

**Erie County Community College
Facilities Master Plan DGEIS
Decision Matrix**

Key: NSIA = No Significant Impact Anticipated
PCRR = Pre-Construction Review Required

Elements	Alternative 1 and 3	Alternative 2
College - Wide Issues		
ECC Mission and Goals/Quality of Education and Deliverability	Alternative 1 and 3: Consistent with ECC's Vision, Mission Core Values and Goals as it will result in renovated and state of the art facilities and will improve the quality of education. However, while both seek to remedy the major functional deficiencies at each campus, each also maintain the utility and personal redundancies throughout the three campuses, which stress the institution financially. While Alternative 3 may provide some minor fiscal relief in funding the implementation of the Alternatives, overall, these Alternative are not consistent with ECC Institutional Goal #9 "Organization." (DGEIS Section 5.1.2.1.1 and 5.3.2.1.1)	Alternative 2 is consistent with ECC's Vision, Mission, Core Values and Goals as follows: State of the art facilities will be provided and the campus will be located in close proximity to the Buffalo Niagara Medical Campus, UB South Campus and Erie County Medical Center. Partnership opportunities between these facilities and ECC would have the potential to enhance the quality of educational programming at ECC which could in turn serve to attract additional students from greater distances seeking to take advantage of the enhanced quality of education available at a consolidated City Campus. (DGEIS Section 5.2..2.1.1)
Socioeconomic Implications		
Job Creation and Associated Payroll Impacts From Associated Private Development	Alternative 1 & 3: While ECC may only see a minor increase in staff and faculty, Alternatives 1 & 3 will result in modest positive impacts on the local and regional socioeconomic conditions as a result of the proposed construction projects and potential private development through P3s. The additional students projected will also result in minor spending impacts on the surrounding communities. The sale and redevelopment of the VTTC site could provide the most tangible economic benefits by resulting in an additional 45 jobs with associated estimated payroll impacts of \$1.5 million annually by 2015. Therefore, in aggregate, Alternatives 1 & 3 would result in positive job creation and related payroll impacts on the surrounding communities, requiring no mitigation. (DGEIS Sections 5.1.2.1.2.1 and 5.3.3.5.5)	Alternative 2, job creation estimates from private development on the suburban campuses range between 6,000 and 11,000 jobs, with estimated payroll impacts of \$182 million to \$456 million. These positive impacts would be in addition to the positive benefits of temporary construction jobs at the suburban campuses and the significant numbers of construction related jobs to be created during the construction of the City Campus. Alternative 2 would also result in a projected \$2 million increase in spending power by students which could translate into at least 30 to 40 food market and services jobs around the new City Campus a significant positive impact. Also, the consolidated campus would likely attract additional companies to the area seeking college-aged and educated employees. Such companies could include support centers and back office call centers which provide salaries ranging from \$18K to \$40K. Lastly, the above described positive impacts are consistent with ECC's Core Value of being committed to "...the needs of our community and the well-being of the College." (DGEIS Section 5.2.2.1.2.1)
Annual County Property Tax Revenue	Alternative 1: ECC will retain all three campuses, which will continue to preclude County tax revenue from being generated by private development on each campus. Alternative 1 proposes the sale of the VTTC site in Orchard Park. Private development on the 6.6-acre VTTC site is projected to result in \$2,500 in annual property taxes for Erie County. The sale of the VTTC and resulting private development will result in a minor positive impacts to the County's fiscal conditions, requiring no mitigation (DGEIS Section 5.1.2.1.2.2). Alternative 3: ECC and Erie County would enter into Public Private Partnerships (3s), which could include the sale of all, or portions of the suburban campuses for private development. This would generate County Tax revenue for property that currently does not produce said tax revenue, as it is owned by the County. This will result in a positive impact on Erie County's fiscal conditions, requiring no mitigation. (DGEIS 5.3.2.1.2.1)	The projected revenue for Erie County under full build-out of the selected Development Scenarios at the suburban Campuses will in aggregate range from \$0.58 million to \$1.8 million annually. Due to the fact that currently, no County property taxes are generated from the suburban Campuses, as they are both owned by ECC and Erie County, opening the Campuses to private development will provide new tax revenue which could potentially be allocated, in part, to fund ECC-related initiatives and improve the quality of the education through continued upgrading of ECC facilities and technology. Additionally, this added revenue stream may aid in offsetting the fiscal implications of a drop in enrollment under Alternative 2. This new County tax revenue is a positive impact on the County's fiscal resources, and therefore, no mitigation is necessary. (DGEIS Section 5.2.2.1.2.2)
Annual Local Property Tax Revenue	Alternative 1: Alternative 1 will not directly result in any additional property tax revenue for the Towns of Amherst, Hamburg, and the City of Buffalo, as the three campuses will be retained. The conveyance of the VTTC site is projected to result in \$38,000 in annual local property and school taxes for the Town of Orchard Park at full build-out of the site in 2015, a minor positive impact on the Town's fiscal conditions, requiring no mitigation. (DGEIS Section 5.1.2.1.2.3) Alternative 3: With the use of a sale-leaseback P3s. Alternative 3 could result in an undetermined amount of town/village and school tax revenue for each involved community. Combined with the sale of the VTTC as described in Alternative 1, Alternative 3 would result in positive impacts on each involved communities' fiscal conditions, requiring no mitigation. (DGEIS Section 5.3.2.1.2.2)	The estimated property tax revenue the local communities and school districts could begin retaining by the year 2015 under Alternative 2 and the selected Development Scenarios at each suburban Campuses ranges from \$4.7 to \$14.5 million annually. This projected property tax revenue is a significant positive economic benefit to the local communities and school districts requiring no mitigation. (DGEIS Section 5.2.2.1.2.3)

