior work. See Appendices I and M.

Comment 11-7: Why can’t architects be hired to figure out something to do with St. Paul’s? (Weidner)

St. Paul's School Demolition for Additional Open Space

- Response 11-7:** Numerous architects have proposed various uses for St. Paul's Main Building. All such uses have either failed to garner sufficient public support for necessary legislation allowing for their development, or have been determined to be neither economically viable nor publicly needed.
- Comment 11-8:** The estimated cost of \$5.8 million to demolish St. Paul's is low and should account for the cost to reconstruct Cluett Hall, and for re-designing, re-grading, repaving, and expanding the parking lot. (Yuter, Sutton)
- Response 11-8:** As shown in Appendices J, M, and N, the actual cost of demolition, regrading, and planting is approximately \$3.5 million. The cost of any mitigation would be additional. The cost to repair Cluett Hall would be insignificant as the passageway did not alter the structural components of Cluett Hall and exterior doors already exist there. After additional inspection it has been determined that routine cleaning of the brick after the passageway is removed would be all that is anticipated. There is no plan to expand any parking lot.
- Comment 11-9:** The community is not in favor of the proposal by AvalonBay and does not want density. (Andromidas)
- Response 11-9:** Comment noted.
- Comment 11-10:** Consider reuse of the building for an athletic complex; natural history or other museum; new school; library; municipal or commercial office space; retail use; hotel. There are many reuse options for St. Paul's including House Tour, and rental space for weddings, gatherings, and special events, which can all generate revenue for the Village. Consider reuse of the main building as a fine arts performance center, or subsidized lofts for aspiring artists, or for children's or senior recreational programs, or a community or cultural center or other community use. Consider reusing the building for senior housing, apartments, condos, or residential properties to generate revenue for the Village. The grounds could be used for tennis courts, croquet courts, putting greens, and swimming pools. Reuse the cafeteria as a lunch place. Support private redevelopment; a public reuse option is not feasible. Preserve the building and make good, public use of the grounds. (K. Sweeney, Havasy, Buffa, Mudford, Di Palma, Kaliban, V. Lewis, Roller, Beyea, Lawry, Petrella, Vukovic, Chereskin, Negretti, Martilla, T. Negretti, Fajans, Sessa, B. Sweeney, Chambers, T. Chambers, Fuchs, S. Fuchs, Ted Chambers, Tricia Schettino, Schmidt, Annunziato, Mayo, Behnke, Blanco-Mood, Carter, DePol, Okun, Keith,

Millstein, Havern, Patterson, Schonau, Scott, A. Dalto, Chernick, Stephen Fuchs, P. DiMattia, R. Brevoort, Welch, Wells, Dell'Olio, Dickson, Henderson)

Response 11-10: The EIS considers a reasonable range of alternatives encompassing the commenters' suggestions. Over the years, numerous proposals have all proved economically infeasible or have failed to garner support among a majority of Village residents. Thus, the State legislation needed to dispose of the Property for a private use is not supported by State Senator Hannon. In addition, no entity has come forth with the necessary funds for any of the public uses suggested by the commenters. See also response to Comment 1-5 reflecting the Village's efforts to identify a reuse alternative over the past 17 years.

Comment 11-11: The DEIS is false in saying that the Village has explored every possible alternative to demolition. The Village should consider all reasonable alternatives to demolition. (Moore, Reitman, A. Dalto, Kahn, Maniaci, S. Scarantino, Buffa, Hall, Emslie, P. DiMattia, Boysen, Tarmin)

Response 11-11: Chapter 1, "Project Description," of the EIS discusses the various proposals other than demolition considered by the Village since its acquisition of the Property. Greater detail of each proposal is available in the Village's records respecting the analyses of them and conclusions as to why they were never implemented. The EIS also examines a number of alternatives to the Proposed Action. In developing these alternatives, it was the objective of the Village, as Lead Agency in this environmental review, to examine a reasonable range of alternatives to the Proposed Action. In accordance with SEQRA, impacts under these alternatives are compared with the Proposed Action and its environmental impacts. To that end, multiple alternatives were evaluated with respect to use of this Village owned site. The Village and community have over the last 17 years considered all reasonable proposed alternatives to demolition and for the reasons stated in the EIS, have failed to identify any viable alternative. It should be noted that designation of the site as parkland in 2004 requires that any proposed private development be subject to formal legislative action of the New York State Legislature. As a result, possible alternative uses of the site which might include private development have been rejected and are unlikely in the future.

