

Item #	Comment Number	Comment	Response	Section Reference
Combined Effects				
321.	4, 38, 57, 60, 62, 63, 163, 164, 457, 523	Coinciding with the Croton WTP, NYCDEP will build a UV facility at Eastview that is the size of 2 football fields and 60 feet high. The overlap of Croton, Catskill/Delaware UV, Police Precinct, and possible the Kensico City Tunnel will create intolerable conditions for local residents and businesses. Cumulative impacts due to Croton WTP and the Catskill/Delaware UV facility will not be analyzed until between the Draft and Final SEIS. Per SEQRA and CEQR, this is not allowed as the public will not be able to respond.	The combined impacts of these projects will be evaluated. The qualitative assessment in the Draft SEIS will be updated with quantitative information from the Catskill / Delaware design team that was not available when the Croton SEIS was published. Design information for the Police Precinct and KCT are not yet available. A quantitative analysis of the impacts of these proposed projects, to the extent that design information is available for each project, will be presented in the Final SEIS.	5.21.
322.	69, 70, 72, 76, 77, 495, 683, 802	NYC has for years been segmenting its applications. Different staffers propose different projects that are in effect a single operation. NYCDEP is segmenting the various projects at Eastview: WTP, impoundment, parking lots, and NCA are only discussed partially. Connection tunnels, connection of WTP to Shaft no. 19, Connection of Catskill aqueduct, police precinct, vehicle inspection area, UV plant, Catskill/Delaware WTP are not discussed at all. A single, comprehensive EIS must be completed that considers the combined effects of these projects. Further, these effects must be analyzed as part of a Draft EIS, and not presented in the Final (per SEQRA/CEQR). Combined impacts of these projects on rate payers must be explained.	Segmentation applies if pieces of the same project are considered in an environmental assessment separately. This was not the case here. The two large construction projects being considered for the Eastview Site (Croton WTP and Catskill/Delaware UV Facility) are considered separate projects subject to independent decision making. However, since the years in which operations would start are the same, and their potential for environmental impacts may overlap in the study area, the NYCDEP is assessing their combined potential for significant adverse environmental impacts, individually and cumulatively. The other projects mentioned are on different design and construction schedules. In accordance with SEQRA, each project undergoes an environmental review and the cumulative impacts of projects are evaluated to the extent possible. There is not enough specific design and construction information available currently to speculate, much less quantify, When those projects are further along in their design to permit a meaningful environmental assessment, their potential for environmental impacts will be assessed including and acknowledging the various environmental consequences of the actions that have occurred, or are predicted to occur from other NYCDEP, public or private actions as part of the future background conditions. Rehabilitation of the NCA is required regardless of whether the water required filtering or not. The Croton WTP project includes preparing the aqueduct to accommodate the filtered water, i.e., pressurization of the aqueduct. This is therefore not segmentation.	5.21.
Jerome Park Reservoir				
323.	146	Jerome Park Reservoir will be affected if plant is built at Van Cortlandt Park, but not if it's built at Eastview.	Work is required around Jerome Park Reservoir for all site alternatives. If the Eastview Site is selected and the Kensico-City Tunnel is adopted to convey the treated water work at Jerome Park Reservoir would be minimized.	8.2.1.

Item #	Comment Number	Comment	Response	Section Reference
324.	195, 351	The plant should not be built at Jerome Park Reservoir where it will affect people and students during construction. Construction may last for 5-7 years.	The plant will not be built at Jerome Park Reservoir. Construction at Jerome Park Reservoir predominantly would consist of decommissioning and dismantling several of the gate Houses and renovating the others. If the plant is built at the Harlem River Site or Mosholu, tunnels will be dug connecting the WTP to JPR. Tunneling would not produce potential significant long-term adverse noise level increases. However, NYCDEP acknowledges that noise level increases associated with any construction activity may be intrusive and annoying. NYCDEP would make every effort to reduce potential noise level increases by adopting engineering methods for construction that would produce the best combination of reducing the noise that is generated throughout the duration of activity. The connection shaft at Jerome Park Reservoir would be conducted by raised bore drilling technique. This is accomplished by using a machine from the bottom of the tunnel to bore up to the surface. All excavated material would be taken back out the tunnel to the WTP site. NYCDEP is very aware of the sensitive nature of schools in the vicinity of the Jerome Park Reservoir site. In addition, in response to public comment the noisiest work at the Jerome Park Reservoir site will be planned to occur during summers, weekends, and holidays (including school holidays) in order to reduce the effect of construction on nearby schools.	8.2.1. & 9.4.6.2.
