

Town of Tyre

State Environmental Quality Review Act (“SEQRA”) Lago Resort and Casino Proposal (formerly named the Wilmot Casino and Resort)

Summary of Changes Proposed to the Site Plan Approved on June 12, 2014 by the Tyre Town Board and Examination Pursuant to SEQRA of Potential Environmental Impacts

Introduction

On April 16, 2014, the Tyre Town Board (the “Board”) received the Site Plan application from BME Associates on behalf of the Applicant, Whitetail 414, LLC, for the creation of a Planned Unit Development District in the Town of Tyre (the “Town”) for the proposed Wilmot Casino and Resort, now known as the Lago Resort and Casino (the “Project”). The Board reviewed a Revised Engineer’s Report with Appendices dated March 2014, updated April 2014. The Board also received Site Plans dated April 2014, and dated April 2014, last revised June 3, 2014.

At its June 12, 2014 special meeting, the Board reviewed the Project’s potential moderate to large impacts identified in Part 2 of the Full Environmental Assessment Form (“EAF”) to determine the significance of each. The Board determined that the Project with the proposed mitigations will result in no significant adverse impacts on the environment, and therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement need not be prepared. The Board issued a resolution the same day making this determination of significance and completed Part 3 of the EAF with a negative declaration, subsequently preparing a summary of the reasons supporting this determination.

By resolution dated June 12, 2014 as well, the Board approved with conditions the Site Plan for the Project dated April 2014, last revised June 3, 2014, finding that it satisfied the requirements under Section 2A.204 of the Town’s Zoning Law.¹ On July 16, 2014, the Applicant submitted an

¹ At the same meeting, the Board also passed resolutions approving the Development Plan for the Project, Local Law No. 3 of 2014, the Host Community Agreement, and a Resolution of Support for the Project.

application to the Board pursuant to Local Law No. 1 of 2014 for approval of the Amended Site Plan for the Project.

The Board is now responsible for determining if any of the modifications to the Site Plan approved on June 12 will result in any potentially significant adverse impacts on the environment that did not previously exist or would alter impacts that were previously identified. The Board must examine the modifications to the Site Plan in comparison with the prior approved version, and for each potential impact discuss its magnitude, duration, and importance in the context of the community. The Board must then determine whether the Amended Site Plan, in light of those impacts, warrants changing its prior negative declaration under SEQRA.

- Magnitude assesses factors such as severity, size or extent of an impact.
- Duration measures how long the impact will occur.
- Importance relates to how people or resources will be qualitatively impacted in the context of the status quo conditions in the community and the environment.

I. Impact on Land (page 1 of the EAF):

- A. What does impact on the land mean? This question asks the Board to evaluate the potential impacts of the physical alteration of the land, including, grading, clearing, filling, excavation, and the construction of structures on the land.
- B. Previous Determination: The Project may have a potential moderate to large impact because the Project involves construction lasting more than one year. However, the Board determined there would be no significant adverse impact to land from the Project.
- C. Project as approved June 12, 2014:
1. Duration of Construction: The Project will likely involve one phase of construction lasting approximately 24 months, after which the Site will be landscaped.
 2. Scale of Disturbance: The Site consists of a total of approximately 85 acres, of which approximately 60 acres will be disturbed. The site is bordered by I-90 to the south and mainly undeveloped or agricultural land to the north, east, and west.
 3. Scale of Structures: The Project will include a 256,000 square foot hotel, 195,000 square foot casino and a six story parking garage. The largest structure will be approximately 80 feet in height, 630 feet in width and 930 feet in length.
 4. Condition of Land: The Site has no bedrock outcroppings. The predominant soils at the Site are muck, Ontario loam and Ovid silt loam. Currently, 79% of the site is moderately or well drained. There are no unique geological features at the Site.
 5. Mitigation: Would the design features of the proposal that provide for stormwater management, wetland avoidance, screening and landscaping mitigate any of the impacts of the alteration of the land?
- D. **Amended Site Plan:** The Project as modified would have a total buildings footprint of approximately 334,100 sq. ft., an increase of approximately 46,600 sq. ft. (or 12.6%) from the

prior 287,500 sq. ft. footprint. The change was made in response to comments during the SEQRA review process about the buildings' visual impact and the larger building footprint resulted from lowering the parking garage and hotel to create shorter, squatter buildings that are better screened from surrounding viewpoints by the existing natural tree line. The parking garage was reduced from six stories in height to four stories that are more spread out, accounting for 34,500 sq. ft. of the increased footprint. However, the total square footage of the buildings has remained virtually the same, increasing only approximately 1% due to the addition of a 4,000 sq. ft. accessory building to be used as a child care facility for staff and employees.

