

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
FOR THE
BASSETT HEALTHCARE – BASSETT HALL & HARRISON HOUSE
PARKING LOTS

Project Location:
Village of Cooperstown, Otsego County, New York

Lead Agency:
Village of Cooperstown Planning Board
22 Main Street
PO Box 346
Cooperstown, NY 13326

Village Contact Person:
Teresa Drerup, Chairman Village Planning Board
607-547-2411

May 25, 2007

Date of Acceptance by Lead Agency:
May 31, 2007

I. INTRODUCTION

The following is the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) prepared for the Bassett Hall and Harrison House Parking Lots. Pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), the purpose of the FEIS is to respond to substantive comments received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).

The DEIS for the two parking lots was determined complete by the Village of Cooperstown Planning Board, acting as Lead Agency, on August 8, 2006. Pursuant to 6 NYCRR 617.8 a public scoping document was prepared that identified potentially significant adverse impacts and is attached as Appendix A to the DEIS. In the DEIS no significant adverse environmental impacts were identified. A public hearing was held on September 12, 2006, and the public comment period ended on October 12, 2006.

Pursuant to the requirements of SEQRA, this FEIS includes the DEIS by reference, substantive comments received during the public hearing and comment period that ended on October 12, 2006 and responses to substantive comments. Transcripts of the Public Hearing and the written comments received are attached to this FEIS.

II. SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON DEIS

Section II of the FEIS provides a summary of substantive comments raised during the public hearing and comment period. Comments addressed herein include those received in writing from agencies and the general public, as well as those comments made by the speakers at the Public Hearing. Copies of the public hearing transcript and written correspondence are included in Appendix A and B, respectively.

Nine individuals provided substantive comments at the public hearing and seventeen (17) letters were received from members of the general public. Most of the comments were generally related to six topics: community character of the neighborhood in which the proposed project is situated, traffic impacts, parking, alternatives, segmentation and pedestrian (including child safety) issues. Responses to repetitive comments refer back to prior responses to similar substantive comments.

III. REVISIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS

Based on information presented in the DEIS and the DEIS Addendum, one issue requires clarification. Table 1 on Page 2 of the DEIS Addendum provide incorrect total number of available parking spaces. The correct version of the table is as follows:

Table 1
Summary of Off Street Employee Parking

Location	# of Parking Spaces
Mill Street	283
Bassett Hall (current)	95
Clark Sports Center	364
Trolley Lot	120
Total	862 Available spaces

IV. FUTURE ACTIONS

The SEQRA process will be concluded with the adoption of the Statement of Findings by Village of Cooperstown Planning Board, acting as Lead Agency. Each of the Involved Agencies may then adopt its own Statement of Findings or adopt the Lead Agency’s Statement of Findings. The Statement of Findings is a written statement prepared by the Lead Agency that considers the relevant environmental impacts presented in the EIS, weighs and balances such impacts with social, economic and other essential considerations, provides a rationale for the Lead Agency’s decision and certifies that the SEQRA requirements have been met for the project. Once the Statement of Findings is prepared and adopted, the Planning Board then will decide, consistent with the Statement of Findings, whether to approve, approve with conditions and/or modifications or deny the site plans for the project.

V. PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

The following are comments taken from the public hearing transcript. For a complete copy of the transcripts, refer to Appendix A.

A. Frank Capozza, 116 Pioneer Street, Cooperstown, New York:

- 1. Comment:** I was reading the addendum and noticed that it appeared that the moving of the employees from Bassett Hall that the parking would then be appropriate, Wilmington and Greystone Office Complex to provide sufficient parking for hospital employees on campus during maximum office hours. A couple of paragraphs later: To cover from Elk Street lot recently converted from employee parking to visitor parking adding forty lot spaces bringing the total within that recommended by the 2005 parking study. So, one of my first questions, it seems from my perspective to state that we don’t need those extra parking spaces because by moving employees, which is what was originally asked

for has to be reviewed, apparently, unless, I am wrong, it seems to have taken care of the problem.

Response: The parking lots that are the subject of the Bassett Healthcare application are intended for use by visiting employees from Bassett Healthcare’s off-site facilities and employees that work at Bassett Hall and Harrison House. The increase in parking will decrease the number of visiting employees and employees of Bassett Hall and Harrison House who otherwise may park on Village streets and in other hospital parking lots. Thus, with additional off-street parking spots available per the proposed project, it is expected that the demand for public parking on Village streets and in other areas of general parking for patients to the Hospital by visitors and staff to Bassett Hall and Harrison House should lessen.

2. **Comment:** The last comment I have was maybe a concern, as I understand that, for the person who purchases the house between the two proposed parking lots. And that bothers me a little, only because I would hate to see the box get connected at some point to become one big parking lot. I just don’t think having that parking lot there, particularly Bassett Hall one, is a good idea.

Response: Reference is made to the former Lydia Flanagan parcel located at 21 Beaver Street, Cooperstown, New York. The parcel is located between the Harrison House and Bassett Hall. Recently, Templeton Foundation, a not-for-profit corporation affiliated with Bassett Healthcare, acquired the underlying fee title to the parcel. Mrs. Flanagan has maintained certain possessory rights to the parcel. The Applicant maintains that Templeton Foundation has no current plans for development of this parcel.

3. **Comment:** I had to wait for 17 cars just to get here today to back out of my driveway.

Response: The traffic study (Appendix B to draft environmental impact statement [“DEIS”]) concluded that taking into account existing traffic volumes combined with the traffic generated by the proposed parking lots, will not have a significant effect on the study area and all movement will operate satisfactorily. The updated intersection traffic study (Attachment 7 to Addendum to DEIS) indicates the seasonal variations in traffic do not impact intersections adjacent to the hospital.

4. **Comment:** The last issue that I wanted to bring up is that I know it says here: The locks -- the spot Bassett Hall would be using for training, sporadically for training functions -- I'm not sure, but I don't remember seeing anything in previous documents mentioning training... And that concerns me in that I don't see where training was mentioned before. And why is it now coming up on the agenda if it wasn't mentioned? I can't speak to these items I now see, a document that says you don't need the parking and yet all of a sudden now we are looking for training space.

Response: Section 1 of the DEIS references the need for the new parking lots to address, in part, staff needs. The Addendum expanded on Bassett Healthcare's explanation as to why additional parking is needed. Specifically, the proposed lots are intended to accommodate visiting employees from off campus facilities who come to Bassett Hall and the Harrison House sporadically for training events and other functions at such buildings. Bassett Healthcare estimates the number of visiting staff at 130 per day.

B. Eileen Anania, 94 Pioneer Street, Cooperstown, New York:

1. **Comment:** In the addendum -- actually, in the Draft EIS, I don't think that Bassett did a good job addressing the multi-level parking garage aspect, and I would like to see a little more emphasis put on that aspect. They actually talked about putting parking garages on those two proposed sites. If we don't want paving there, we certainly don't want Bassett to be thinking of putting parking garages on those sites.

Response: The alternative of constructing a multi-level parking garage must be considered (as the Planning Board will do when it prepares the Statement of Findings) in relation to its costs and environmental concerns that may result from the alternative. These are set forth in Section 3.5 of the DEIS at pages 42-43.

2. **Comment:** I would like them to reconsider a Riverside Drive cul de sac. The basic reason is that the school children will no longer have to cross Susquehanna. They will stay on one side. I would like them to revisit a parking garage on that Riverside Drive cul de sac.

Response: The Riverside Drive cul de sac alternative is not part of the public scoping document attached as Appendix A to DEIS and therefore, was not considered and did not qualify as a reasonable alternative under 6 NYCRR 617.8(f)(5).

- a. **Sub-comment:** On the Internet under thechase.com, I found a parking garage that actually was just built in Saratoga holding 260 vehicles. It's a very historic design. I will get you a picture of it. It was \$2.6 million, and I know it was done by Chase who I know has done other work for Bassett. Bassett addressed a 500-car car parking garage. We aren't looking for a 500-car expansion. But if they proposed one, say, on the lower lot behind the Bassett Hospital, I, for one, wouldn't be against that. But I can't understand them pushing this off to someone else's neighborhood.

Response: Refer to the Response for Comment B1.

3. **Comment:** At the very least, I would like to see -- I don't know if I can talk about this until you consider the site plan. But the Bassett Hall entrances and exits are right now across from Pioneer Street. I would like to see at the very least not an entrance on Pioneer, across from Pioneer, but an exit perhaps on Riverside Drive with the crossovers terracing and maybe it's not too steep to allow for an exit there. Again, because circumstances have changed, and the bridge is being redone, it's a four-way stop and it won't involve school children crossing at the busy intersection.

Response: To evaluate this possibility, Bassett Healthcare had BSA Lifestructures undertaken a preliminary feasibility analysis of a driveway between Bassett Hall and Riverside Drive. The report, which is included in Appendix C, has concluded that a driveway between Bassett Hall and Riverside Drive would create safety concerns for vehicle and pedestrians due to steep slopes in excess of 10% and inadequate safe stopping distances. For these reasons, BSA Lifestructures concluded in its report that this option is not feasible. Prior to adoption of the Statement of Findings, the Planning Board will assess such conclusion.

4. **Comment:** My next concern is the alternative of where the parking garage is. On the Greystone relocation, it says, "In the alternative, it would cost Bassett Hospital \$5 million to relocate 150 employees to the Greystone complex. Therefore, they decided that wasn't a viable option. Then, in the addendum it says that Bassett is now in the process of relocating employees to the Greystone lot. I can't remember the exact numbers, but by 2009, a total of 150 employees will be relocated there. This concerns me because Bassett has taken a proposed alternative and turned it into reality.

Response: The \$5 million cost included acquisition of the real estate and building. Initially, the owner of the Greystone Office Complex was not interested in selling the property. The owner thereafter agreed to lease the building and property to Bassett Healthcare with a purchase option. Bassett Healthcare is in the process of relocating 150 employees to the Greystone Office Complex with 80 more employees to be relocated by mid-2007 and another 70 by mid-2009. See-Section 1.4 of the Addendum to DEIS. The relocation of staff to the Greystone Office Complex is a proactive measure to reduce the parking needs in the Village of Cooperstown. SEQRA does not preclude an applicant from implementing an Alternative during an ongoing SEQRA process on a separately proposed project. Based upon information provided to the Village by Bassett, the lots proposed for Bassett Hall and Harrison House are intended to accommodate visiting employees from off campus facilities who come to Bassett Hall and the Harrison House sporadically for training events and other functions. The relocation of staff to the Greystone buildings has not, therefore, reduced the need for the proposed Project according to the Applicant's representations.