Comment 11-12: Consider a tax credit for developers who offer affordable housing. (Behnke)

Response 11-12: The means of financing various private-sector alternatives are beyond the scope of this EIS.

St. Paul's School Demolition for Additional Open Space

Comment 11-13: The FEIS should provide reasonable detail for each and every plan, suggestion, or alternative use proposed by the Village and private and public groups for the site during the last 17 years and the Village's response to such proposals. Chapter 11 of the DEIS does not provide sufficient detail. Such details should include the dates of any cost estimates. (Daughney)

Response 11-13: Chapter 1, "Project Description," of the EIS has been modified to include additional details related to the various uses considered for the property over the last 17 years. As noted above, additional details are available in the Village's records. Chapter 11, "Alternatives," includes a reasonable range of alternatives with comparative detail for analysis purposes. A "Time Line of Committee Appointments and Proposed Uses" has been included in Chapter 1.

Comment 11-14: A financial feasibility study should be conducted for the proposed alternatives/options/suggestions. (Schmidt)

Response 11-14: A financial feasibility study is beyond the scope of SEQRA. Relative costs of various alternatives are however provided in the EIS. The cost estimate for basic restoration is applicable to all potential reuses. The Village made a public Request for Proposals to get bids for environmental abatement and demolition including planting and grading; the cost for demolition and abatement of the Main Building and Ellis Hall is approximately \$3.5 million (see Appendices J, M, and N). As part of the EIS process, additional cost estimating for restoration was undertaken in addition to the responses to the Village's RFP. An architectural and engineering firm retained by the Village has estimated that any reuse option would cost \$26 million or more. The cost for partial stabilization is at least \$2 million and could approach \$9 to \$13.9 million for complete stabilization. See Appendices C, J, and M.

Comment 11-15: Sell the property back to the Dioceses of Garden City. (Lawry)

Response 11-15: No one at the Dioceses has expressed interest in obtaining the property.

Comment 11-16: Look to students for ideas. Consider putting the property up for auction with stipulations. Sell off the land surrounding the Main Building. Contact Biltmore Estate in Asheville, NC to consult with the Village; they are a successful renovator. (Lawry, Buffa, Petrella)

Response 11-16: There have been multiple studies and RFPs issued related to the potential reuse of the Main Building. Proposals for rehabilitating the building for public use have been determined to not be economically feasible, or not publicly needed. Proposals for private redevelopment

have not garnered a consensus of public support needed for the introduction of the required State legislation in order to proceed with private reuse of the property.

Comment 11-17: The Committee to Save St. Paul’s proposal underestimates the cost to renovate the building and fails to address the burden that would be placed on taxpayers. The Board should address the proposal so the public is not misinformed. The detailed restoration and renovation plan that was presented by Einhorn Yaffee Prescott in 2002 estimated over \$37 million (in 2001) to restore the interior and exterior of the building. At the time of the presentation, the Board felt that the costs might approach \$50 million. An approximately \$200K estimate to preserve the building is not realistic. The heat was turned off this year; there has been no renovation on the roof in years and there are holes in the roof; rain pours into the building through broken windows; bricks are falling off the walls of the building. Each year the task of renovation becomes more costly. Letting the building sit without work is a death sentence. (J. Schwieger)

Response 11-17: Comment noted. See Chapter 11, “Alternatives,” which contains an analysis of the CSSP proposal and Appendices I and M, which contain an analysis of the costs that CSSP projects.

Comment 11-18: The Village could sell the existing Village Hall and other municipal facilities and move those facilities to St. Paul’s to pay for the restoration and reuse. Bonds could be sold incrementally to pay for the restoration work until the existing facilities could be sold. (B. Sweeney)

Response 11-18: This alternative was considered in the past, but rejected because it is not economically and practically feasible given the relatively high costs of renovating the Main Building (see Appendices C, K, and M). Additional Village space, if needed could be acquired for significantly less money. See Appendix O.

Comment 11-19: Discussions of the designation of the site as parkland in 2004 should also include discussion that such designation requires that any proposed private development be subject to formal legislative action of the New York State Legislature. As a result, possible alternative uses of the site which might include private development are unlikely and therefore the Village has discounted and would be required to discount in the future the viability of any such projects/uses. (Daughney)

Response 11-19: Comment noted.