- E. Key Question: Does the modification to the scale of the structures increasing the Project's square footage and footprint create a significant adverse environmental impact that did not previously exist or alter an impact that was previously identified?

- II. Impact on Geological Features (page 2 of the EAF):
 - A. What does impact on geological features mean? This question asks whether the proposed action may result in the modification or destruction of any unique or unusual landforms on the Site, or impede access to them.
 - B. Previous Determination: The Project will not impact geological features.
 - C. **No new or altered impacts to geological features have been identified in the Amended Site Plan.**

III. Impact on Surface Water (page 2 of the EAF):

- A. What does impact on surface water mean? The Board must evaluate the potential impacts of the Project creating two new surface water bodies.
- B. Previous Determination: The Project may have a moderate to large impact on surface water because it involves creating new water bodies. However, the Board determined that creation would not have a significant adverse impact on surface water.
- C. Project as approved June 12, 2014:
 1. Purpose of the ponds: The purpose of the ponds is to mitigate, or eliminate, stormwater impacts that would otherwise result from the Project. The ponds are required pursuant to a stormwater pollution prevention plan prepared by the Applicant in compliance with all relevant DEC regulations and guidelines.
 2. Description of the stormwater management facilities ("SMFs"): The development of the Site will include the installation of a collection system to direct stormwater runoff from the developed areas and convey it to the proposed SMFs. The SMFs include the two stormwater management ponds, which will detain runoff long enough to allow for sediment settling and pollutant removal. The net effect of the SMFs will be to control the rate of stormwater discharge from the Site so that it will be no greater post-development compared to present conditions.
 3. Description of Ponds: The two ponds will be located in the northwest corner and eastern portion of the Site respectively. The ponds will hold 0.78 million gallons of water and have a surface area of 2.5 acres. The dimensions of the proposed impounding structures will be approximately 8 feet deep and 300 feet long. The ponds will include outlet structures designed to control the rate at which runoff is discharged from the Site. The ponds will have sufficient storage volume to mitigate a 100-year storm as required by DEC guidelines.

4. Mitigation: Would the components of the stormwater management plan that include a comprehensive erosion control plan to control silt runoff during and after construction mitigate any impacts related to the construction of the ponds?
- D. **Amended Site Plan**: There will be no change in the SMFs as the ponds and the proposed ground surface gradients will remain essentially the same. The peak rates, capacity, and situation of the ponds within the original area of disturbance will remain the same. Only the location of the discharge pipes leading into the ponds will be moved, but they will still have the same function and effect.
- E. Key Question: Does the modification to the location of the discharge pipes to the SMFs create a significant adverse environmental impact that did not previously exist or alter an impact that was previously identified?

IV. Impact on Groundwater (page 3 of EAF):

- A. What does impact on groundwater mean? This question asks whether the proposed action may result in new or additional use of ground water, or might have the potential to introduce contaminants to ground water or an aquifer.
- B. Previous Determination: The Project will not impact groundwater.
- C. **No new or altered impacts to groundwater have been identified in the Amended Site Plan.**

V. Impacts on Flooding (page 3 of EAF):

- A. What does impact on flooding mean? This question asks whether the proposed action may result in development on lands subject to flooding.
- B. Previous Determination: The Project will not impact flooding.
- C. **No new or altered impacts to flooding have been identified in the Amended Site Plan.**

VI. Impacts on Air (page 4 of EAF):

- A. What does impacts on air mean? This question asks whether the proposed action may result include a state regulated air emission source.
- B. Previous Determination: The Project will not impact air.
- C. **No new or altered impacts to air have been identified in the Amended Site Plan.**

VII. Impact on Plants and Animals (page 4 of EAF):

- A. What does impact on plants and animals mean? The Board must evaluate the Project's potential to result in a loss of flora or fauna.
- B. Previous Determination: The Project may have a moderate to large impact on plants and animals because it involves using herbicides or pesticides. However, the Board determined this use would not pose a significant adverse impact on plants and animals.
- C. Project as approved June 12, 2014:
 - 1. Pesticides and herbicides will be applied to the lawn and landscaped areas around the Site to prevent weeds and insect damage.
 - 2. No rare, threatened or endangered plant or animal species are present at the Site. The Site is not near any significant natural communities or critical environmental areas.
 - 3. Wetland areas have been identified at the Site but will be avoided by all development activities.
 - 4. Mitigation: Does the Applicant's stormwater management plan mitigate the impact of the use of herbicides and pesticides by preventing them from spreading to neighboring properties?
- D. **Amended Site Plan:** No new or altered impacts to plants and animals have been identified in the Amended Site Plan. The wetlands continue to be avoided under the revised plan. The area reserved for green space (63%+/-) remains the same as well.