**Erie County Community College
Facilities Master Plan DGEIS
Decision Matrix**

Elements	Alternative 1 and 3	Alternative 2
Revenue From Sale of Suburban Campuses	<p>Alternative 1: The sale of the VTTC could result in approximately \$1.26 to \$1.57 million in revenue for ECC and Erie County, a positive impact on the fiscal resources for ECC and the County, requiring no mitigation. (DGEIS Section 5.1.2.1.2.4)</p> <p>Alternative 3: Through P3s, the sale of all of the suburban campuses and the VTTC site could result in between \$11.3 and \$20.57 million dollars in revenue for ECC and Erie County resulting in positive impacts on the fiscal resources for ECC and the County, requiring no mitigation. (DGEIS Section 5.3.2.1.2.3)</p>	<p>The total projected revenue through the sale of the suburban Campuses at the likely development density analyzed within the selected Development Scenarios ranges between \$11.4 and \$19.7 million, a positive impact to both ECC's and Erie County's fiscal resources. Therefore, no mitigation is required. This revenue has the potential to offset/mitigate potential fiscal impacts associated with a projected drop in enrollment as discussed below. (DGEIS Section 5.2.2.1.2.4)</p>
Operation and Management	<p>Some minor energy and staffing efficiencies could be realized as programs are reorganized; however, the current three-campus configuration will be maintained resulting in certain inefficiencies, an adverse impact on the fiscal resources of ECC. Mitigation in the form of additional program reorganization and consolidation would provide some relief. This mitigation strategy will need further analysis to identify the programs and departments appropriate for reorganization and consolidation. Under Alternative 3, additional mitigation may be in the form of sale-lease back, development lease-back P3s arrangements or a potential partnership with BOCES. These options may relieve some of the operational costs of selective ECC facilities. (DGEIS Sections 5.1.2.1.3 & 5.3.2.1.3)</p>	<p>It is estimated that under Alternative 2, the College may see a total annual savings of approximately \$3.2 million over current expense levels through the consolidation of utilities and personnel, a positive impact on ECC's fiscal resources. Therefore, no mitigation is necessary. Furthermore, this savings would aid in off-setting potential adverse implications associated with a drop in enrollment described below. (DGEIS Section 5.2.2.1.3)</p>
College Fiscal		
Enrollment	<p>Alternatives 1 & 3: Both Alternatives 1 or 3 will result in a projected increase of 560 total students (or 442 additional FTEs) over the current enrollment figures by 2015, a positive impact on enrollment and in turn will have positive effects on ECC's fiscal resources. Therefore, no mitigation will be required. (DGEIS Sections 5.1.2.1.4.1 & 5.3.2.1.4.1)</p>	<p>Based on reviews of enrollment figures at relevant community colleges in New York State, Alternative 2 may result in a 9.7 percent drop in FTE's when compared to 2015 estimates under Alternative 1. Strategically placed extension centers would help ECC retain approximately 409 FTEs reducing the projected enrollment drop by at least 4 percent. The projected enrollment drop could be further mitigated through the likely attraction of additional lower-credit students to the extension centers, and the fact that enrollment figures are expected to increase once the City Campus is fully operational. The recapturing of approximately 409 FTEs, with the likelihood of attracting more, combined with the many wide-ranging economic and fiscal benefits associated with a consolidated Downtown Campus and the sale of the suburban Campuses, along with the increase in the amount of ECC's operating budget being invested in the classroom which will translate into an improved quality of education, the projected drop in enrollment is not considered a significant impact. (DGEIS Section 5.2.2.1.4.1)</p>
Chargebacks	<p>Alternatives 1 or 3: Would result in a projected \$0.6 million improvement over Erie County's current chargeback differential, a positive impact; requiring no mitigation. (DGEIS Sections 5.1.2.1.4.2 & 5.3.2.1.4.2)</p>	<p>While the projected loss of students in the over nine credit group is the most difficult to mitigate under Alternative 2, it is likely that once the City Campus is in operation, it's state-of-the-art facilities, combined with an enhanced educational program offering, including partnerships with the Buffalo Niagara Medical Campus including the University at Buffalo Center for Bioinformatics, UB South (medical/dental) Campus, and Erie County Medical Center will act to attract additional students from this group. ECC would be able to recapture approximately 409 FTEs through extension centers, thus partially mitigating the projected increase in the \$1million chargeback figures. The estimated increase in chargebacks under Alternative 2 would be further mitigated through numerous economic benefits of a consolidated Campus and the private development on the suburban Campuses and associated economic and fiscal impacts. In aggregate, the projected initial increasedrop in enrollment and associated ECC fiscal implications are not anticipated to be significant. (DGEIS Section 5.2.2.1.4.2)</p>