5. **Comment:** I also think that Bassett didn't do a good job addressing future needs. And, in June of this year the Daily Star indicated an increase in surgery, up 7.5 percent, and outpatient visits up to 5.5 percent. The year before in the Daily Star it was indicated that surgery cases have doubled at Bassett...Segmentation is an issue that I will be watching. I think segmentation is very important, and SEQRA does not allow for it.

Response: Bassett Healthcare has not submitted or proposed to the Village of Cooperstown any other improvement project to its facilities. Bassett Healthcare has represented to the Planning Board that it has no such plans for improvements to its facilities in the near future. The Planning Board has no option other than to take the Applicant at its word. However, the Planning Board will hold Bassett Healthcare to its word and will not entertain any future proposal for facility improvements until a master plan for future facility improvements is first submitted and reviewed by the Village. The parking lots project as currently proposed is a discrete and independent project, and, according to Bassett Healthcare, no other parking lot projects or other facility projects that would increase demand for parking are currently proposed by Bassett Healthcare. Therefore, and based upon information provided by Bassett Healthcare to the Village, the Planning Board is not engaging in segmentation under SEQRA by reviewing the currently proposed action. (See - Section 1.1 of the Addendum to DEIS).

C. Giles Russell, 11 Church Street, Cooperstown, New York:

1. **Comment:** I can just comment that I know from personal experience how important it was to have Bassett here.

Response: Comment noted.

2. **Comment:** I believe it basically concludes that the project will cause no greater delays in the traffic pattern, no change in air quality, no noticeable change in noise level, minimal visual impact by using appropriate landscaping, no effect on the ecology of the area, and appropriate measures would be taken for protecting any archeological finds.

Response: Comment noted. 3. **Comment:** Now, under the possible alternatives it has been mentioned, of course, about a garage for both staff and patients. Not only would this have a high cost -- I'm not going to argue about what the actual costs would be or how many cars. But I think it would end up in the neighborhood of close to \$15,000 a space. It is my belief that this would create a greater environmental impact, and I know it would be difficult to find appropriate sites. Knowing the lay of the land around Cooperstown, it would be very difficult to build such a building.

Response: Comment noted. In determining the feasibility of possible alternatives, the Planning Board will consider such factors. See Response to Comment B-1 above.

4. **Comment:** Additional offsite parking would be certainly okay for staff but not for patients and visitors.

Response: Comment noted. The applicant has maintained that the additional parking proposed under the present project will not be utilized for staff, patients or visitors to facilities other than staff of and visiting staff at Bassett Hall and Harrison House.

5. **Comment:** And I know that this proposal is based mainly on additional staff locations, but I think it goes without saying that any future need for additional patient/visitor parking on site is a logical anticipation. And you can't move the visitors and the patients offsite.

Response: Comment noted. See also Response to Comment B-5 above.

D. Stewart Coughlin, 24 Maple Street, Cooperstown, New York:

1. **Comment:** I have a great feeling for MIB, and I think that what we have to do here is everything that we can do to make it better for the people in the area that we have to do. I think when we do it, we have to do it in the mind of the proper things for the institution that probably is the greatest blessing we have here in our community, not only our community but the community as a whole area.

Response: Comment noted.

2. **Comment:** The other thing that I would suggest, and hope that this will go through, is that a sidewalk will be put on that side of the street so that those people, the doctors, customers, and whatever, walking there, don't have to cross the street twice.

Response: To provide pedestrian access for the new parking lots, new sidewalks are proposed along Susquehanna Avenue and Beaver Street for the entire length of the project.

3. **Comment:** And sometimes we have Beaver -- we have maintained Beaver Street in good condition, but sometimes we have a main break or ditch and people are getting washed during the spring and fall. I think that could be corrected along with it.

Response: Comment noted.

4. **Comment:** If you look at the character of how the Harrison House is located, you can't even see a parking lot from across the street, and it would be an excellent place for a parking area. And I think that whole thing could be done with the proper shrubbery, and that, so they would hardly even know it was there.

Response: Comment noted. Prior to rendering a final decision on the proposed project and the Statement of Findings, the Planning Board will consider the existing character of Harrison House and the surrounding neighborhood in conjunction with the proposed plans.

E. Ann Capozza, 116 Pioneer Street, Cooperstown, New York:

1. **Comment:** We already appreciate having Bassett in our community and think they are a wonderful organization. And I use Bassett and my family uses Bassett for our healthcare. And that was not a question.

Response: Comment noted regarding benefit of Bassett Healthcare to community.

2. **Comment:** The question that has been concerning us for the past three years is maintaining the residential feeling of our neighborhood. I counted up today the number of school-aged children that live between Pioneer from Beaver to Elm Street. There are 39 children of school age on that street alone. And we have concerns about the safety of our children, the increased traffic going down Pioneer Street at the end of the day because that seems to be the easiest way to get out of Bassett Hall and avoid having the traffic backup at the four-corner intersection of Beaver Street and Susquehanna Avenue. The proposed site area is currently zoned R-1.

Response: See response to Comment A3 of Frank Capozza above. While according to the traffic studies performed for the proposed project there may not be an overall increase in traffic to the area, the safety and welfare of all pedestrians is of critical importance. To further facilitate pedestrian safety, the Planning Board will consider appropriate conditions to further mitigate such potential impacts. One condition that will be evaluated is requiring Bassett Healthcare to station crossing guards at the intersections of Susquehanna and Beaver St. and Beaver and Pioneer St. during the morning and afternoon hours when school children are walking to and from school.

3. **Comment:** I understand the hospitals are allowed in an R-1 zoning. However, the proposed parking lot would require both front and side setback variances.

Response: The Planning Board will analyze the variances obtained to date and additional variances that may be necessary. (See - Attachment 2 appended to Addendum to DEIS).

4. **Comment:** I did notice when going through the documents that one of the potential impacts that was cited would be a change in the character of the area. This is all we are fighting for is to maintain the residential feel of our neighborhood. It is zone R-1, and we enjoy living there.

Response: The Planning Board recognizes that the character of the neighborhood in which Bassett Hall and Harrison House are located has been the predominant concern of residents. Changes in neighborhood or community character are generally related to impacts associated with traffic, pedestrian safety, air and noise quality, aesthetics, and the compatibility and mixture of uses. Significant

changes in any of these conditions can have a negative impact on the character of the neighborhood.

The DEIS provides significant analysis on traffic in Section 2.2, Visual in Section 2.4, and Air and Noise in Section 2.9 and 2.10, respectively. As discussed in these sections, the new parking lots would not have a significant adverse impact on traffic, air and noise quality, or aesthetics although there may be small to moderate impacts with respect to such issues and thereby also on the neighborhood character. In particular, the transformation of the Harrison House property from its present residential-estate aesthetic character that would occur under the present proposal is also expected to have some impact on the present neighborhood character. Therefore, although it could be concluded that the Project would not result in a significant adverse impact on neighborhood or community character given the existence of Bassett's present facilities within the neighborhood the Planning Board will consider whether modifications and/or conditions to the proposed site plans such as better screening and parking space reduction or reconfiguration will adequately mitigate impacts on and to preserve the existing community character.

The Project as currently proposed may have an adverse impact on community character due to the proposed expansion of parking facilities in the neighborhood. Specifically, the proposed change in character of the Harrison House to a more apparent "office" use through the addition of a parking lot in front of the structure is one consequence of concern that the Planning Board will consider in its deliberations on the project as proposed.

5. **Comment:** I also have some concerns about Bassett's purchase of the new piece of property. I don't have any idea what that piece of property is scheduled to be used for. I don't know if Bassett has any final plan for what that property is going to be used for. However, whether it's going to be for parking or a new or additional building or -- I can see that it might bring more traffic to this street and into the area and I think that should be taken into consideration.

Response: See response to Comment A2 of Frank Capozza above.

6. **Comment:** And I also still, as Ms. Anania said, have concerns about segmentation. I still don't see where the two proposed property lots meet the needs that were originally outlined in the original proposal and document and, therefore, still meet the requirements of the regulations, requirements of the regulations regarding segmentation as outlined in SEQRA.

Response: As set forth in the response to Comment B5 of Eileen Anania above, the Planning Board is concerned about Bassett Healthcare’s seemingly piecemeal approach to expansion or improvement of its facilities. However, the Applicant has repeatedly stated that it has no future plans for further projects and the present projects represent a reasonable effort to resolve parking issues at least with respect to Bassett Hall and Harrison House. As such, the Planning Board is of the opinion that the present proposal is not segmentation and as a measure to prevent any future segmentation the Planning Board will recommend or require that any future project proposal not be accepted as complete until Bassett Healthcare provides a long-term plan for future expansion or growth.

F. **Diane Grigoli, 111 Pioneer Street, Cooperstown, New York:**

1. **Comment:** I have three children going to school, and my understanding is that there will be many cars coming up Beaver Street and turning at the intersection of Pioneer into Bassett Hall. My children cross that way, as do many children in the neighborhood. My neighborhood is growing, so that is my concern as a mom.

Response: To facilitate pedestrian safety, the Planning Board will consider requiring Bassett Healthcare as a condition to any approval of the present project to station crossing guards at the intersections of Susquehanna and Beaver St. and Beaver and Pioneer St. during the morning and afternoon hours when school children are walking to and from school.

2. **Comment:** Also, I have a question. And that would be concerning the parking on my street. There is also the parking on Susquehanna and Delaware as well. They use my street as well as those streets as parking lots. I have to say when I’m on my porch I see the ladies from Bassett Hall come on their breaks -- which, I might add, they have many -- and they come together. And I have signs on the street that say “two-hour parking” and these ladies swap spots so that parking becomes all-day parking for them because their cars are now in different spots...But my street has become their parking lot. And are these people who are parking on my street, Susquehanna, Eagle and Delaware, are they the ones that are going to be parking in the new parking spots or are these parking spots strictly for the physicians or people working for the finance department? That is a concern of mine as well. Who is parking in these parking lots that are being created for Bassett Hall? I would really be happy if these people on my street had a place to park. It’s very difficult to back out of my house, especially in the wintertime when piles of snow are so high and you have to creep out and hope and pray to God there is not somebody up there as you are backing out.