325.	291	The Draft SEIS does not mention the impact of construction at the Bx. H.S. of Science.	Please see Section 8.2 of the Draft SEIS. The Draft SEIS does evaluate construction impacts numerous receptors in the vicinity of Jerome Park Reservoir, including the Bronx H.S. of Science.	8.2.3.2.6.
326.	352, 353, 366, 373, 390, 343, 397, 403, 430, 433, 434, 435, 439, 536, 540, 558, 584, 614, 631, 769, 917	High decibel noise from blasting, drilling, and other construction activities will disrupt school activities for years and may have adverse health effects on students and faculty. Schools are not sound-insulated enough to mitigate that level of noise. Sound walls will not mitigate the noise even though the Draft SEIS states that the noise will not constitute an impact.	Tunnels would be dug connecting the Harlem River or Mosholu Site alternatives to the Jerome Park Reservoir. The connection shaft at Jerome Park Reservoir would be conducted by raised bore drilling technique. This is accomplished by using a machine from the bottom of the tunnel to bore up to the surface. Most, if not all, excavated material would be taken back out the tunnel to the WTP site. NYCDEP is very aware of the sensitive nature of schools in the vicinity of the Jerome Park Reservoir site. In addition, in response to public comment the noisiest work at the Jerome Park Reservoir site will be planned to occur during summers, weekends, and holidays (including school holidays) in order to reduce the effect of construction on nearby schools.	8.2.3.2.6. & 9.4.6.2.
327.	344, 345, 386, 613, 615	Dust and dirt will be generated by construction, increasing the numbers of students with serious respiratory diseases. 200 Bx. H.S. students already are on the medical alert list. Schools are not equipped to filter out this level of dust and dirt.	The outside surface work near the Bronx High School of Science is not anticipated to raise much dust. Almost all of the excavation at this site would be done from the below-grade tunnel. The surface work would be like normal street work that supports utility projects throughout the City.	8.2.3.2.5.

Item #	Comment Number	Comment	Response	Section Reference
328.	346, 630	Blasting required to produce an elevator shaft and underground truck tunnel will compromise the stability of the buildings and infrastructures.	Blasting in shafts and tunnels would be very controlled. Many holes, containing sequenced charges weighing less than 5 pounds will be used to break rock in tunnel and shaft blasts. Open rock faces of tunnel and shaft walls would be adequately supported to prevent any ground movement that could impact any nearby structures or utilities.	8.2.3.2.6.
329.	347	Diesel trucks will use this new underground tunnel [at Jerome Park Reservoir] to carry chemical and equipment to the site. Fumes will create a hazard and potential respiratory ailments. Idling trucks will increase noise and pollution.	There would not be a permanent truck tunnel or conveyance for hazardous chemicals. The tunnel would be build to convey drinking water, but of course during construction equipment would be in the tunnel. Air quality must be regulated to protect worker safety within the tunnel. Any combustion equipment that is allowed in the drinking water tunnel would be carefully regulated and restricted and the exposure to the public outside of the tunnel to particulates would be negligible.	8.2.3.2.5.
330.	237, 348	Rats and mice whose habitats are disturbed by construction will seek refuge in nearby buildings, i.e. the local schools and residences.	A rodent control expert was retained by the NYCDEP to evaluate the risk of rats and rodents encroaching on local neighborhoods as a result of construction activities. The Draft SEIS (Public Health sections) describes that the sites in the Bronx are not currently good rodent habitat, so that the proposed activity would not drive rodents off the site and into neighborhoods. The real concern is that rats can be attracted to the debris on a construction site, increasing the existing local rodent population. A rodent control plan would be instituted by NYCDOHMH and supported by NYCDEP.	8.2.3.2.1.
331.	354, 355, 357, 367, 368, 370, 371, 374, 387, 393, 401, 633, 798	There are 25,000 students from DeWitt Clinton, Bx. Science, H.S. of American Studies, and Lehman College in the immediate vicinity of the proposed construction. This construction will not be conducive to learning. This does not reconcile itself with the city's stated intention of raising the quality of NYC education. This construction will ruin that environment. Commuting to and from school through a construction site will be disruptive and unsafe. Redirected traffic will increase the chances of students being hit and will add difficulty in getting to school.	Construction activities at the JPR will be a series of small and discrete projects focusing on the various gate houses already at the site. Much of the work will happen inside the gate houses themselves. Measures will be taken to lessen potential impacts to the area. During the peak construction year approximately 21 construction workers and approximately five trucks would work at the sites around Jerome Park Reservoir on any given weekday.	8.2.3.2.1.