St. Paul's School Demolition for Additional Open Space

Comment 11-20: The Board has refused to entertain seriously any plans other than the AvalonBay proposal. (Poz)

Response 11-20: The Board has seriously considered many proposals for the property over the last 17 years, including a proposal for redeveloping the Main Building with senior housing, for which a developer was conditionally designated. These proposed plans are listed in Chapter 1, "Project Description," and the original materials in and available in the Village's files. See also Responses to Comments 11-10, 11-11, and 11-13. In addition, the Board has and will continue to seriously consider the alternative proposals set forth in the EIS.

Comment 11-21: It should be evident to all parties that after 17 years, no economically viable plans for preservation have been presented and approved by the voters of Garden City. Since 1993, the Village Boards of Trustees have been trying to find a suitable use for the St. Paul's Main Building at an affordable cost to taxpayers. A quick look at the Village website shows the list of studies that were done over the past 17 years which have produced no satisfactory result. Throughout the past 17 years, a number of studies were commissioned by the Mayor and Village Boards. Professional architects, engineers, financial and real estate experts were retained to explore the feasibility of converting the main building for public use. Concomitantly, Committees made up of residents, who are also professionals in these fields, were appointed to review the report of each consultant and make recommendations to the Village Boards. Proposals to convert the main building for use as Village Hall, the Police and Fire Departments, the Recreation Department, a Senior Center, a Youth Center, a public high school, and a public library have all been carefully scrutinized. Mayors and Boards of Trustees, the Board of Education, the Property Owners' Associations, and many residents have given serious consideration to every consultant's findings and every committee report on each proposal for public use. (J. Bauer, Former Mayors)

Response 11-21: Comment noted.

Comment 11-22: Significant financial analysis needs to be done to validate the costs of the CSSP's Alternative Plan; however, it would appear that these costs would be significantly lower while preserving the historic character of the building. The CSSP and GCHS's proposal fails to address glaring deficiencies in the CSSP plan presented in late June. The following is a critique of the CSSP proposal: What are the uses for the 10,000 SF that will be renovated? Who are the potential users? How frequently will they use it? Are there any potential revenue streams to help offset the

costs? Will the Conservancy require that the facility be used by non-Village residents? Will the proposal cannibalize the existing meeting rooms in the library, Senior Citizen Center, or other facilities in the Village, or facilities at the Garden City Hotel? Without empirical information and solid commitments, the CSSP presentation does not provide a foundation for a business/revenue plan and revenues to warrant raising capital to fund the venture. The financials presented in the CSSP proposal did not have apples-to-apples comparisons. Showing the demolition expenses over a 10-year period and then showing the CSSP proposal over a 15-year period presented numbers that are not compatible in terms of the impact on Village taxes. The CSSP proposal, by only focusing on partial rehabilitation with a 3 to 5 year life, did not account for the incremental costs of future renovation, which would substantially increase the long-term costs of renovation. The incremental costs need to be figured into the 10 or 15 year plans, starting in year 3 or year 5. The CSSP proposal for Partial Rehabilitation failed to address the impact of having a partially renovated building on the customer experience in the renovated sections; the upkeep and appearance of the grounds; the adequacy of the renovated first floor for all potential uses; the dangers and risks of the unoccupied upper to lower floors. All of these issues need to be addressed, backed up by credible market research, an unassailable business plan, and solid commitments by potential users. (J. Bauer)

Response 11-22: Comment Noted. Chapter 11, “Alternatives,” has been modified to assess the June 29, 2010 “Alternative Proposal to Save St. Paul’s” presented by the Committee to Save St. Paul’s (CSSP) and the Garden City Historical Society and a further analysis is included in Appendices I and M.

Comment 11-23: Consider the following Alternative Proposal to retain the historic character of St. Paul’s without requiring the Village to spend any more than the basic costs of demolition. It would eliminate potential future expenses other than possibly modest maintenance. It would also require those wanting to retain the historic character of the building to secure a modest amount of financing by a certain date, in effect having them make a financial commitment. It would be bring closure to some 17 years of lack of progress:

- Demolish all parts of building except for front façade and any required supporting walls. The remaining building would continue to be owned by the Village; the Village could, at any point in the future, sell or otherwise dispose of the building at its sole discretion.