Response: The proposed parking lots will be used by visiting employees from Bassett Healthcare’s off-site facilities and employees that work at Bassett Hall. The increase in parking will decrease the number of visiting employees and employees of Bassett Hall who park on Village streets and in other hospital parking lots, therefore lessening the demand for parking on Village streets by Bassett employees and visiting employees. The Planning Board will recommend that the Village look into the issue of controlling the use of on-street parking by Bassett staff where there are other off-street parking facilities available.

G. Elizabeth Lesko, 20 Beaver Street, Cooperstown, New York:

1. **Comment:** I have to kind of agree with Ms. Grigoli. I am a mom of three young kids, one of which goes to school now. It scares me knowing there will be that many more people parking across from my house.

Response: Comment noted. Refer to response to Comment F1 above.

2. **Comment:** And, again, I also have concerns about what’s going to be happening across from my house in the future.

Response: See response to Comment 5B of Eileen Anania above.

3. **Comment:** And I’m all for Bassett too. It’s a great facility, and what-not. And something needs to be done about the parking.

Response: Comment noted.

4. **Comment:** Just please consider the neighborhood when you are making your decisions.

Response: Comment noted. See Response to Comment E-4 above.

5. **Comment:** I just forgot to mention that where we live I am concerned about the value of our home and our property once you start putting in all of those parking lots, and what not. So, I wanted that to be taken into consideration.

Response: Comment noted. Although no supporting documentation or other testimony was submitted by Ms. Lesko or any other individual regarding the claim that value of homes and property will decrease if Planning Board approves the proposed action, the Planning Board does acknowledge that impacts on aesthetics and community character may have a correlative impact on residential

property values in the neighborhood. As set forth in the Response to Comment E-4 above, the Planning Board is taking the issue of impacts on community character seriously and will consider such issue when deliberating on the final decisions for this project.

- 6. Comment:** And, also, we talk about making it look nice; that there is a parking lot there, putting up bushes and shrubs, I am all for that. But it still doesn't take away from what it is, which is more vehicles in front of my house and around my house. So I just wanted to add that.

Response: The Planning Board will consider modifications to the site plan to better screen the proposed lots from public rights of ways, and to better preserve the existing community character.

H. Stephanie Bower, 93 Pioneer Street, Cooperstown, New York:

- 1. Comment:** I guess my comment is that we have a neighborhood in juxtaposition with general industry or business. And to have those two groups to try and get along is really of paramount importance.

Response: Comment noted.

- 2. Comment:** And I think in the past Bassett has always been perceived as being a good neighbor as witness to how they constructed their construction and the parking lot and things like that.

Response: Comment noted.

- 3. Comment:** Amongst myself and the neighbors there is a perception that Bassett has not sufficiently explored the alternatives. The neighborhood has been protesting this for two or three years, yet we still see the same proposals with the same number of spots, with not addressing the total number that they really need. So, people now are going to worry that these are going to go in and there will be a request for having a further parking lot in this neighborhood again sometime again in the near future.

Response: Under Section 3 of the FEIS the alternatives of the proposed action as identified in the scoping document were sufficiently analyzed and addressed in accordance with the requirements of SEQRA. Any future parking lot construction or development that would increase demand for parking by Bassett would require additional local reviews and approvals and, as mentioned previously, the Planning

Board will require a full master plan of future improvements or expansions before entertaining any other proposal from this applicant.

4. **Comment:** And to reiterate, the other thing is the exploration of alternatives.

Response: See Response to previous Comment H3 above.

I. Mary B. Marx, 106 Pioneer Street, Cooperstown, New York:

1. **Comment:** I am concerned about the Bassett Healthcare partial plan for employee parking which will be considered by the Cooperstown Planning Board today. My concern is precisely that it is only a partial plan rather than an overall plan. No one knows how these partial formulations will relate to future partial moves or what the final effects will be on the village, the village traffic patterns, the residential areas of the village, or Bassett's employees.

Response: The project should not be considered a partial solution to the parking situation at Bassett Hospital. The project has been formulated and presented as a solution to the parking situations at Bassett Hall and Harrison House. This project is to provide adequate on-site parking for those two buildings in order to accommodate staff and visitors that enter those buildings from time to time for training and other activities. Thus, the project is viewed by the Planning Board as a solution to one aspect of the general parking situation for all Bassett facilities and will clearly be an improvement to the parking needs of Bassett Hall and Harrison House and should be some improvement to the overall parking situation. In general, based upon the Planning Board's understanding and interpretation of the information provided in the DEIS and the Addendum, the parking situation is summarized as follows:

Pursuant to the August 8, 2006 DEIS Addendum, Bassett Healthcare projects its needs to be:

- | | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 1. Patient/Visitor Parking: | 294-350 spaces needed (2004 Parking Survey); 315 exist |
| 2. Employee Parking: | Employees (1750) + visiting employees (130) = 1880 total employees; 940 spaces minimum needed per Zoning Code; 862 exist = deficit of 78 |

In 2009, with the relocation of 150 Staff to the Greystone Building, and the proposed construction of 134 new spaces at Harrison House and Bassett:

1. Patient/Visitor Parking: 294-350 spaces needed (2004 Parking Survey; 315 exist
2. Employee Parking: Employees (1600) + visiting employees (130) = 1730 total employees; 865 spaces minimum needed per Zoning Code; 996 exist (862 + 134 new) creating a surplus of 131 spaces

Consequently, the total number of parking spaces available to both visitors and staff are within the range of the required number of parking spaces. The feasibility of Bassett Healthcare restricting employee parking on Village streets will be investigated further outside of the proposed Project.

2. **Comment:** My concerns focus on safety, on the dangers of an increase in local traffic, and on air quality as related to increased traffic. Beaver Street and the southern portion of Fair Street are already extremely busy residential streets due to traffic bound for Bassett Healthcare facilities.

Response: As set forth in the Response to Comment A-3 (of Frank Capozza) above, the traffic study (Appendix B to draft environmental impact statement [“DEIS”]) concluded that taking into account existing traffic volumes combined with the traffic generated by the proposed parking lots, will not have a significant effect on the study area and all movement will operate satisfactorily. The updated intersection traffic study (Attachment 7 to Addendum to DEIS) indicates the seasonal variations in traffic do not impact intersections adjacent to the hospital. It is acknowledged that Beaver Street and the southern portion of Fair Street are busy residential streets, but according to the traffic study mentioned above the operation of the two parking lots in question will not significantly impact the existing conditions.

3. **Comment:** Increasing the numbers of parkers with access to Beaver Street would therefore increase the possibility for accidents and the difficulty in crossing Beaver and Fair Streets, both of which are residential.

Response: This has been looked at by the traffic study in the DEIS and there is no empirical proof that the parking lots proposed will increase the potential for accidents or the difficulty in crossing Beaver or Fair Streets.

4. **Comment:** The traffic on Pioneer Street would also increase as parkers leave the proposed parking areas.

Response: See Responses to Comments I-2 and I-3above.

5. **Comment:** Finally, the air quality of this part of our village would be strongly affected by increasing the vehicles coming and going from Bassett's proposed parking areas.

Response: Section 2.9 of the FEIS and Appendix K- Air Quality Analysis Report provide that the proposed action does not have the potential to impact air quality. A microscale air quality analysis is not necessary since the project will not increase traffic volumes, reduce the difference between vehicles producing exhaust and sensitive receptors or change other existing conditions to such a degree as to jeopardize attainment of air quality standards. However, the project has limited potential to have short-term impacts on ambient air quality resulting from the construction of the facility. To minimize these impacts to the maximum extent possible, the FEIS identifies certain reasonable mitigation action that will be undertaken by Bassett Healthcare and the Planning Board will require such mitigation as a condition to any approval.

VI. COMMENTS RECEIVED AFTER PUBLIC HEARING CONDUCTED ON SEPTEMBER 12, 2006:

A. Saratoga Associates on behalf of the Village Planning Board:

The following comments are taken from a letter dated January 23, 2007 from Saratoga Associates, who reviewed the DEIS on behalf of the Planning Board. A copy of the letter is included in Appendix B. Since Saratoga Associates is the Planning Board consultant who asked Bassett Healthcare to provide responses to specific questions, the responses that Bassett provided to the Planning Board in its initial draft of this FEIS are provided below followed by an additional response from the Planning Board.

1. **Comment:** Pedestrian safety around the project site was one of the major concerns raised during the public comment period. Therefore, it is imperative that the applicant explain what steps, if any, they intend to take in the design and construction of the Project that will result in a more pedestrian safe environment for adults and children as they walk along and cross streets near the Project Site.

Bassett Response: During construction, safety fencing would be installed along the site perimeter to prevent pedestrians from inadvertently entering the construction site. During the initial phases of construction, when demolition and earthwork is being completed, the sidewalks on the east side of Susquehanna Avenue and south side of Beaver Street, adjacent to site, may need to be closed temporarily. Any temporary sidewalk closures would have to be coordinated with the Village and the School District. During temporary sidewalk closures, all pedestrian traffic would use the sidewalks on the west side of Susquehanna Avenue and north side of Beaver Street.

Once the sidewalks are complete, pedestrian safety would be maintained with painted crosswalks at the driveway of each parking lot. No other pedestrian specific safety measures are needed or anticipated.

Planning Board Response: The Planning Board disagrees with the statement that no other pedestrian specific safety measures are needed or anticipated. As set forth above in various responses to hearing comments, the Planning Board is particularly concerned about pedestrian safety of children during the times that children are known to walk to and from school. As such, the Planning Board is considering additional safety measures such as requiring the applicant to provide crossing guards at specified times and locations (e.g. at Susquehanna and Beaver Street intersection) as a condition to any approval.

2. **Comment:** The Applicant should provide an overview of the nature of pedestrian travel along Susquehanna Ave., Beaver, Pioneer, and Fair Streets including but not limited to the following information:
 - a. Who uses the sidewalks;
 - b. Where are they coming from and going to; and
 - c. What streets do they need to cross?