**Erie County Community College
Facilities Master Plan DGEIS
Decision Matrix**

Elements	Alternative 1 and 3	Alternative 2
Tuition and State Aid	Alternative 1 & 3: Based on the projected increases in Enrollment under Alternatives 1 & 3, these Alternatives would result an increase in revenue from tuition and state aid of approximately \$2.2 million per year, a positive impact, and as such, no mitigation will be required. (DGEIS Sections 5.1.2.1.4.3 and 5.3.2.1.4.3)	Alone, the estimated annual loss of tuition and state aid of \$ 3.3 million would be considered an adverse fiscal impact on ECC. However, through the use of extension centers, the projected drop in tuition and state aid will be reduced to \$1.3 million, coupled with the countless economic benefits of a consolidated Campus, the projected loss in tuition and state aid is not anticipated to be significant. (DGEIS Section 5.2.2.1.4.3)
Student Costs	Alternative 1 & 3: During the implementation of Alternatives 1 or 3 and as ECC introduces newer and state-of-the-art facilities to its students, periodic increases in tuition may be necessary to meet the financial needs of ECC. While this may be considered an adverse impact with no mitigation, the new and state-of-the-art facilities that ECC will be providing will serve to off-set the impact of increased tuition. Under Alternative 3 however, the use of P3s would off-set the costs of implementation, and therefore, require less of the costs to be passed on to students. Furthermore, ECC remains one of the lowest-price secondary educational institutions in the region. (DGEIS Sections 5.1.2.1.4.4 and 5.3.2.1.4.4)	The one direct cost as a result of Alternative 2 will likely be parking fees. As further described in DGEIS Section 5.2.2.1.5.2 Parking, the cost for downtown parking under Alternative 2 is estimated at around \$216.00 per semester per student. Due to the fact that adequate surface parking currently exists in the immediate vicinity of the proposed consolidated Campus to meet the parking demand under Alternative 2, along with the fact that the projected cost of parking can be dramatically reduced through P3s, alternative means of financing and a rearrangement of class schedules to alter the peak parking times, Alternative 2 will not result in significant adverse impacts on student costs related to parking fees. (DGEIS Section 5.2.2.1.4.4)
Transportation		
Network Impacts	Alternative 1: Due to the fact that the projected increase in student enrollment through 2015 will be approximately 5 percent, well below planning averages for growth on the regional highway network, and due to the fact that anticipated regional transportation improvements as identified in <i>DGEIS Section 4.1.2.2 Proposed Transportation Projects</i> , should alleviate these normal growth trends, any impacts on the regional transportation network resulting from Alternatives 1 are anticipated to be minimal. However, there are currently Level of Service (LOS) issues on both Main St. and Wehrle Dr. at the North Campus. Currently, the segments of these two roads have either an LOS of E or F. The proposed increase in students will compound these existing problems. (DGEIS Section 5.1.2.1.5) Alternative 3: Full build-out of the student housing complexes would also offset the impact that a five percent enrollment increase over 13 years would have on the transportation system. (DGEIS Section 5.3.2.1.5)	The Elm/Oak arterial, adjacent to ECC City Campus and connecting I-190 with NY 33 (Kensington Expressway) will see a 25 percent increase in traffic, which will result in an LOS F for the arterial at full build-out of the City Campus in 2015. This arterial collects traffic from I-190 to the north and east, NY 33 to the northeast, and NY Route 5 from the south. This increase in traffic would result in delays and backups along the corridor, mainly during peak AM periods. With additional targeted traffic analysis, the implementation of designated turn lanes and, if necessary, additional identified mitigative measures, the adverse impacts on the Elm/Oak arterial are not anticipated to be significant. (DGEIS Section 5.2.2.1.5)
Commuter Time	Alternative 1 & 3: The implementation of Alternative 1 or 3 would not directly result in adverse impacts on student travel times. However, the current LOS designations for Main St. and Wehrle Dr. at the North Campus will be exacerbated with an increase in students traveling to the Campus, and may result in increased delays. Alternative 3: Future impacts may occur as a result of non-ECC related development in and around each Campus under Alternative 3 P3s. (DGEIS Sections 5.1.2.1.5 & 5.3.2.1.5)	Commuting times under Alternative 2, on average, would increase by 3 minutes to 21 minutes. When suburban Campus students alone are analyzed, the commuting times are 19 minutes (Alternative 1) and 22 minutes (Alternative 2), respectively. Of significance, rural and outward suburban students would see travel times increase by 12 to 15 minutes. This is mathematically off-set by City Campus students, who would actually see a five-minute average reduction in travel time to reach the City Campus. Refer to <i>Table 5.2.2-17 Travel Times For Students By Campus, By Town</i> for additional information on these travel time analysis results. With the provision of extension centers, which will provide reasonable commuting times for suburban and outward suburban students as well as out-of-county students, and the fact that the commute time for students originating from the City's surrounding townships are also likely to decrease, in aggregate, the impacts on commuter times under Alternative 2 will not be significant, and will likely result in positive impacts for most students. (DGEIS 5.2.2.1.5)
Public Safety	Alternative 1 & 3: According to the ECC Public Safety Department, the Department will be able to accommodate up to a total of 15,000 students throughout the three campus system, without the need to hire additional staff. Therefore, no significant impacts related to Campus safety are anticipated as a result of the proposed increase in student enrollment under either Alternatives 1 or 3. (DGEIS Sections 5.1.2.1.6 & 5.3.2.1.6) Alternative 3: With on-campus student housing, ECC Public Safety Officials will require additional training and will need to have "Peace Officer" status. (DGEIS Section 5.3.2.1.6)	A downtown campus combined with the increase in the number of students at the City Campus both present additional security issues. However, the numerous safety and security features are proposed, combined with the use of CPTED in the planning and design of the City Campus, the additional training and "peace officer" status for the ECC Public Safety Officers, continued coordination with local law enforcement authorities, and the presence of over 200 Public Safety employees including City Police Officers and the County Sheriff, impacts on the ability of ECC to provide for the safety and security of students, faculty, staff, and visitors are not anticipated. (DGEIS Section 5.2.2.1.6)