VIII. Impact on Agricultural Resources (page 5 of the EAF):

- A. What does impact on agricultural resources mean? Agricultural resources refer to the soil, land and on-farm buildings, equipment, manure processing and handling facilities and processing and handling facilities which contribute to the production, preparation and marketing of crops, livestock and livestock products as a commercial enterprise.
- B. Previous Determination: Several potential moderate to large impacts on agricultural resources were identified, including that certain soil classes may be impacted, agricultural land would be converted to non-agricultural uses, and the Project would result in increased development. However, the Board determined that, in the context of the community and given abundance of suitable agricultural land in the area when compared to the size of the Site, the Project would not cause a significant adverse impact on agricultural resources.
- C. Project as approved June 12, 2014:
1. The owners of the Site have applied for it to be removed from Agricultural District #6. The Project may result in the excavation or compaction of the soil profile of agricultural land. Moreover, the Project may irreversibly convert agricultural land to non-agricultural uses.
 2. A significant portion of the Town is utilized for agricultural purposes. However, the Site is located near to I-90 and Petro Waterloo, one of the areas of the Town that may be considered appropriate for large scale commercial development.
 3. The Project may result, directly or indirectly, in increased development potential or pressure on farmland.
 4. The Project is not consistent with the adopted Seneca County Agriculture and Protection Plan. However, the Site is proposed to be re-zoned as part of a Planned Unit Development Unit.
 5. Mitigation: Would the Host Community Agreement proposed by the Applicant mitigate the loss of farmland by

providing \$600,000 over six years to be used to preserve agricultural resources in the Town?

- D. **Amended Site Plan:** It is unlikely that the increased footprint of the buildings for the Project (totaling just over one acre) will result in additional excavation or compaction of the soil profile of agricultural land than under the previous site plan since the overall grading disturbance limits of the Project remain the same. The Project still remains within the originally planned area that will no longer be farmed. To accomplish this, the Applicant has reorganized the built environments and grading elements within the overall grading disturbance limits that were described in the Development Plan and original Site Plan.
- E. **Key Question:** Does the modification to the Project's square footage and footprint create a significant adverse environmental impact that did not previously exist or alter an impact that was previously identified?

IX. Impact on Aesthetic Resources (page 6 of the EAF):

- A. What does impact on aesthetic resources mean? This question explores consistency in land use between the Project and other land uses that may be seen from all or part of a scenic or aesthetic resource. It is oriented to those scenic and aesthetic resources that are officially designated and publicly accessible.
- B. Previous Determination: Potential moderate to large impacts on the aesthetic resources in the Town were identified because the Project would be visible from publicly accessible vantage points seasonally and year-round, both by residents in day to day life and by tourists in the area temporarily, but a similar project (Petro) is visible within one mile of the Site. The Board determined that given its proximity to Petro Waterloo and the Site's location at the intersection of I-90 and Route 414, one of the areas of the Town that is appropriate for large scale commercial development, the Project would not result in a significant adverse impact on aesthetic resources.
- C. Project as approved June 12, 2014:
1. The proposed use of land for the Project differs from current predominantly agricultural land use patterns in the area. The Project is located within 5 miles of the Women's Rights National Park and the Montezuma National Wildlife Refuge. The Wesleyan Methodist Church and Cobblestone Farmhouse at 1229 Birdsley Road, which are both listed on the National Register of Historic Places, are somewhat near to the Site.
 2. On May 16, 2014, the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Places issued its opinion that the Project would have no impact on the above mentioned cultural resources.
 3. The proposed action may be visible from publicly accessible vantage points year round. The situation or activity in which viewers are engaged while viewing the proposed action is routine travel by residents and recreation or tourism activities.
 4. There is a large commercial project (Petro Waterloo) visible within 0.13 miles of the proposed project.