Bassett Response: The Final Scoping Document, dated October 4, 2004 (Appendix A) does not require performance of a pedestrian traffic study. As such, claims relating to pedestrian impacts have been determined to be irrelevant by the Planning Board. Notwithstanding that determination, the following statements are offered based on observations:

The primary users of the sidewalks along Susquehanna Avenue, Beaver Street, Pioneer Street, and Fair Street are the local residents living in the Village, students and employees walking to and from school, and Bassett Healthcare

employees that live in the immediate area walking to work as well as between the Hospital and Bassett Hall. For the most part, users of the sidewalks are traveling from their places of residence to either work or school.

There is likely a small portion of pedestrians that are using the sidewalks for recreational purposes. There is a small portion of Bassett Health employees who park at the Clark Recreation Center and walk along Susquehanna Avenue to get to the Bassett campus. Without knowing the exact origins and destinations of all pedestrians it is not possible to identify all streets that crossed by pedestrians. Periodically, all the streets in the areas are likely crossed by pedestrians. However, in general, pedestrians would likely have to cross at least one or some of the following streets on a regular basis: Beaver Street, Pioneer Street and Susquehanna Avenue.

It should be noted that all intersections have crosswalks painted on the street pavement to indicate their location. Also, it is anticipated that the proposed parking lots will reduce the level of on-street parking and concomitantly reduce the risks to pedestrians who do not use the crosswalks.

Planning Board Response: Although true that the final scope did not require a specific pedestrian traffic study, the safety of pedestrians was not considered irrelevant by the Planning Board. Pursuant to the SEQRA public comment process, pedestrian traffic and safety issues have been genuinely presented to the Planning Board as a legitimate and valid concern which the Planning Board takes seriously both in its role as Lead Agency for the project and in reviewing the site plans in question under its zoning jurisdiction. With that said, the response from Bassett above is an accurate assessment of pedestrian traffic within the project area based on the input from the public and the personal knowledge of Planning Board members. At this time the Planning Board does not deem it necessary to require an additional study on pedestrian traffic because the impacts of the proposed project on such traffic is readily discernable. The use of existing sidewalks and the new sidewalk proposed along Beaver Street will enable the implementation of the proposed parking project without significant impact on pedestrian safety and, as mentioned in various comments above, the Planning Board is considering additional mitigation measures to enhance pedestrian safety, particularly school-age children that walk to and from school as the applicant acknowledges.

3. **Comment:** The Applicant should indicate the entrance/exit times from both proposed parking areas compared with the peak pedestrian traffic, particularly children walking to and from school.

Bassett Response: Elementary school students typically arrive at school between 8:00 and 8:10 am and are dismissed at 2:35 pm. Employees using the new parking areas would likely arrive in the 7:15 to 8:15 am time frame and would not be leaving until after 4:30 pm.

Consequently, it is unlikely that there will be a significant conflict with users of the parking areas and elementary school children. Logically, there will be minor conflict with Bassett employees who walk to work since employees who walk or drive leave at the same general time.

Planning Board Response: The Planning Board agrees with the above response from the applicant that there does not appear to be “significant” conflict with users of the proposed parking areas and elementary school children but the Planning Board is of the opinion that the safety of school-age children walking to and from school is such an important issue that any conflict is a legitimate concern. Therefore, as mentioned above, the Planning Board will consider further mitigation measures on this issue in its final decision-making deliberations.

4. **Comment:** The Applicant should provide a discussion of any reasonable designs for improved traffic management within the Bassett parking lot that might lessen potential impacts on adjacent roads and improve pedestrian safety.

Bassett Response: As discussed in Section 2.2 of the DEIS and page 5 of the DEIS Addendum, the new parking lots will not impact the local road system. No change in traffic volume is expected as a result of this project. There is sufficient capacity to support the traffic entering and exiting the parking lots. For a discussion of pedestrian safety issues refer to the response to Comment 1 on page 13.

Moreover, it is important to understand, that the parking lots do generate additional traffic within and adjacent to the hospital campus. The Hospital’s employees, visitors and patients currently park in the existing lots and on Village streets. If the new parking lots were not constructed, the Bassett employees who would be using the new lots would still be driving to the hospital and using other on or off street parking spaces. The relocation of employee vehicles to the proposed new parking lots will not increase traffic volume.

Planning Board Response: The Planning Board agrees with the above response that it is the existing facilities and not the proposed parking lots that are the significant traffic generators. However, the proposed parking lots will effect traffic patterns to some degree and will certainly generate more vehicular trips to Bassett Hall and Harrison House. The comment requested that the applicant look at ways to improve the internal traffic management within the proposed parking lots. The applicant's response did not address such issue. As such, the Planning Board will consider possible modifications to the proposed parking lot site plan to address internal traffic management concerns when it deliberates on its final decisions for the proposal.

5. **Comment:** There seems to be discrepancies between previous Applicant submissions and the FEIS regarding the issue of who will be using the new parking facilities. In order for the Planning Board to have a clear understanding of the current benefit and need of the proposed Project, please provide an updated and detailed explanation of who (employees, visitors and patients) will be using the proposed new parking facilities, where they currently park, and how this facility will reduce on-street parking needs by current and future employees, visitors and patients.

Bassett Response:

A summary of Bassett's existing parking system, users of the new parking lots and the benefits of the project were provided in the DEIS Addendum dated August 2, 2006, pages 2 through 5. Aside from the revised Table 1 included on Page 2 of the FEIS, all information presented in the DEIS Addendum is correct and up to date.

Planning Board Response: The above response does not answer the specific question raised in the comment. It is the Planning Board's understanding at the present time that the applicant has represented that the proposed parking lot projects were intended for and will be used to accommodate staff and visiting staff to Bassett Hall and Harrison House and the Planning Board will condition any approval of the proposed parking lots to that specific use.

6. **Comment:** The Applicant should provide a proposal on how Bassett Healthcare can work cooperatively with the Village of Cooperstown to develop a strategy for reducing the on-street parking needs by Bassett Healthcare employees, visitors and patients and improve the overall parking situation in and around Bassett Healthcare facilities in the Village of Cooperstown.

Bassett Response: Over the last several years Bassett Healthcare has undertaken several steps to limit the amount of parking its needs within the Village. These include encouraging carpooling, which totals 91 carpooling vehicles, evaluating the possibility of employee bus shuttles and relocating staff of the main campus to remote locations.

These activities were documented in Section III of the DEIS and on Page 2-5 of the DEIS Addendum. Bassett's most recent step to minimize parking within the Village has been to relocate approximately 150 employees to the Greystone Office Complex by the end of 2009.

Bassett will continue to explore opportunities to minimize employee parking needs within the Village. However, patient and visitor parking is difficult if not impossible to locate to remote areas (i.e. outside the hospital campus) for obvious reasons. To that end there will also be a need for a significant amount of patient and visitor parking.

Preventing staff, patients or visitors from using on street parking could only be accomplished through a Residential Parking Permit system, which requires approval from the NYS Legislature. If the Village of Cooperstown wants to pursue such an initiative Bassett Healthcare would not oppose it.

Planning Board Response: The Planning Board appreciates Bassett's efforts to continue to resolve the parking issues with their facilities. The Planning Board does not agree however that a residential parking permit system (nor that State legislative approval is required) is the only available method to control Bassett staff or visitors from parking on the Village streets particularly where there may be off-street parking available. The Planning Board will recommend to the Village that this issue be studied further and a reasonable method to control such on-street parking be implemented if practicable.

B. Charlie Hill, Planning Board Member Cooperstown, New York:

The following comments are taken from an email from Charlie Hill to Teresa Drerup dated January 26, 2007. A copy of the email is included in Appendix B.

1. **Comment:** Pedestrian safety around the project site was one of the major concerns raised during the public comment period. Specifically, the impact of 134 additional vehicles, twice a day, leaving and entering the two proposed

parking areas along already heavily used neighborhood streets, is a safety concern for adult and children who routinely walk the adjoining streets. Therefore, it is imperative that the applicant explain what steps, if any, they intend to take in the design and construction of the Project that will result in a more pedestrian safe environment for adults and children as they walk along and cross streets near the Project Site.

Response: See Response to Comments to IV-A above. Again, the Planning Board will consider the issue of pedestrian safety and specifically the safety of children when it deliberates on its final decisions so that such issues are properly addressed by modifications or conditions.

2. **Comment:** The Applicant should provide an overview of the nature of pedestrian travel along Susquehanna Ave., Beaver, Pioneer, and Fair Streets including but not limited to the following information:
 - a. Who uses the sidewalks;
 - b. Where are they coming from and going to; and
 - c. What streets do they need to cross?

Response: See response to comment IV-A2 of Saratoga Associates above.

3. **Comment:** The Applicant should indicate the entrance/exit times from both proposed parking areas compared with the peak pedestrian traffic, particularly children walking to and from school.

Response: See response to comment IV-A3 of Saratoga Associates above.

4. **Comment:** The Applicant should provide a discussion of any reasonable designs for improved traffic management within the Bassett parking lot that might lessen potential impacts on adjacent roads and improve pedestrian safety.

Response: See response to comment IV-A4 of Saratoga Associates above.

5. **Comment:** There seems to be discrepancies between previous Applicant submissions and the FEIS regarding the issue of who will be using the new parking facilities. There is some discrepancy as to the number of parking spaces currently available in each of the current parking lots (Atwell, Clinic, Mill, Elk, Bassett Hall, Gym, Linden and Greystone) and who (patients, visitors, employees, volunteers, students, Resident Dr., visiting staff from off site Bassett facilities, employee handicapped) is assigned to use each of these parking facilities. Please provide this information. If the total number of employees during maximum

employees hours at Bassett Cooperstown has changed since the Addendum (1,750), please include a revised number as of January 2007. In order for the Planning Board to have a clear understanding of the current benefit and need of the proposed Project, please provide an updated and detailed explanation of who (employees, visitors and patients) will be using the proposed new parking facilities, where they currently park, and how this facility will reduce on-street parking needs by current and future employees, visitors and patients.

Response: See response to comment IV-A5 of Saratoga Associates above.

6. **Comment:** The Applicant should provide a proposal on how Bassett Healthcare can work cooperatively with the Village of Cooperstown to develop a strategy for reducing the on-street parking needs by Bassett Healthcare employees, visitors and patients and improve the overall parking situation in and around Bassett Healthcare facilities in the Village of Cooperstown.

Response: See response to comment IV-A6 of Saratoga Associates above.