**Erie County Community College
Facilities Master Plan DGEIS
Decision Matrix**

Elements	Alternative 1 and 3	Alternative 2
Air Resources	Alternative 1 & 3: Only marginal increases in students and associated vehicle trips through the year 2015, combined with the fact that any increase in emissions from the heating plants on each campus will be in full compliance with local, state, and federal rules, regulations, and guidelines, specifically 6 NYCRR Part 201, Alternatives 1 or 3 are not anticipated to result in significant adverse impacts on the region's air resources. (DGEIS Section 5.1.2.1.7)	The increase in automobile traffic may result in localized impacts on air quality. The use of public transportation may mitigate these impacts to a certain extent. Beyond the use of public transportation, the potential air quality impacts related to automobile trip increases cannot be further mitigated directly by ECC and Erie County. However, these impacts alone are not anticipated to be significant. The use of a heating and cooling district may mitigate the amount of emissions (pollution and heat) that would be emitted from the City Campus. The process that is ultimately chosen will be the most efficient and cleanest process available while at the same time the most economically feasible for ECC and Erie County. Furthermore, any increase in emissions from the City Campus will be in full compliance with local, state, and federal rules, regulations, and guidelines, specifically 6 NYCRR Part 201. (DGEIS 5.2.2.1.7)
Environmental Justice	Alternative 1 & 3: Minority and low-income residents in the City of Buffalo are currently at a disadvantage when it comes to accessing post-secondary education, as the City Campus does not offer the same courses and programs provided at the suburban campuses, and these residents rely more heavily on public transportation which severely limits their ability to commute to the suburban campuses. Neither Alternative 1 or 3 addresses this deficiency as the three-campus arrangement will be maintained and no major reallocation of courses and programs are proposed. To significantly mitigate this impact would cost ECC more than \$2.5 million dollars in additional program offering and free public transportation to those students in need. This is not financially feasible for ECC to incur along with the continued O&M redundancies under the current three-campus system. Therefore, this adverse impact cannot be mitigated. (DGEIS 5.1.2.5 and 5.3.2.5)	The consolidation of ECC into downtown Buffalo will provide the minority and low-income residents of the City of Buffalo who are currently at a disadvantage when it comes to equal access to post-secondary education, improved access to all of the courses and programs at ECC. Therefore, Alternative 3 alleviates the current EJ issues in the City of Buffalo with respect to equal access to education. (DGEIS 5.2.2.5)
Cumulative Impact Analysis	Alternative 1& 3: The three-campus system promotes continued suburbanization, and when combined with additional projects that are automobile oriented, such as malls, big-box stores, etc., the trend of suburbanization is continually supported. Adverse impacts on traffic congestion, quality of life, air quality, and numerous additional issues arise and existing ones are exacerbated. This is a cumulative impact that cannot be directly fully mitigated by ECC. Cumulatively, suburbanization impacts the City through population loss, the associated fiscal and social implications and the ultimate deterioration of the City's economic and social well-being. Continuing with the three-campus configuration only serves to exacerbate this phenomenon, with no direct mitigation measures available. (DGEIS 5.1.2.6 & 5.3.2.6)	When identified current and future projects are combined and added to the infrastructural characteristics of ECC's Campus Master Plan, no significant cumulative community impacts are revealed and none are anticipated to occur through the planning period. (DGEIS 2.2.2.6)
Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	Under Alternative 1, the unavoidable adverse impacts include the operation and maintenance-related fiscal impacts on ECC; City students' lack of equal access to ECC courses and programs not offered at the City Campus, an Environmental Justice issue; and the cumulative impacts of supporting the trend of suburbanization, automobile dependency the outward migration of the City population and the numerous associated secondary impacts. (DGEIS 5.1.2.7 & 5.3.2.7)	Alternative 2 will result in the degradation of the Elm Street/Oak Street arterial to LOS F, with an expected increase of 25 percent traffic on the corridor. During the design of a Campus, a detailed assessment of this corridor would be required. Mitigation could include new turn lanes at Campus intersections, but this would need to be balanced against constraints to maintain sidewalks. Walks on one side of the corridor may need to be closed. Where new Campus building occurs, setbacks would be proposed which would allow for suitable capacity of the roadway with pedestrian accommodations. (DGEIS Section 5.2.2.7)