5. Mitigation: Would the design features of the proposal that provide for screening, landscaping and aesthetically pleasing water features mitigate any of the visual impacts of the Project?
- D. **Amended Site Plan**: The height and location of some structures has been modified for the purpose of creating a more desirable visual viewshed and screening from certain surrounding areas. Specifically, the parking garage has been modified to be two stories shorter (now four stories tall instead of six), reducing the total height of the building by approximately 25 feet. Both the height and location of the hotel is changed too. The hotel has been relocated approximately 825 feet closer to the western property line where the existing trees to the north and along Route 414 provide better screening, particularly for residents on Chase Road to the north. The hotel was relocated to a section of the Site with a naturally lower elevation, allowing the visible height of the hotel to decrease 12-14 feet from the previous plan, which also improves the viewshed to surrounding properties.
- E. Key Question: Does the modification to the height and location of buildings create a significant adverse environmental impact that did not previously exist or alter an impact that was previously identified?

- X. Impact on Historic and Archeological Resources (page 6 of the EAF):
- A. What does impact on historic and archeological resources mean? This provision asks whether the location of the Project will occur in or adjacent to a historic or archaeological resource.
 - B. Previous Determination: The Project will not impact historic or archaeological resources.
 - C. **No new or altered impacts to historic and archeological resources have been identified in the Amended Site Plan.**
- XI. Impacts on Open Space and Recreation (page 7 of the EAF):
- A. What does impact on open space and recreation mean? This question asks whether the proposed action may result in a loss of recreational opportunities or a reduction of open space resources designed in any adopted municipal open space plan.
 - B. Previous Determination: The Project will not impact open space and recreation.
 - C. **No new or altered impacts to open space and recreation have been identified in the Amended Site Plan.**
- XII. Impacts on Critical Environmental Areas (page 7 of the EAF):
- A. What does impact on Critical Environmental Areas mean? This provision asks whether the location of the Project will occur inside or adjacent to a designated Critical Environmental Area (“CEA”).
 - B. Previous Determination: The Project will not impact CEAs.
 - C. **No new or altered impacts to CEAs have been identified in the Amended Site Plan.**

XIII. Impact on Transportation (page 8 of the EAF):

- A. What does impact on transportation mean? New development can generate or change traffic, or create a new demand for public transportation. Several potential impacts can result when traffic levels increase in a community. More traffic can lead to congestion, which in turn may have economic, environmental, and safety impacts. Traffic congestion is not only bothersome to motorists, but can increase economic costs because of extra fuel used, lost productivity, and time wasted. It can also result in higher air pollution emissions, increased traffic accident rates, decreased accessibility to economic centers, decreased road surface lifetimes, and increased vehicle maintenance costs.
- B. Previous Determination: The Board identified several moderate to large impacts on transportation that may be caused by the Project because the expected traffic increase would alter the current traffic patterns, exceed the capacity of the existing road network, degrade existing transit access and pedestrian or bicycle accommodations, and result in paving parking areas for more than 500 vehicles. However, considering the traffic study already provided by the Applicant, the Project's proximity to existing infrastructure, the trip origination percentages and improvements proposed by the Applicant, the Board determined that the Project would not result in a significant adverse impact on transportation in the Town.
- C. Project as approved June 12, 2014:
1. The Project includes 3,300 new parking spaces for vehicles. The peak traffic to the Site is expected during evenings and weekends. The developer anticipated 22 additional truck trips per day, 1208 additional vehicle trips during the Friday evening peak hour, and 1115 during the Saturday evening peak hour. These trip calculations include vehicles both entering and exiting the Site.
 2. The projected traffic increase may exceed capacity of the existing road network. The proposed action will degrade existing transit access. The proposed action will degrade existing pedestrian or bicycle accommodations. The proposed action may alter the present pattern of movement of people or goods.

3. The Project includes road widening, lane improvements, installation of traffic control signals and revisions to existing traffic signals. These recommendations were added to the Project following a traffic study completed by McFarland Johnson, Inc. that evaluated current and future traffic conditions.
 4. 69% of vehicle trips will originate from the Thruway. 26% of vehicle trips will come from the south, and thus, will have minimal impact on the Town. Only 5% of vehicles will come through the Town from the North.
 5. Only one intersection (Rte. 414 and I-90) will be impacted to the degree that it could have an unacceptable level of service if not modified. The proposal includes a number of improvements to mitigate the impact of the increased traffic at this intersection, including the addition of a number of right and left turn lanes.
 6. Mitigation: Would the design features of the proposal that provide for significant upgrades to the road infrastructure, which designs have been reviewed and modified to address the comments and concerns of the NYS Department of Transportation and the NYS Thruway Authority, mitigate any of the transportation impacts of the Project?
- D. **Amended Site Plan**: The only change relating to transportation is that the designated drop-off/pick-up area for buses and large vehicles has been changed to the eastern side of the main building for the convenience of patrons and to alleviate potential congestion that might occur with visitor passenger vehicles. This will also help reduce the risk of traffic accidents between passenger vehicles and buses, RVs, or the like. The site entrance, the estimated number of visitors, and other details as examined in the prior McFarland Johnson traffic study remain applicable.
- E. Key Question: Does the modification of the bus drop-off/pick-up area create a significant adverse environmental impact that did not previously exist or alter an impact that was previously identified?