St. Paul's School Demolition for Additional Open Space

- Remove all architecturally interesting and significant elements from the remaining exterior walls and interior rooms. Initially, store these off-site until a new permanent, purpose-built structure could be built on the St. Paul's grounds. This new structure would also be used for other public purposes. This new structure would be a separate project, independent from this Alternative Proposal. There would be no requirement that it be done. Alternatively, the architectural elements could be relocated off site to any current or future public building or location within the Village. The architectural elements would continue to be owned by the Village.
- Certain architectural elements could be sold off to raise funds to finance the incremental expenses for preservation.
- Financing: If the Village residents vote for demolition, the Village and residents would fund only the demolition portion of the project. All incremental expenses would be borne by the CSSP or other interested parties. In the event that funds could not be raised by the target date for start of demolition, the Village would have the right to demolish the entire building and have no future obligation to preservation. A reasonable period of time (i.e. 18 months) would be established during which incremental funds could be raised. An independent financial institution would be appointed to manage the finances, own the removed architectural elements, and hold the funds in escrow until the completion of the project. (J. Bauer)

Response 11-23:

The EIS considers a reasonable range of alternatives (see Chapter 11, "Alternatives." Over the last 17 years, there has been a large number of suggestions pertaining to reuse of the property (see Chapter 1, "Project Description). The Commenter's proposed alternative would not avoid the significant adverse impacts on historic and aesthetic resources, or community character that would be occasioned by the Proposed Action. As stated on page 1-13 of the EIS, "Given the Village's inability to facilitate the preservation of the building through adaptive reuse over the last 17 years, the purposes of the Proposed Action, which is the subject of this EIS, are to relieve the Village of a considerable financial cost and potential liability, while creating additional open space. Because of the restrictions on use of the property to park uses and the prohibitive cost of renovating the Main Building for municipal use, the Village has proposed demolition consistent with the purposes of initial acquisition of the property and consistent with its designation as parkland, i.e., public recreational space. Demolishing the Main Building and Ellis Hall would therefore allow this property to become part of the recreational amenity provided by the remainder of the former campus and would fulfill the public use objectives for which the property was originally acquired and designated as parkland." Lastly, the estimated

cost of undertaking the commenter's proposal is between \$7 and \$8 million (see Appendix M), which is far in excess of the approximately \$3.5 million needed for demolition.

Comment 11-24: The CSSP Proposal is flawed because there is no use for a 130,000-square foot building. The CSSP Proposal is flawed because there is no way to raise the approximately \$40 million that is needed to restore the interior and exterior of the building. The CSSP Proposal is flawed because putting the property in the hands of a conservancy does not relieve the Village residents of the long-term task of restoration/renovation. (J. Schwieger)

Response 11-24: Comment noted. Chapter 11, "Alternatives," has been modified to assess the June 29, 2010 "An Alternative Proposal to Save St. Paul's" presented by the Committee to Save St. Paul's (CSSP) and the Garden City Historical Society. A copy of the CSSP's latest proposal is included in Appendix I. Also included in Appendix M is an analysis of the CSSP proposal.

MISCELLANEOUS

Comment 12-1: The proposed demolition would have an adverse economic impact on the Village, ultimately resulting in a decrease in property values and overall capital budgets. (F. McDonough, Sweeney, Dimattia)

Response 12-1: The EIS concludes that the Proposed Action would result in a significant adverse impact on historic resources, aesthetic resources, and community character. Consideration of solely economic impacts such as property value is beyond the scope of SEQRA. There is no quantitative or qualitative evidence of a decrease in property values as a result of demolition. By relieving the Village of future operation, maintenance, and capital expenses, demolition would decrease the overall tax burden on the community.

Comment 12-2: A \$30 million 5 percent 20 year bond would cost \$350 per residence/household. A bond to restore St. Paul's School would likely cost Village residents less than the risk of eroding property values due to the change in Garden City ambiance that would occur with the demolition of the school. (Schmidt)

Response 12-2: Assuming, arguendo, the commenter's math is correct, there still is no quantitative or qualitative evidence of a decrease in property values as a result of demolition. By relieving the Village of future operation, maintenance, and capital expenses, demolition would decrease the overall tax burden on the community and therefore should increase

St. Paul's School Demolition for Additional Open Space

property values. The Proposed Action's potential effect on property values would not result in any neighborhood character impacts given the various elements that give communities their distinct "personality," including land use, aesthetic resources, historic features, traffic volumes and circulation, noise levels, and other physical or social characteristics that define a community as discussed in Chapter 7, "Community Character."

*