**Erie County Community College
Facilities Master Plan DGEIS
Decision Matrix**

Elements	Alternative 1 and 3	Alternative 2
North Campus		
Geology	Alternative 1 & 3: NSIA/PCRR. While no significant impacts are anticipated, a full geo-technical evaluation is recommended within areas proposed for construction. (DGEIS Section 5.1.2.2.1 & 5.3.2.2.1)	NSI/PCR. While no significant impacts are anticipated, it is recommended that a full geo-technical analyses be conducted by the site developer and independent of ECC. (DGEIS Section 5.2.3.6.1)
Water Resources	Alternatives 1 & 3: NSIA/PCRR. While increased storm water runoff may occur, the preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) should minimize any significant impacts. (DGEIS Section 5.1.2.2.2 & 5.3.2.2.1)	NSI/PCR. While increased storm water runoff may occur, the preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan should minimize any significant impact. Additional review will be the responsibility of the site developer. (DGEIS Section 5.2.3.6.2)
Terrestrial and Aquatic Ecology	Alternatives 1 & 3: NSIA/PCRR. Minimal and temporary impacts may occur during the construction phase. However, erosion control measures applied during construction and a post-construction planting plan will counteract any impacts and will actually result in additional habitat for terrestrial species common in suburban areas, a positive impact. (DGEIS Section 5.1.2.2.3 & 5.3.2.2.1)	NSI/PCR. Minimal impacts may occur during the construction phase. However, the site developer can implement erosion control measures applied during construction and a post-construction planting plan to counteract any impacts. (DGEIS Section 5.2.3.6.3)
Parking	Alternative 1: NSIA. Projected increases in parking demands will not exceed future capacity. Proposed facility additions are not expected to impact parking facilities. (DGEIS Section 5.1.2.2.4) Alternative 3: PCRR. The implications of private development under Alternative 3 on parking will need to be addressed during the review of the individual P3 partnerships. (DGEIS Section 5.3.2.2.2)	NSI. The need for student parking would be reduced with Alternative 2. Parking requirements for new construction can not be determined at this time, but should be coordinated with the Town. Compliance is the responsibility of the site developer. (DGEIS Section 5.2.3.6.4)
Land Use and Zoning	Alternative 1: NSIA. Land use will remain educational and ECC is currently exempt from local zoning. All attempts will be made to comply with local zoning regulations (DGEIS Section 5.1.2.4.5) Alternative 3: PCRR. If all or portions of the land are either sold or leased to a private entity through P3s, development on said properties would no longer be exempt from local zoning, and therefore a change in zoning may be required as the campus is currently zoned as Community Facilities District (DGEIS Section 5.3.2.2.3)	NSI. For this alternative, the zoning would need to permit higher density commercial development. The site developer would need to follow through with any zoning requests. (DGEIS Section 5.2.3.6.5)
Community Character	Alternative 1 and 3: NSIA. All new development will be constructed and screened in such a way as to reduce any impacts on community character and the surrounding uses. Alternatives 1 & 3 are consistent with the Town of Amherst Draft Comprehensive Plan dated December 2002 and Parks Plan Dated February 2003. (DGEIS Section 5.1.2.2.5 & 5.3.2.2.3) Alternative 3: PCRR. As the types of P3s are currently unknown, the potential impacts on adjoining and nearby properties resulting from P3s will need to be reviewed prior to implementation. (DGEIS Section 5.3.2.2.3)	NSI. It is recommended that the site developer screen all new development from nearby roadways and adjacent uses to reduce any impacts on community character. Alternative 2 would be consistent with the Town's Draft Comprehensive Plan and Recreation and Parks Master Plan. (DGEIS Section 5.2.2.2.5)
Community Services	Alternative 1 & 3: NSI. Adequate water supply and pressure currently exist in the Town of Amherst. Therefore, any increase in demand will be accommodated. Community service providers anticipate accommodating an increase in service needs. (DGEIS Section 5.1.2.2.6)	NSI/PCR. Adequate water supply and pressure currently exist in the Town of Amherst. Therefore, any increase in demand should be accommodated. However, the site developer should coordinate with community service providers to ensure service needs can be met. (DGEIS Section 5.2.3.6.6)