XIV. Impact on Energy (page 8 of the EAF):

- A. What does impact on energy mean? An increase in energy use means a need for more energy production either on-site or off-site, which in turn will mean an increase in pollution. It puts more strain on the energy supply system (the energy grid), sometimes to the point where upgrades to the production or delivery system are needed.
- B. Previous Determination: Potential moderate to large impacts on energy were identified because the Project will require creating or extending transmission lines to serve its commercial use and it involves heating and cooling more than 100,000 sq. ft. of building area once complete. The Board determined that given the limited additional infrastructure required to service the Project, the impacts on energy would not be significant or adverse.
- C. Project as approved June 12, 2014:
1. New York State Gas and Electric (“NYSEG”) will provide service to the Site. There are currently overhead electric lines located on Route 414 adjacent to the Site and gas service on the east side of Route 414. The Applicant will work with NYSEG to determine what if any upgrades are required to serve the Project and will be responsible for all such upgrades.
 2. The proposed action may cause an increase in the use of energy. The proposed action will require the creation or extension of an energy transmission or supply system to serve a commercial use. The proposed action may involve heating and/or cooling of more than 100,000 square feet of building area when completed.
 3. Mitigation: Would the design features of the proposal that provide for upgrades to the electric and gas infrastructure mitigate any of the energy impacts of the Project?
- D. Amended Site Plan: The addition of an out building on the Site to be used as child care facility for staff members’ children may change the amount of energy consumed and the square footage that needs to be heated and cooled. However, this building is only 4,000 square feet (1% of the total building

square footage) and represents a small increase when compared to the Project as a whole. Additionally, this out building falls within the original overall site disturbance limits that were displayed on the Development Plan and original Site Plan. This building has replaced several parking spaces that were part of the original Site Plan layout.

- E. Key Question: Does the addition of the child care facility or modifications to the other buildings create a significant adverse environmental impact that did not previously exist or alter an impact that was previously identified?

XV. Impact on (Noise, Odor, and) Light (page 8 of the EAF):

- A. What does impact on light mean? Sky-glow generated by lighting associated with a proposed project can sometimes be visible from adjacent or nearby properties. It can be generated during both construction and operation phases of a project and can create conditions which can affect the health and safety of both humans and wildlife. Sky-glow, rather than lighting that directly shines onto a neighboring property, is considered here because the lighting associated with the Project is not expected to shine directly onto any other Property by virtue of the design of the lighting fixtures that will narrowly focus the light onto the ground at the Site.
- B. Previous Determination: The Board identified potential moderate to large impacts on light that might result from the Project because of its risk for sky-glow. However, the Board determined that given the location of the Site so close to the Petro Waterloo facility, another commercial development producing sky-glow, the Project was unlikely to significantly increase sky-glow beyond the existing conditions. Accordingly, no significant adverse impact on noise, odor, or light existed.
- C. Project as approved June 12, 2014:
1. The proposed action may result in lighting creating sky-glow brighter than existing area conditions.
 2. Site lighting will include the use of a combination of full cut-off shoebox style fixtures, and full cut-off building mounted wall sconces. Lighting will be incorporated into the Site to provide illumination for pedestrian ways, parking areas and areas immediately adjacent to the proposed buildings. High mast full cut-off fixtures with mounting heights of between 30-40 feet will be used with the larger parking fields at the Site.
 3. Illumination levels will vary from 0.1 to 2.8 foot-candles.
 4. Petro Waterloo is located south of the Site and currently utilizes 120 foot tall exterior pole mounted lights in its parking lot. Petro Waterloo produces a significant amount of skyglow, potentially lessening the net impact of the Project.