332.	176, 372, 375, 376, 377, 384, 389, 402, 446, 565, 568	Jerome Park Reservoir is a peaceful spot at the heart of a living neighborhood. It is used by the community for recreation, relaxation, joggers, etc. Construction would destroy this important community asset and will disrupt the present tranquility and quality of life of thousands of local residents. The existing train yard is already a distraction that has hurt Bx. Science's reputation. This construction will further damage its appeal for gifted students and its reputation for academic quality. Whatever happens at JPR must be done with the utmost sensitivity.	Construction activities at the JPR will be a series of small and discrete projects focusing on the various gate houses already at the site. Much of the work will happen inside the gate houses themselves. Measures will be taken to mitigate any impacts to lessen project-related effects on the area.	8.2.3.2.

Item #	Comment Number	Comment	Response	Section Reference
333.	385	If anything needs to happen, the Bronx. High School of Science should be expanded as it is already over-crowded and congested.	This is outside the scope of this project.	N/A
334.	388	Blasting may loosen asbestos currently in the Bronx High School of Science.	The intensity of blast-induced motion in all buildings would not exceed 0.5 in/s. Motion of this level is not expected to loosen asbestos or cause any other form of damage or permanent physical changes in the structures. Pre- and post-construction surveys of buildings would be done to quantify any changes to foundations or interior structures.	8.2.3.2.6.
335.	177, 445, 447, 448, 449, 462	Jerome Park Reservoir should be developed as a park and place of recreation for public access. Building in Westchester would allow the Jerome Park Reservoir to be decommissioned and reverted to park land. The City and State must grant park status to Jerome Park Reservoir. Assuring the future of Jerome Park Reservoir must be pivotal in decision of where to site the WTP	Access to the perimeter road would still be problematic if Jerome Park Reservoir is taken off line (i.e. built in Westchester), because the Reservoir would be preserved for emergency use. Public access to the water's edge would be restricted for both public safety and security reasons.	8.2.1.
336.	466	Why is Jerome Park Reservoir being considered for off-site components? What alternatives were considered? There needs to be an environmental review for the work at Gate House No. 5	This information was provided in more detail in the Draft SEIS. In most cases they are existing facilities that are being upgraded, so alternatives are not appropriate. Jerome Park was originally built as the connection point for the entire Croton system because the filtration planned was planned for this site. The water must be conveyed to this point before it can flow to final users in Manhattan and the Bronx, as well as other parts of the City via high pressure connections. Gate House No. 5 is currently used for chemical treatment of the water supply. The proposed future use of this facility for the addition of potassium permanganate to treat the water is consistent with the existing use.	8.2.1.
337.	467	The need for work at Jerome Park Reservoir was not described, nor its relationship to federal requirements and the schedule.	The need for work at Jerome Park Reservoir was described in Section 8 of the Draft SEIS. This section was 188 pages long. Additional descriptions of the need for the various projects around Jerome Park Reservoir and the different level of effort for each WTP alternative will be provided in the Final SEIS.	8.2.1.
<i>New Croton Aqueduct</i>				
338.	24, 40	NYCDEP should fix both the NCA and the Delaware Aqueduct	The Baseline Rehabilitation project would rehabilitate the NCA as a raw water conveyance. If the WTP is built at Eastview then the NCA would be sealed and pressurized. The repair of the Delaware Aqueduct is in planning stages; it depends on having the Croton supply available.	8.1.1.

Item #	Comment Number	Comment	Response	Section Reference
339.	27, 95, 116 293, 504, 577, 595, 596, 953	The NCA is 110 years old, made of brick, and has not been adequately maintained. Contamination and leaks occur along its length. Most of the Croton shut downs were for maintenance and not for bad water. NYCDEP has not done a feasibility study for the NCA, but rather has chosen to filter instead of repairing the NCA. Boston won a court case not to filter by stating that it must fix its aqueducts first. NYCDEP must fix the aqueduct first before considering filtration. Color and odor problems can be the result of a degraded distribution system. The NCA should be lined and sealed along its entire length in order to protect against contaminant infiltration. Many of the water quality, odor, taste, and color issues would be solved this way.	The NCA is designed to allow infiltration. There are no plans to prevent infiltration of groundwater except for one alternative for the Eastview Site alternative that would use the NCA to convey treated water. This alternative would seal and pressurize the aqueduct. The Baseline Rehabilitation project would rehabilitate the NCA as a raw water conveyance but the weep holes would remain.	5.1.2.6.2. & 8.1.1.