**Erie County Community College
Facilities Master Plan DGEIS
Decision Matrix**

Elements	Alternative 1 and 3	Alternative 2
Historic, Cultural and Archaeological Resources	Alternative 1 & 3: NSI/PCR. A Phase 1A Archeological Survey has been performed and no impacts are anticipated. However, a Phase 1B Survey is also recommended prior to construction. (DGEIS Section 5.1.2.2.7 and 5.3.2.2.4)	NSI/PCR. A Phase 1A Archeological Survey has been performed and no impacts are anticipated. However, a Phase 1B Survey should be conducted by the site developer prior to construction. (DGEIS Section 5.2.3.6.7)
Public Health – Hazardous Materials	Alternative 1 & 3: NSI/PCR. Based on preliminary analyses, impacts are minimal. However, a Full Phase I and II Environmental Assessment is recommended prior to construction. (DGEIS Section 5.1.2.2.8)	NSI. No remediation or abatement is presumed to be required based on preliminary analyses. However, perceived or real hazardous materials on site may reduce the property's value. (DGEIS Section 5.2.3.6.8)
City Campus		
Geology	Alternative 1 & 3: No Significant Impacts Anticipated (NSIA)/Pre Construction Review Required (PCRR). While no significant impacts are anticipated, a full geo-technical evaluation is recommended within areas proposed for construction. (DGEIS Section 5.1.2.3.1)	NSI/PCR. While no significant impacts are anticipated, it is recommended that a full geo-technical analyses be conducted by the site developer and independent of ECC. (DGEIS Section 5.2.3.6.1)
Water Resources	Alternative 1 & 3: NSI/PCR. While increased storm water runoff may occur, the preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan should minimize any significant impact. (DGEIS Section 5.1.2.3.2)	NSI/PCR. While increased storm water runoff may occur, the preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan should minimize any significant impact. Additional review will be the responsibility of the site developer. (DGEIS Section 5.2.3.6.2)
Terrestrial and Aquatic Ecology	Alternative 1 & 3: NSI/PCR. Minimal impacts may occur during the construction phase. However, erosion control measures applied during construction and a post-construction planting plan will counteract any impacts. (DGEIS Section 5.1.2.3.3)	NSI/PCR. Minimal impacts may occur during the construction phase. However, the site developer can implement erosion control measures applied during construction and a post-construction planting plan to counteract any impacts. (DGEIS Section 5.2.3.6.3)
Parking	Alternative 1 & 3: NSI. Any increase in parking demands will not exceed future capacity. Construction activities will be planned and scheduled to minimize impacts on parking. (DGEIS Section 5.1.2.3.5)	NSI. The need for student parking would be reduced with Alternative 2. Parking requirements for new construction can not be determined at this time, but should be coordinated with the Town. Compliance is the responsibility of the site developer. (DGEIS Section 5.2.3.6.4)
Land Use	Alternative 1 & 3: NSI. The land use will not change. Current land uses surrounding the campus include commercial, industrial or office, there will be no resulting impacts. (DGEIS Section 5.1.2.3.5)	NSI. Land use on site will change very little. The existing land uses surrounding the campus include commercial, industrial or office, and the new uses on the site will include office as well as research and development uses. Therefore, impact of this change is anticipated to be minimal. (DGEIS Section 5.2.3.6.5)
Zoning	Alternative 1 & 3: NSI. ECC is exempt from compliance with local zoning. However, to the greatest extent possible ECC will attempt to comply with existing and future land use regulations. (DGEIS Section 5.1.2.3.5)	NSI. For this alternative, the zoning would need to permit higher density commercial development. The site developer would need to follow through with any zoning requests. (DGEIS Section 5.2.3.6.5)
Community Character	Alternative 1 & 3: NSI. All new development will be screened from nearby roadways and uses to reduce any foreseen impacts on community character. Alternative 1 and 3 are consistent with both development priorities of ate City's Draft Comprehensive Plan dated June 26, 2003. (DGEIS Section 5.1.2.3.5)	NSI. It is recommended that the site developer screen all new development from nearby roadways and adjacent uses to reduce any impacts on community character. Alternative 2 would be consistent with the Town's Draft Comprehensive Plan and Recreation and Parks Master Plan. (DGEIS Section 5.2.2.2.5)