7. **Comment:** Public comments reflect a concern for maintaining the residential character of Beaver, Pioneer and Fair Streets and Susquehanna Ave. Please describe how you intend to design /mitigate your project so it reflects the residential character of the neighborhood.

Response: Again, residential character of the neighborhood where the parking lots are located is a serious issue, which has been addressed in several comments above. The measures to mitigate impacts on surrounding land uses and the residential character of the neighborhood as offered by the applicant were discussed in Sections 2.3 – Land Use and Zoning and Section 2.4 –Visual of the DEIS. In general terms, these measures include new landscaping to replace and or enhance existing landscaped buffers, period and or dark sky friendly lighting and ornamental fencing. The Planning Board will consider whether such measures are adequate and what additional measures that may be appropriate by site plan modifications or conditions.

C. **Reed Metzger, M.D., J.D., 45 Beaver Street, Cooperstown, New York:**

The following comments are taken from a letter dated from H. Reed Metzger. A copy of the letter is included in Appendix B.

1. **Comment:** Expanding surface parking at Bassett hall is a bad idea - bad for the neighbors and bad for the town. Not too good for Bassett either. Here's why: The neighbors did not expect to be living next to a busy parking lot. Parents of youngsters worry about the traffic increase, all of us are concerned about the

appearance, noise and fumes. Of course the DEIS bought slick studies to tell us that more cars will not mean more traffic or noise or fumes. I don't but [buy] it and neither should you. The report cleverly tells us that any disagreeable changes are insignificant. Insignificant to whom? The people to be adversely affected were not asked. This is not just rude, in a democratic society it is unconscionable and we look to the Board for protection.

Response: Comment noted. The Planning Board's jurisdiction and authority in this matter is to weigh the project benefits against its adverse impacts and to appropriately balance those competing objectives. It should be noted that many comments have maintained that Bassett Healthcare provides important services to the community and is an important part of the Village. The Planning Board agrees with such assessment. Thus, any expansion or improvement of its facilities must be weighed against this aspect as well.

2. **Comment:** The present proposal is a bad idea for the village. Firstly, Cooperstown is a very special place. We all know it. It is a beautiful village preserving that which is best in our country: the historic ambience; pleasant residential streets lined with trees and flowers; sweet, clean, fresh air. Turning lawns and tennis courts into parking lots is destructive to the character of our village and should not be tolerated.

Response: Comment noted. The Planning Board agrees with the comment that the Village is a very special place and that its character is unique and precious to all who live and work in the Village and who visit because of its character. The addition or expansion of parking lots is typically not a use of land which is preferable from an aesthetic point of view but parking is an unavoidable need of a busy Village and the generation of traffic to health care facilities is an aspect of such services that also is unavoidable.

3. **Comment:** Secondly, there is an effect on the property values in the affected area. If values go down what happens to our tax base? This must be studied. The DEIS does not even mention this as an issue.

Response: Comment noted. See Response to Comment III-G-5 above.

5. **Comment:** Thirdly, rendering more land impermeable worsens water runoff problems. The DEIS discusses drainage and catchment basins, but these studies predate the terrible floods of last spring. An up-to-date review is imperative.

Response: The Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan included in Appendix G of the DEIS analyzes the stormwater management system for the 1-year, 10-year and 100-year rainfall events in accordance with NYSDEC requirements. It does not need to be updated to address a particular storm event that occurred in the spring of 2006. The system has already been designed to accommodate major storm events in accordance with applicable regulations.

6. **Comment:** Bassett can do better. The DEIS treats alternative solutions in a cavalier manner using dismissal words such as impracticable and too expensive but not going too deeply into details. Too expensive for whom? I don't think underground parking was even mentioned. The report tells us that Bassett is growing but doesn't go into future plans. This DEIS is an ad hoc, simplistic, destructive solution to a long term issue. The board must have a plan for the future, not simply react to applicants demands when they are presented. Such future plans act as template against which proposals are measured.

Response: See response to comment of Eileen Anania at V B1 above.

7. **Comment:** Other issues come to mind that relate to the democratic functioning of our civic institutions. Notice of hearings is deficient - I live across the street from Bassett Hall and only found out accidentally two days before the hearing. Not enough time to adequately study the DEIS.

Response: Comment noted. Although the Planning Board regrets that the commentor apparently found out about the hearing only two days before it was held, the notice of hearing was properly issued and published in accordance with all legal requirements and the public comment period was held open after the hearing for written comments. Several such letters were received including this commentor's letter, which the Planning Board appreciates.

8. **Comment:** A report of such length, involving serious consequences and obviously prepared by professionals should be examined closely by neutral experts in the field. Consultants should be engaged by the Board, paid by the applicant, and their review available to villagers along with the DEIS.

Response: The Planning Board retained the services of Saratoga Associates in accordance with SEQRA regulations to provide independent review and analysis as well as to assist the Planning Board in the review and final preparation of this FEIS. Saratoga Associates have participated in various meetings of the Planning

Board which were open to the public and their reports are part of the record available for review by the public.

9. **Comment:** All residents should be encouraged to voice opinions at the hearing(s) even if seemingly repetitious. Nuances thus expressed can prove significant to the planner's deliberations and those speakers will have the satisfaction of being heard. Many employees, would-be employees and/or relatives of the employees of Bassett and affiliated organizations are hesitant to share any views that may be considered disloyal. Some are frankly intimidated. Sad. Bassett should encourage participation if not support. But that is for Bassett. The planning Board and Trustees represent all of us.

Response: Comment noted. The Planning Board believes that the process on this project has been open and that public comments were encouraged. The Planning Board takes all such comments seriously in deliberating on this project.

D. **Jeff and Erika Idelson, 104 Pioneer Street, Cooperstown, New York, dated October 8, 2006:**

1. **Comment:** This plan will create additional significant traffic congestion in a residentially zoned area.

Response: See above relevant responses including comment V A3.

2. **Comment:** This plan will lead to a major decline in the environmental sanctity of area neighborhoods, including noise and air pollution.

Response: The Planning Board is taking such issues into consideration. See above relevant responses including comment V E4, V I5 and other relevant comments above.

3. **Comment:** This plan will provide enhanced challenges to school children and Bassett employees who regularly walk to nearby public schools and to the hospital.

Response: One of the intended goals of the proposed action is to reduce the number of Bassett Healthcare employees and visitors parking on public streets, thereby reducing the hazards to neighborhood children. As set forth in responses to above relevant comments, the Planning Board is considering other measures to protect the safety of children in the area of the project such as the requirement that the applicant maintain crossing guards at certain times and locations.

4. **Comment:** This plan will turn Pioneer Street into a hazard for area children who routinely use home lawns and sidewalks as a non-traditional play area.

Response: See response to Comment 3 of Jeff and Erika Idelson above. The parking lot project should not have an affect on children's safety on private residential properties.

5. **Comment:** This plan will lead to diminished property values because of visual impact of removing green space and making the area less desirable for families with school-aged children.

Response: Comment noted. See relevant responses above on neighborhood character.

E. **William Rath, 103 Pioneer Street, Cooperstown, New York, dated October 6, 2006:**

1. **Comment:** Our neighborhood is zoned R1 residential and it is unfair and unsafe for the Bassett campus to spread into this historic neighborhood.

Response: Comment noted. The residential character of the neighborhood is being considered in deliberations on this proposal. It should be noted that the Bassett facilities have been part of such neighborhood for a long time [predating the zoning designation of the area to R1].

2. **Comment:** It will be unsafe to place the new entrance to Bassett Hall directly across from Pioneer Street. This will cause even more vehicles to cut through Pioneer Street when entering and exiting Bassett Hall. It is already difficult to get out of the driveway because Bassett employees park in front of my house all day. There are at least 40 children residing on Pioneer Street and I fear that the quality of life for residents in this beautiful neighborhood will be adversely affected by the parking proposal.

Response: It should be noted that the project will not create a new entrance across from Pioneer Street. The project will improve the existing entrance. Furthermore, Section 2.2 of the DEIS indicates that the Beaver/Pioneer Street intersection currently operates at a LOS B. With the project, the PM peak hour will remain unchanged, while the AM peak hour will change to a LOS C. The LOS C does not adversely impact the intersection or create an unsafe traffic condition.

F. Frank E. Capozza, 116 Pioneer Street, Cooperstown, New York, received October 11, 2006:

1. **Comment:** As Bassett is a part of the Clark family of properties, I feel they should become a major player in finding a solution to this issue. There is plenty of Clark land in and around the village that could accommodate Bassett facilities and parking. Two quick suggestions would be the Deer Pen on Brooklyn Avenue or the land across from the Otsego Manor.

Response: Comment noted.

2. **Comment:** The alternatives of a parking structure or offsite parking have not been fully explored including a structure off the southeast side of the main hospital down toward the parking area known as Lot 3. They were able to build a clinic building just across the street why not build its garage in this area. As to offsite areas, I believe the use of the Linden Avenue extension is still viable and should be considered for development.

Response: Reasonable alternatives to proposed action were addressed in Section 3 of the DEIS.

3. **Comment:** Traffic studies notwithstanding, the traffic on Beaver Street has increased to the point where it is a detriment to the neighborhood from a noise, pollution and safety standpoint. We also see no need for a reduction on our property values caused by the continued development of the Bassett grounds where it impinges on our neighborhood.

Response: See response to comment of Frank Capozza at V A3 above.

4. **Comment:** I am concerned about the purchase of 21 Beaver Street as it lies between the Harrison House and Bassett Hall. If this house were removed it would further impact the value of our area as mentioned above. A worse case scenario would put a further parking lot in its place. The Board should as part of its deliberations find out exactly what is planned for this site.

Response: See response to comment of Frank Capozza at V A2 above.

5. **Comment:** As in point 4, I would like to see what the Hospital has in its Master Plan and how parking and traffic movement will be satisfied in these plans.

Response: See response to comment of Frank Capozza at V A3 above at page 3.

6. **Comment:** If the parking plan is approved for building, I sincerely ask that Bassett spend a great deal of time in site development to minimize the visual, light, noise and pollution impact on us. In addition, I am asking for far more work to be accomplished as regard the traffic patterns for entrance and exiting these lots. For example, could both lots use Mill Street and Riverside Drive as their entrance and exit roads instead of Beaver Street?