5. Mitigation: Would the design of the lighting fixtures proposed by the Applicant that are intended to limit the amount of light that escapes from the Site mitigate this impact?
- D. **Amended Site Plan**: The changes in elevation of the parking garage and the hotel may alter or diminish the visibility of light patterns from the Project. The light fixtures and mitigation measures will not change.
- E. Key Question: Does the modification to the location and elevation of the structures create a significant adverse environmental impact that did not previously exist or alter an impact that was previously identified?

XVI. Impacts on Human Health (page 9 of the EAF):

- A. What does impact on human health mean? This provision asks whether the Project may impact human health and wellbeing due to exposure to new or existing sources of contaminants.
- B. Previous Determination: The Project will not impact human health.
- C. **No new or altered impacts on human health have been identified in the Amended Site Plan.**

XVII. Consistency with Community Plans (page 10 of the EAF):

- A. What does consistency with community plans mean? The proposed action may cause a change in the density of development that is not supported by existing infrastructure or is distant from existing infrastructure.
- B. Previous Determination: It was identified that the Project would cause a change in the density of development not supported by existing infrastructure or distant from existing infrastructure. However, taking into account the zoning and planning aspects of the Project, the Board determined that the Project would not result in a significant adverse impact on municipal planning or create important inconsistencies with the community plans that would greatly affect the residents of the Town.
- C. Project as approved June 12, 2014:
1. The Comprehensive Plan for the Town was adopted on February 20, 2014. The Project is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.
 2. The Project is consistent with the proposed Planned Unit Development where the Site is located.
 3. The revenues from the NYS gaming tax, and also from the developer pursuant to a Host Community Agreement with the Town, are anticipated to provide adequate resources for a variety of increased services within the Town.
 4. Mitigation: Will the funds provided by the gaming tax and Host Community Agreement offset any planning difficulties related to increased strain on Town resources related to increased development?
- D. Amended Site Plan: No new or altered impacts on community plans have been identified in the Amended Site Plan.

XVIII. Consistency with Community Character (page 10 of EAF):

- A. What does consistency with community character mean?
Community character is defined by all the man-made and natural features of the area. It includes the visual character of a town, and its visual landscape; but also includes the buildings and structures and their uses, the natural environment, activities, town services, and local policies that are in place. These combine to create a sense of place or character that defines the area. Changes to the type and intensity of land use, public services, aesthetic quality, and to the balance between residential and commercial uses can all change community character.
- B. Previous Determination: It was determined that the Project might create moderate to large impacts on the community character because the Project would increase the demand for community services and it differed from the existing natural landscape and predominant architecture in the area. The Board determined that the location of the Project near the Thruway and Petro Waterloo was appropriate for this large commercial development and the Project would not create a significant adverse impact on the community character.
- C. Project as approved June 12, 2014:
1. The proposed action may create a demand for additional community services. The proposed action is inconsistent with the predominant architectural scale and character, as well as the character of the existing natural landscape.
 2. The Site is located near to I-90 and Petro Waterloo, one of the areas of the Town that may be considered appropriate for large scale commercial development.
 3. Mitigation: Will the location (near the thruway and Petro Waterloo) and design of the Project, along with the funds provided by the gaming tax revenue and the Host Community Agreement, offset any new demand for community services and impacts on community character?
- D. Amended Site Plan: No new or altered impacts on community character have been identified in the Amended Site Plan.

XIX. Other:

A. Weaver Family Burial Ground

1. Previous Determination: This was not considered an environmental impact necessitating a SEQRA review, but the Board nevertheless examines the issues concerning the burial ground and assured itself that the area would be properly preserved.
2. Project as approved June 12, 2014: A preservation area measuring 50 feet x 75 feet was reserved for the burial ground.
3. **Amended Site Plan:** A preservation area measuring 75 feet x 75 feet has been reserved for the burial ground, as shown in red on the attached drawing prepared by BME Associates. The location of the graves within this area is shown in green and marked "Burial Area." This change represents an increase of approximately 1875 square feet. The burial ground will be surrounded by a mowed grass area adjacent to the parking lots, as shown in white on the drawing. The grading of the plan was also adjusted to keep the burial ground close to the existing grade instead of creating a noticeable grade change as previously planned.

B. Child Care Facility

1. Previous Determination: Not explicitly included.
2. Project as approved June 12, 2014: Not explicitly included.
3. **Amended Site Plan:** A private child care facility has been added as an accessory use in an out building on the Site where staff members' children will be cared for. The area is approximately 4,000 square feet, approximately 1% of the total square footage for the Project. It will help reduce vehicle trips in the surrounding area of staff transporting children to or from various daycare centers.