**Erie County Community College
Facilities Master Plan DGEIS
Decision Matrix**

Elements	Alternative 1 and 3	Alternative 2
Community Services	Alternative 1 & 3: NSI/PCR. According to the City's Draft Comprehensive Plan, adequate water supply exists in the City. Pre-Construction reviews on the actual water demand of Alternatives 1 and 3 are recommended to ensure adequate capacity and pressure. NSI regarding sanitary sewer, electric, gas, telecommunications, emergency and protective services and solid waste management services are anticipated. (DGEIS Section 5.1.2.3.6)	NSI/PCR. Adequate water supply and pressure currently exist in the Town of Amherst. Therefore, any increase in demand should be accommodated. However, the site developer should coordinate with community service providers to ensure service needs can be met. (DGEIS Section 5.2.3.6.6)
Historic, Cultural and Archaeological Resources	Alternative 1 & 3: NSI/PCR. A Phase 1A Archeological Survey has been performed and no impacts are anticipated. However, a Phase 1B Survey is also recommended prior to construction. (DGEIS Section 5.1.2.3.7)	NSI/PCR. A Phase 1A Archeological Survey has been performed and no impacts are anticipated. However, a Phase 1B Survey should be conducted by the site developer prior to construction. (DGEIS Section 5.2.3.6.7)
Public Health – Hazardous Materials	Alternative 1 & 3: NSI/PCR. Based on preliminary analyses, impacts are minimal. However, a Full Phase I and II Environmental Assessment is recommended prior to construction. (DGEIS Section 5.1.2.3.8)	NSI. No remediation or abatement is presumed to be required based on preliminary analyses. However, perceived or real hazardous materials on site may reduce the property's value. (DGEIS Section 5.2.3.6.8)
South Campus		
Geology	Alternatives 1 & 3: NSIA/PCRR. While no significant impacts are anticipated, a full geo-technical evaluation is recommended within areas proposed for construction. (DGEIS Section 5.1.2.4.1 & 5.3.2.4.1)	NSI/PCR. While no significant impacts are anticipated, it is recommended that a full geo-technical analyses be conducted by the site developer and independent of ECC. (DGEIS Section 5.2.3.8.1)
Water Resources	Alternatives 1 and 3: NSIA/PCRR. While increased storm water runoff may occur, the preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan should minimize any significant impact. (DGEIS Section 5.1.2.4.2 & 5.3.2.4.1)	NSI/PCR. While increased storm water runoff may occur, the preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan should minimize any significant impact. Additional review and analysis will be the responsibility of the site developer. (DGEIS Section 5.2.3.8.2)
Terrestrial and Aquatic Ecology	Alternatives 1 & 3: NSIA/PCRR. Minimal and temporary impacts may occur during the construction phase. However, erosion control measures applied during construction and a post-construction planting plan will counteract any impacts and will actually result in additional habitat for terrestrial species common in suburban areas. (DGEIS Section 5.1.2.4.3 & 5.3.2.4.1)	NSI/PCR. Minimal impacts may occur during the construction phase. However, the site developer can implement erosion control measures applied during construction and a post-construction planting plan to counteract any impacts. (DGEIS Section 5.2.3.8.3)