Response: Comment noted. See Section 2.4.2 of the DEIS and Addendum along with Response to Comment B3 above.

G. **Mrs. Constance Wallace, 22 Beaver Street, Cooperstown, New York, dated October 10, 2006:**

1. **Comment:** I am questioning what the recently purchased residence at 21 Beaver Street will be used for by Bassett Hospital - will this turn into a medical arts building or yet another parking area?

Response: See response to comment of Frank Capozza at V A2 above.

2. **Comment:** I have concerns about attempting to cross the street - where will the exits/entrances be and crosswalks?

Response: Under proposed action, cross-walks remain at all current locations.

3. **Comment:** I am also questioning what the drainage plan is for the excess run-off created by future construction and black-topped surfaces.

Response: See response to comment of Reed Metzger, M.D., J.D. at A5 above.

4. **Comment:** I am quite concerned regarding how many new lights will be erected and the glare created by them. I have heard that a sidewalk may be constructed across the street. If this occurs, what additional lighting will be added?

Response: Bassett Healthcare's measures to mitigate lighting in the new parking lots are adequately addressed in Sections 2.4.2 of the DEIS. Where appropriate, architectural lighting fixtures to match existing lighting will be used and will be "dark sky friendly."

5. **Comment:** I can only imagine the economic depreciation of my home and those of my neighbors if these areas are created.

Response: Comment noted. See Responses to above relevant Comments .

6. **Comment:** I am also wondering why the DEIS makes no mention of the current location of Bassett's delivery entrance/drop-off areas in relation to a parking lot located adjacent to it. There are multiple deliveries to the hospital at all hours of the day and night, which almost always leads to some type of traffic jam, directly in front of Harrison House.

Response: Comment noted. Given the specific use of Harrison House, the deliver times should not create a conflict. This situation will be monitored, however.

7. **Comment:** Another huge concern I have and this is one of the noise. It's not only the noise of more cars and delivery vehicles that upsets me, but the addition of more equipment such as snow blowers, street cleaners, and lawn care machinery that frequently operates before seven a.m. As it is now, there is always some type of equipment going up and down the road to care for Bassett Hall and now 21 Beaver Street. Adding to the mix, of course, will be the ongoing construction if this proposal and future proposals are carried out.

Response: See response to comment of Ann Capozza at V E4 above at page 8.

H. **The Lesko Family, 20 Beaver Street, Cooperstown, New York, dated October 10, 2006:**

1. **Comment:** We also have genuine concerns regarding the value of our property and the economic hardship we may be facing as a result of Bassett's proposal.

Response: See response to comment of Constance Wallace at E5 above.

2. **Comment:** If others are allowed to use these spaces in the future, then more people will be coming and going from this site, and the current DEIS does not account for this type of use with resulting traffic situations nor does it address the potential for the 21 Beaver Street residence to be used for further parking in the future.

Response: See responses to comments of Frank Capozza at V A2 and 3 above at page 3. The Planning Board intends to limit the use of the proposed parking lots to only service the facilities on those lots (i.e.: Bassett Hall and Harrison House).

3. **Comment:** The DEIS states that the added spaces will not have an impact on air quality.

Response: Comment noted. That is the conclusion contained in the DEIS.

4. **Comment:** Snow removal is also an issue.

Response: Comment noted.

5. **Comment:** Another concern is lighting and the illumination of our home during evening hours. What are Bassett's plans for lighting and what kind of an impact will it have on the neighborhood homes.

Response: See response to comment of Constance Wallace at E4 above.

6. **Comment:** In response to the unobstructed views issue, what is Bassett's plan with concern to the current loading and drop-off areas? There are numerous delivery trucks that come at all hours to the hospital and use the small section down what used to be the continuation of Beaver Street.

Response: Comment noted. See response to Comment G6 above.

7. **Comment:** This brings us to our biggest concern with this proposal - the safety of our children...the need for clear-cut, concise plans for crosswalks and examination of where exits and entrances will be constructed is crucial.

Response: The Planning Board agrees. See various responses above relating to the issue of children pedestrian safety.

8. **Comment:** The safety of our children and our neighbors' children is what is at stake here, not to mention the added noise pollution and fumes from motorists.

Response: See responses to comments of Jeff and Erika Idelson at B3 and Ann Capozza at V E4 above.

9. **Comment:** Yet another point, which affects our home in particular, is the drainage issue. Our home has become a safe haven for pedestrians in an attempt to flee from the spraying "lake" created in front of our home. Apparently, the situation has been occurring for years, long before we moved to 20 Beaver [Street]...[t]he DEIS *recommends* that runoff and drainage be addressed. We would like to see clear-cut plans as to how the drainage will be implemented in front of our home and how it may in turn affect our property.

Response: See response to comment of Reed Metzger, M.D., J.D. at A5 above.

- 10. Comment:** We have enclosed several photos of a beautiful parking garage recently erected in the oldest city in the United States established in 1565 - St. Augustine...[i]f Bassett would take the initiative to at least contemplate building a similar structure to finally fix the parking issue, then it would eliminate the need to construct these “band-aid” parking lots that are not going to meet the current and future needs of this fine institution and parking will continue to be segmented.

Response: Comment noted. See response to comment of Eileen Anania at V B5 above.

I. Eileen Anania, 94 Pioneer Street, Cooperstown, New York, dated October 7, 2006:

- 1. Comment:** Specifically, I am concerned with segmentation under section 617.3(g)(1) of SEQRA, the lack of a good faith effort on the part of Bassett Healthcare to explore the parking structure alternative and its failure to adequately discuss current and future parking needs...I direct your attention to Section 617.3(g)(1) which reads in pertinent part “considering only a part or segment of an action is contrary to the intent of SEQRA.”

Response: Comment noted. See response to comment of Eileen Anania at V B5 above.

- 2. Comment:** The recent purchase of 21 Beaver Street by Templeton Foundation which also owns the adjoining properties including Bassett Hall and all of Riverside Drive is of grave concern.

Response: See response to comment of Frank Capozza at V A2 above.

- 3. Comment:** I’m also curious as to exactly what Phase II of the Facilities Master Plan entails. I direct your attention to the August 2, 2006 Addendum wherein Bassett states “Even if Bassett Healthcare was to eventually pursue implementation of Phase II of the Facilities Master Plan, it would neither add employees nor beds to the Hospital and; therefore not impact the proposed parking project.”

Response: Comment noted. See - Section 1.1 of Addendum to DEIS. Bassett Healthcare has not taken any formal corporate action by its Board of Trustees to approve submittal of Phase II or any other improvements under the Facilities Master Plan to the Village of Cooperstown.

4. **Comment:** Also, Bassett’s statement on page 1 of the Addendum that reads “The planning board will not be engaging in segmentation under SEQRA by accepting the DEIS, since the current site plan review is for a stand alone project that is not part of any long-range plan of action. The project under review is independent of any potential future plans of Bassett Healthcare and is not part of an integrated larger project...” is false and directly contradicts their own statement in the Addendum as quoted above, and is contrary to case law. I direct your attention to Sun Company, Inc. et al. vs. City of Syracuse Industrial Development 209 A.D 2D 34; 625 N.Y.S 2d 371; 1995 N.Y. App Div.1.

Response: Legal conclusion noted.

5. **Comment:** A close look at the January 2005 parking study reveals it was based on parking demand in 2004 with the actual two day patient/visitor parking occupancy study completed in August 2004, over two years ago. Given Bassett’s continued recent expansion to Sidney, Little Falls, etc this study appears to already be out of date. Therefore, I would urge the planning board to require Bassett to provide 350 patient/visitor spaces rather than a number between 294 and 350.

Response: Comment noted. The traffic study has been adequately updated and supplemented at the request of the Planning Board. The supplemental traffic data appears as Attachment 7 to the Addendum.

6. **Comment:** I am also concerned that Bassett Hall could be transformed into additional clinic space causing patients to be entering and exiting Bassett Hall at Beaver and Pioneer all day.

Response: Comment noted. Bassett Healthcare has represented that it does not intend to change the existing use of Bassett Hall. The parking plan for Bassett Hall is based on, and will be restricted to, its current use. Any proposal to change the existing use of Bassett Hall would require further review and approvals by the Village.

7. **Comment:** Bassett has also continuously failed to adequately address the parking structure alternative. I direct your attention to Section III of the DEIS entitled “Alternatives to the Proposed Action” wherein Bassett sets forth the cost of a 500 car structure and then dismisses it as too costly at \$14,000 per space. Where did they get this information and why did they get a quote on a 500 car lot?

Response: Bassett Healthcare’s estimated costs were provided by a specialized parking garage contractor based upon site conditions at the Mill Street Lot. Currently, there are 283 regular parking spaces and 10 handicapped spaces in Lot 3 (Mill Street Lot) where the garage would be constructed. Since the garage structure when considered had to include at least 134 parking spaces (i.e. the number of spaces involved in the proposed project), together with the 293 existing spaces, a 500 parking space garage was considered.

8. **Comment:** The DEIS also fails to address pedestrian safety and traffic concerns especially along Beaver Street. Attached you will find a copy of my August 4, 2004 letter outlining specific concerns.

Response: See response to comment of Frank Capozza at V A3 above.

9. **Comment:** Please note that the Bassett Hall site plans for Bassett Hall and Harrison House are sadly inadequate. The Bassett Hall plan lacks arrows to show the flow of traffic in and out of the Bassett Hall site and now has cars parked in the front circle, wasn’t this supposed to be green space? What are the plans for the two driveways closest to Susquehanna Avenue? These are a safety concern and should be addressed. Will the many Bassett buses that now stop on Beaver Street in front of Bassett Hall continue to do so or will they turn into the lot to drop employees off? Both site plans should be updated to show that Templeton Foundation now owns 21 Beaver Street. Does Bassett intend to put sidewalks in front of 21 Beaver?

Response: Flow into and out of parking lot will continue as existing patterns. There will be no reason for Bassett Healthcare buses to stop on Beaver Street when the project is completed. Bassett Healthcare intends to construct a sidewalk in front of the former Flanagan parcel at 21 Beaver Street so that there will be a continuous sidewalk the length of the south side of Beaver Street. As stated above, the Planning Board will consider the internal traffic management of both proposed parking lots and will require project modifications or conditions as it deems appropriate.

10. **Comment:** We all know that traffic is already extremely backed up on Beaver and Chestnut from mid June to Labor Day while the Dreams Park is operating. I direct your attention to the DEIS Addendum dated 8/2/06, Section 2.2 Transportation which addresses a traffic study done June 2006. I question exactly what dates in June this study was done since it concludes that “the seasonal variation in traffic does not impact the intersections adjacent to the hospital”

(Beaver at Chestnut/Pioneer/Susquehanna). The greatest seasonal variation in traffic on Chestnut is tied to the Dreams Park, which did not even open for campers until June 17, 2006. Therefore any traffic study done before June 17 would not reflect the significant seasonal variation that we live day in and day out during the Dreams Park season. Ideally, this study should have been done during the July 4 to Labor Day tourist season.

Response: Comment noted. The traffic study conducted during time period as recommended and agreed to by Planning Board.

11. **Comment:** As you know, the village is in the process of conducting property revaluations, many of which have been completed. If these parking lots are placed in our residential neighborhood it will result in a direct economic loss, a loss in our property values. Clearly homes in the Beaver/Pioneer/Susquehanna vicinities will be less desirable to prospective home buyers because of the increased traffic, noise, odor and change in the residential character of the neighborhood.

Response: See response to comment of Constance Wallace at E5 above.

12. **Comment:** And finally, while I appreciate that Bassett is looking at relocating non-essential staff to outlying locations such as the Greystone Complex, I am concerned that the relocation has begun. By choosing this alternative, Bassett is essentially dismissing other alternatives such as the parking structure. This is a pre-decision action which is against the spirit and intent of SEQRA.

Response: Comment noted. See Response to above relevant Comments.

J. Eileen Anania, 94 Pioneer Street, Cooperstown, New York, dated August 17, 2006:

1. **Comment:** First, I direct your attention to Section II. Potential Significant Adverse Impacts, 1. Transportation and Parking. The proposed entrance/exit of the Bassett Hall parking lot is directly across from Pioneer Street. Thus, I feel that the traffic study should include Beaver Street at Pioneer Street. I am very concerned that Pioneer Street will become a “cut through” due to the increased number of vehicles entering and exiting Bassett Hall. This also raises concern addressed on p. 19 of SEQRA entitled Impact on Public Health wherein it is noted there are “possible pedestrian traffic safety issues.”

Response: See response to comment of Frank Capozza at V A3 above.

2. **Comment:** Another area of concern is the potential impact on Community Services wherein it is stated “The construction and operation of the new parking facilities is not expected to impact police, fire or emergency rescues services offered by the Village of Cooperstown and the Town of Otsego.”

Response: Comment noted.

3. **Comment:** And finally, I direct your attention to Section III. Reasonable Alternatives to be Considered. Under Item A. No Action, please discuss exactly who will be parking at Harrison House and Bassett Hall.

Response: See response to comment of Stephanie Bower at V H3 above. It is the Planning Board’s understanding that the parking at Harrison House will be used only for staff and visitors to Harrison House and the parking at Bassett Hall will be only used for staff and visitors to Bassett Hall. The Planning Board will require that any approval be conditioned on those specific uses.

K. Lynn D. Murphy, 14042 Davenport Avenue, San Diego, California 92129, dated October 11, 2006:

1. **Comment:** The DEIS fails to address cumulative impacts. [6 NYCRR Part 617.9(b)(5)(iii)(a)].

Response: According to 617.9 (b), a DEIS need only address cumulative impacts where “applicable and significant”. The Public Scoping Document, which was accepted by the Village of Cooperstown Planning Board, (Appendix A of the DEIS) does not require the project to address cumulative impacts. Cumulative impacts of the project were not considered a significant issue during the public scoping process, as such they were not addressed in the DEIS.

Regardless, cumulative impacts would only be an issue if there were other development projects being undertaken currently in close proximity to the parking lots. Since no other development is occurring in the area, there are no cumulative impacts.

2. **Comment:** The DEIS fails to address irreversible and irretrievable commitments of environmental resources. [6 NYCRR Part 617.9(b)(5)(iii)(c)].

Response: As with cumulative impacts, SEQRA only requires that a DEIS address irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources where applicable and significant. Concerns for the project’s commitment of resources were not

raised during the public scoping process as either applicable or significant, and, as such, they were not addressed in the DEIS.

3. **Comment:** The DEIS fails to address any growth inducing aspects of the proposed action. [6 NYCRR Part 617.9(b)(5)(iii)(d)].

Response: Growth inducing impacts were not included in the DEIS because they were not raised as an issue during the public scoping process. SEQRA only requires that a DEIS address growth inducing impacts where applicable and significant. With respect to the present parking lot proposal, there is no growth inducing aspect because the use of the parking lots will be limited to the existing uses of Harrison House and Bassett Hall. See Response to Comment J-3 above.

4. **Comment:** The DEIS fails to identify any true and reasonable alternatives. [6 NYCRR Part 617.9(b)(5)(v)].

Response: See response to comment of Stephanie Bower at V H3 above.

5. **Comment:** The DEIS fails to comply with the non-segmentation provision of the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA). [6 NYCRR Part 617.9(g)(1)].

Response: See response to comment of Eileen Anania at V B5 above.

6. **Comment:** Specifically, Section II of the DEIS fails to identify the alternative for which potential impacts are discussed. This section should tell the reader about the impacts that may be associated with each alternative including the no action alternative. While there is a brief and inadequate discussion of impacts and mitigation for each resource area in Section II, there is no discussion of potential impacts specific to each alternative or to the no action alternative.

Response: The impact analysis presented in Section II of the DEIS relates to the applicants preferred alternative: the construction of two parking lots. In accordance with 617.9, the description and evaluation of each alternative presented in Section III is of a level of detail sufficient for a comparative assessment. The alternatives discussed in Section III were established by the applicant and the Planning Board via the Public Scoping Process.

7. **Comment:** Section III of the DEIS is inadequate for the following reasons:

- a. The DEIS fails to identify the criteria against which alternative should be evaluated to determine reasonableness.

Response: As previously discussed, the alternatives presented in Section III of the DEIS were developed by the applicant and the Planning Board via the public scoping process. The alternatives presented in Section III, except for the No Action Alternative, were considered reasonable by the applicant. Each had been considered by the applicant prior to the DEIS process in an attempt to address the hospital's parking situation. Where feasible these alternatives were implemented (e.g. relocation of non medical staff off campus) or will be implemented.

- b. Some of the proposed alternatives are already being implemented and are already known to be inadequate to meet the purpose of and need for the project. The SEQRA requires that the action proponent identify and evaluate reasonable alternatives to the proposed action. The alternatives presented in the DEIS are not alternatives, they are actions that are already being implemented and actions that are known not to meet the purpose and need for action. These alternatives therefore, cannot be considered reasonable.

Response: See response to comment of Stephanie Bower at V H3 above.

- c. The parking garage alternative is dismissed as being unreasonable based upon the cost of constructing 500 parking spaces. The proposed action proposes to provide only 134 spaces. The reasonableness of the parking garage should be based upon the cost to construct a parking garage that provides 134 spaces.

Response: See response to comment 7b of Lynn Murphy above.

- d. As required by SEQRA, Section III, as written, does not provide an evaluation of the comparative merits of each reasonable alternative taking into consideration the ability of the alternative to meet the objectives of the project and the environmental impacts associated with each alternative.

Response: Comment noted.

- e. Most alarming in this DEIS is Bassett Healthcare's total disregard for and failure to consider impacts to public safety, especially for the safety of children walking to and from school.

Response: See response to comment of Frank Capozza at V A3 above.

- f. Section III and in fact this entire document, is nothing more than Bassett Healthcare's attempt to justify, after the fact, the decision they have already made to construct parking lots at Bassett Hall and Harrison House.

Response: Comment noted.

8. **Comment:** Preparation of this DEIS without consideration of Bassett Healthcare parking needs and facility growth as a whole is segmentation. Further, this DEIS fails to consider any reasonably foreseeable future actions in the Village of Cooperstown that may attempt to address parking requirements, needs and potential solutions.

Response: See response to comment of Eileen Anania at V B5 above.

9. **Comment:** Finally, while SEQRA makes provisions for Supplemental DEISs, there is nothing in the regulations that acknowledges a DEIS Addendum.

Response: Comment noted

L. **Rich Campbell, 66 Susquehanna Avenue, Cooperstown, New York, received October 12, 2006:**

1. **Comment:** The current parking proposal in front of the planning board is simply a stop gap measure, and measures such as these fail in the long term while the originator of the measure scrambles for a real solution. Will parking within the village improve? No.

Response: Comment noted. Parking should improve if only to have off-street parking accommodations available for staff and visitors to Bassett Hall and Harrison House. Such users would then not be utilizing on-street parking or other Bassett facility parking areas.

2. **Comment:** Witness the move to make the hospital a "smoke-free" zone. Bassett is free from the noxious effects of smoking and all the negative peripheral issues that accompany it. Who must deal with it now? Village residents, of course.

Response: Comment noted. This issue is not related to the proposed project and is thus beyond scope of the DEIS.

3. **Comment:** The proposed parking lots fall way short of Bassett's stated need, yet, does nothing to solve the current on street parking problem on neighborhood streets. Neighbors have complained, litter and cigarette entrails abound, and Bassett's response? "The village needs to monitor its own streets - it's not our problem."

Response: Comment noted.

4. **Comment:** If the new parking plan is agreed upon, how does it fit in with the next capital project set to begin in 2008 when Bassett will be adding a new hospital structure onto the east side of the existing facility?

Response: The Applicant has stated that no future development is currently proposed.

5. **Comment:** Stacking issues with ingress and egress to the parking lots have also not been considered nor the stacking that will occur on residential streets. Efforts to set the issue aside with approximate LOS times are another example of statistical manipulation.

Response: Establishing a LOS for studied intersections should not be considered "statistical manipulation." Using LOS for traffic impact studies is an industry wide accepted approach. Moreover, LOS measures "stacking," to a degree, by establishing the amount of delay a typical vehicle will experience during the am or pm peak. A vehicle traveling through an intersection with a LOS A would experience a delay of less than 10 second, while a vehicle traveling through an intersection with a LOS F would experience a delay of more than 50 seconds.