Parking	Alternative 1: NSIA. Projected increases in parking demands will not exceed future capacity. Proposed facility additions are not expected to impact parking facilities. (DGEIS Section 5.1.2.4.4) Alternative 3: PCRR. The implications of private development under Alternative 3 on parking will need to be addressed during the review of the individual P3 partnerships. (DGEIS Section 5.3.2.4.2)	NSI. The need for student parking would be reduced with Alternative 2. Parking requirements for new construction can not be determined at this time, but should be consistent with the local regulations. Compliance is the responsibility of the site developer. (DGEIS Section 5.2.3.8.4)
Land Use and Zoning	Alternative 1: NSIA. Land use will remain educational and ECC is currently exempt from local zoning. All attempts will be made to comply with local zoning regulations (DGEIS Section 5.1.2.4.5) Alternative 3: PCRR. If all or portions of the land are either sold or leased to a private entity through P3s, development on said properties would no longer be exempt from local zoning, and therefore a change in zoning may be required as the campus is currently zoned for residential in both the Towns of Hamburg and Orchard Park. (DGEIS Section 5.3.2.4.3)	NSI. Land use on site will change very little. The existing land uses surrounding the campus include commercial, industrial or office, and the new uses on the site will include office as well as research and development uses. Therefore, impact of this change is anticipated to be minimal. (DGEIS Section 5.2.3.8.5)
Community Character	Alternatives 1 and 3: NSIA. All new development will be constructed and screened in such a way as to reduce any impacts on community character and the surrounding uses. Alternative 3: PCRR. As the types of P3s are currently unknown, the potential impacts on adjoining and nearby properties resulting from P3s will need to be reviewed prior to implementation. (DGEIS Section 5.1.2.4.5 and 5.3.2.4.3)	NSI. It is recommended that the site developer screen all new development from nearby roadways and adjacent uses to reduce any impacts on community character. (DGEIS Section 5.2.3.8.5)

**Erie County Community College
Facilities Master Plan DGEIS
Decision Matrix**

Elements	Alternative 1 and 3	Alternative 2
Community Services	Alternative 1 & 3: NSIA/PCRR. Adequate water supply and pressure currently exist on Campus. Therefore, community service providers anticipate accommodating an increase in service needs. (DGEIS Section 5.1.2.4.6)	NSI/PCR. Adequate water supply and pressure currently exist on site. Therefore, any increase in demand should be accommodated. However, the site developer should coordinate with community service providers to ensure service needs can be met. (DGEIS Section 5.2.3.8.6)
Historic, Cultural and Archaeological Resources	Alternatives 1 & 3: NSIA/PCRR. A Phase 1A Archeological Survey has been performed and no impacts are anticipated. However, a Phase 1B Survey is also recommended. (DGEIS Section 5.1.2.4.7 and 5.3.2.4.5)	NSI/PCR. A Phase 1A Archeological Survey has been performed and no impacts are anticipated. However, a Phase 1B Survey should be conducted by the site developer prior to any construction. (DGEIS Section 5.2.3.8.7)
Public Health – Hazardous Materials	Alternatives 1 & 3: NSIA/PCRR. The presence of leaking USTS and asbestos will require cleanup and abatement measures at the time of demolition or construction of Campus buildings. Alternative 1 and 3 will actually result in positive impacts as the environmental health of the South Campus would be improved after any necessary remediation. (DGEIS Section 5.1.2.4.8 & 5.3.2.4.5)	PCRR. The presence of LUSTS and asbestos will require cleanup and abatement measures. (DGEIS Section 5.1.2.8.8)