As discussed in Section 2.2, the majority of intersections studied would have a LOS of A or B if the project is constructed, which would indicate there would be minimal delay traveling through the intersections, and, therefore, there would little or no "stacking" of vehicles. Two intersections, however (Beaver Street/Pioneer Street and Beaver Street/Chestnut Street) would experience a LOS C in a particular turning movement. Vehicles making movements would experience delays of between 20 and 35 seconds, which is not expected to result in a significant amount of vehicle "stacking" at the intersection.

6. **Comment:** Future planning issues, not correlated with current proposals I might add, lead this planning board with whom the decision rests, onto the proverbial slippery slope. SEQRA speaks directly to this within its legal confines and seeks

to prevent development that is presented in one manner yet progresses in a decidedly different direction.

Response: Comment noted. See responses to comments ---- and --- above.

7. **Comment:** Cooperstown also has a state of the art water filtration system and serves as an example for communities that are authentic stewards of their natural water supplies. Does this parking proposal fit in with the area's philosophy of environmental care?

Response: Yes because the stormwater drainage plan will sufficiently manage the additional stormwater runoff due to the expanded parking areas.

M. **Maureen & Matt Schuermann, 110 Pioneer Street, Cooperstown, New York, dated October 8, 2006:**

1. **Comment:** Our concern with the current parking proposal before the board pertains specifically to traffic safety at the intersection of Pioneer Street and Beaver Street and the direct impact that this traffic has on the safety of Pioneer Street families as cars enter and exit Bassett Hall.

Response: See response to comment of Frank Capozza at V A3 above.

2. **Comment:** Can traffic resulting from additional parking on the Bassett Campus along Beaver Street be required to enter/exit through a constructed road via the Bassett property connected to the intersection of Susquehanna Street and Walnut Street?

Response: No. See response to comment of Eileen Anania at V B3 above.

3. **Comment:** Will additional parking spaces in these areas remain forever for full-time Bassett staff who will enter and exit only during work hours, or can these spaces potentially be used for patients in the future? The answer to this question has important consequences on traffic in and out of the Bassett Campus along Beaver Street.

Response: Both lots are intended to service only staff and visitors to Bassett Hall and Harrison House and will not be used for general Hospital needs.

N. **Mrs. Diane C. Grigoli, 111 Pioneer Street, Cooperstown, New York, dated October 10, 2006:**

1. **Comment:** Safety issues for all school age children going to and coming home from school.

Response: See response to comment of Frank Capozza at V A3 above.

2. **Comment:** Pioneer Street [is] still the main parking lot for Bassett Hall employees.

Response: Comment noted. Based upon the information provided by the Applicant, the proposed parking lot should be adequate for staff and visiting staff of Bassett Hall so that on-street parking will not be necessary for staff and visiting staff of Bassett Hall.

3. **Comment:** Noise pollution.

Response: See response to comment of Ann Capozza at V E4 above.

O. **Ann L. Capozza, 116 Pioneer Street, Cooperstown, New York, dated October 11, 2006:**

1. **Comment:** I am greatly concerned about the increase in traffic on Pioneer and Beaver Streets. The existing traffic on these streets is already excessive, creating periods of bottleneck traffic at the intersections of Beaver and Pioneer as well as Beaver and Susquehanna. The addition of traffic from these proposed spaces will cause more cars to attempt crossing Beaver and using Pioneer as the escape route.

Response: See response to comment of Frank Capozza at V A3 above.

2. **Comment:** And as I mentioned at the September 12, 2006 public hearing, there are currently thirty-nine school aged and younger children living on Pioneer Street between Beaver and Elm Streets. These additional cars, in conjunction with the cars belonging to Bassett Hall employees already using Pioneer Street as a parking lot, have the potential of creating a very dangerous situation on our street.

Response: See response to comment of Frank Capozza at V A3 above.

3. **Comment:** Another issue of concern is the increase of noise and exhaust emissions from these additional cars.

Response: See responses to comments of Ann Capozza at V E4 and Mary B. Marx at V I5 above.

4. **Comment:** Many of us are concerned these parking lots, if allowed to go forward, will negatively impact our property values.

Response: Comment noted. See responses to above relevant comments.

5. **Comment:** I have been unable to determine the flow of traffic for the proposed parking spaces at Bassett Hall. There are currently three driveways used for exiting Bassett Hall onto Beaver Street. Are all three of these driveways to remain in use? Will the driveway, across from Pioneer Street, be the main source of both entrance and exit for the one hundred and seventy-two vehicles parked at Bassett Hall everyday? And what about the sixty-one new spaces proposed at Harrison House? Beaver Street is already heavily traveled. It is an emergency route. It is the road trucks travel when making deliveries to the hospital. Does the DEIS address the “stacking” issue of not just the proposed new spaces but also of the current traffic?

Response: All these driveways are to remain in use. The driveway across from Pioneer Street will be both an exit and an entrance into Bassett Hall parking lot. Current traffic flow will be unchanged. Vehicles from the Harrison House parking lot will exit west of the intersection of Beaver and Fair Streets. The traffic study, as supplemented, addresses the “stacking” issue.

P. Carol W. Taylor, 97 Pioneer Street, Cooperstown, New York, dated October 10, 2006:

1. **Comment:** Residential safety: increase in traffic - using the same street pattern that has a congestion problem now and then add more to it.

Response: See response to comment of Frank Capozza at V A3 above.

2. **Comment:** Environmental effects: increase in car exhaust particularly in the winter warming the car, (air pollution) along with the present off campus smoking.

Response: See Section 2.9 of DEIS and Addendum that adequately address pollution issue and proposed mitigation.

3. **Comment:** Safety of the many children that live in this effected area due to the traffic and pollution.

Response: See response to comment of Frank Capozza at V A3 above.

4. **Comment:** Old business, the water line for Fair Street that would improve the water pressure it was discussed several years ago when the Critical Care was proposed will this happen?

Response: Comment noted but not related to proposed project and is thus beyond the scope of proposed action.

5. **Comment:** A parking garage for the present lower parking lots on Mill Street; the right side in back of the inpatient building and left back of out patient building. This would be ideal and unobtrusive have these areas been considered? Continue Clarks Sports Center use and if there is a possible expansion in this area.

Response: The reasonable alternatives identified in the public scoping document are adequately addressed in Section 3 of the DEIS. The owner of the Clark Sports Center will not permit any further expansion of parking for Bassett Healthcare.

6. **Comment:** In the off tourist season September through June, utilize the red, blue and yellow trolleys lots in the summer July through end of August utilize the school parking lots. Maintenance would be shared accordingly by all entities involved.

Response: Comment noted. This issue was not part of the public scoping document attached as Appendix A to the DEIS.

7. **Comment:** A couple of last thoughts could there [be] any consideration given to the use of part of the field that is bordered by [Estli] Avenue, Susquehanna Avenue and Brooklyn Avenue and or the use of what is known as the Paddock on Fair Street?

Response: These alternative sites are not part of the public scoping document attached as Appendix A to DEIS. Moreover, the identified properties are not available for use as parking.

8. **Comment:** How will these changes affect our property values and the taxes we pay surely they would be adjusted down?

Response: Please see Responses to above relevant Comments including G5.

Q. Ann Lindsay-Brown, 49 Beaver Street, Cooperstown, NY 13326, dated October 6, 2006:

1. **Comment:** Share the pain. Keep multiple avenues of traffic flow around the hospital and community so as to disperse the volume of cars.

Response: The Traffic Study included in the DEIS as Appendix B concluded that the project does not have a significant effect on the study area intersections. It was determined that the project will not change the existing street grid in the vicinity of the hospital. Construction is occurring within land owned by Bassett Healthcare and will not change Village streets.

2. **Comment:** Consolidate parking. Increase volume on already existing lots with multiple level and lots will not visually appear “too high”.

Response: The alternative of constructing a multi-level parking garage is unreasonable based upon cost and environmental concerns set forth in Section 3.5 of the DEIS at pages 42-43.

3. **Comment:** Rerouting of traffic. Consider routing cars from Walnut and Susquehanna Avenue (South) onto Riverside Drive and develop a through road from the court to behind Bassett Hall, behind the old fieldstone hospital to a parking garage. This would divert a tremendous amount of traffic from an already severely overloaded street.

Response See response to comment of Eileen Anania V B3 above at page 5 that refers to a feasibility analysis completed by BSA LifeStructures of New York, LLC that is included in Appendix C.

R. Jennifer Taylor, 108 Fair St., Cooperstown, NY 13326, dated October 9, 2006:

1. **Comment:** This brings me to the current proposal of a 60 space parking lot. Currently the traffic around the Beaver St./Fair St. corner is heavy enough. On an

average I wait any where from 2-4 minutes to back out of my drive way. I certainly do not want to have to wait more. I am curious who came up with the additional wait time of 4 seconds... My children walk these streets on their way to and from school. It is scary enough having them walk down Beaver St. with sidewalk butting up against the street but to add additional traffic on that section of street I fear for there safety.

Response See response to comment VI. A3 made by Saratoga Associates on behalf of the Village Board,

- Comment:** This is a very beautiful neighborhood and also part of the historical district of this town. I love looking out my window seeing a beautiful stone building and well maintained grounds. To see the wonderful large trees and lawns behind the Harrison house is a great joy. The fact that Cooperstown is part of Tree City USA and you are willing to let these trees be cut down for a parking lot is a shame. This certainly will not do anything for property values of the surrounding houses.

Response See response to Elizabeth Lesko's Comment V. G5

- Comment:** It seems to me that there are many other options that should be looked at before you chose to destroy a beautiful piece of property. For example the other parking lots that Bassett currently has, there seems to be a lot of potential in those lots. First of all a parking garage in either of the lower lots seems quite logical. This would create many more parking spaces for both patients and employees. They would not seem like an eye sore because they being put where existing already are located.

Response: The alternative of constructing a multi-level parking garage is unreasonable based upon cost and environmental concerns set forth in Section 3.5 of the DEIS at pages 42-43.

S. Barbara Hall, 11 Pine Boulevard, Cooperstown, NY 13326, dated January 1, 2007:

- Comment:** When it becomes apparent that there is insufficient, convenient ground space in the vicinity of a large Medical Center available for parking, it would time to go vertical and consider a parking garage as a viable option that must be put on the table for consideration!

Response See response to comment of Jennifer Taylor at V R3 above.