340.	90, 91, 92, 292	NYCDEP is negligent in not maintaining the NCA. It is documented that NYCDEP has knowingly used polluted water. And it's suspected this was covered up. Rehabilitation plans are vague. The public can not totally trust the NYCDEP.	The NYC drinking water is tested continuously, and any contamination that exceeds the standards results in a system shutdown as required by the regulations and is immediately reported. Rehabilitation of the NCA is being performed as a separate action. The rehabilitation is required regardless of where or when the WTP is built. For one of the Eastview alternatives, the NCA will be pressurized. Because this scenario is an integral part of WTP construction at Eastview, NCA pressurization was included in the Draft SEIS.	Executive Summary, 2. & 8.1.1.
341.	486	The DSEIS suggests that the NYCDEP does not know what should be done about the NCA (pressurization, rehab, lining, work on shafts).	There are several alternatives under consideration for the future use of the NCA. The siting decision for the Croton WTP will narrow the list of options and lead to a final decision on the NCA. There is a commitment to complete the baseline rehabilitation because that work must be completed regardless of the choice of sites for the WTP.	3.7-10
342.	487	The KCT option is not fully explored. What improvements, if any, would be made to the NCA if the KCT were used to transport Croton water?	If the KCT were used to convey Croton water from the Eastview Site, the NCA would be used to supply some users in Westchester County, it would be available for plant overflows and pump shutdowns, and it would continue to supply Jerome Park Reservoir.	5.1.2.6.2. & 3.8.4.
343.	493	More information is required regarding the amount of water that could be discharged at NCA shaft no. 9. What is the danger to people from this scenario? An alarm should be installed to alert the PD, FD, and community in the case of a discharge.	This discharge is contemplated if the NCA is pressurized and the WTP is built at the Eastview Site. The amount of rise in the water is described in detail in Section 8.1.2.3.1. No structures would be impacted, and the water level in the Pocantico Rive where the public has access would increase over a period of several minutes; allowing people along the banks of the river to leave. The area immediately around the blow-off outlet at Carl's Brook is in NYCDEP property and is already restricted.	8.1.2.3.1.
344.	494	No details are provided in relation to work at NCA no. 10	The EAS for NCA Baseline Rehabilitation will discuss proposed work at NCA Shaft No. 10. The pressurization work as part of the Eastview construction does not include substantial work at Shaft No. 10.	8.1.1.

Item #	Comment Number	Comment	Response	Section Reference
345.	701	The DSEIS does not address how filtration will solve problem of contamination within the NCA. According to NYCDEP, raw water quality is important as it can't remove oil-based (and other) contaminants. A plan for NCA rehabilitation is not presented in the NCA.	Filtration is quite effective at removing oil-based solvents. There has been a lot of planning around this issue. The NYCDEP produced a document entitled <i>Plan for the Protection of Treated Water in the New Croton Aqueduct</i> in 2001. This is the basis for deciding that the aqueduct would need to be pressurized to carry treated water.	2.2.
346.	682, 721	The Draft SEIS should include work completed to prevent infiltration in the NCA and how much this will prevent contamination. Documentary evidence suggests infiltration poses a greater threat to Croton water quality than the reservoir system. We cannot evaluate the need for the project before the infiltration threat is taken care of. No serious discussion of how and when the NCA will be upgraded is provided.	See the preceding response. Infiltration into an untreated distribution system is a serious risk. Filtration of the water largely mitigates this risk.	2.2.
347.	853	The NCA work including lining must be explained.	This work is described in Section 5.1.6.2 of the Draft SEIS, Treated Water Conveyance, Eastview Site.	5.1.6.2.
Miscellaneous				
348.	669	The Final SEIS should commit to naming a community ombudsman available and accessible for inquiries and complaints from neighborhood residents regarding any and all environmental and quality of life issues that may arise during plant construction.	NYCDEP has instituted quality of life commitments and community feedback and communication into its contract specifications. The Construction Manager and Resident Engineer will be responsible for meeting all commitments made to the community. The 311 City communication line will funnel inquiries directly to the NYCDEP community affairs office, which is charged with being responsive to the public. In addition, a Facilities Monitoring Committee, with representation of the Bronx Borough President's Office, Community Boards, and NYCDPR will meet monthly or as needed to resolve issues. NYCDEP is also committing to an air and noise inspector with the responsibility for monitoring the construction related activities at the site.	Out of Scope of Final SEIS
349.	51, 54	The pictures in the Draft SEIS are inadequate. There's no way to know what you're doing, where and how you're doing it.	The Draft SEIS has many illustrations that are intended to communicate the plans as best as possible.	Universal
350.	61	The appendices contain 22,000 pages of material. The public review period is not long to review this material.	The review period was consistent with CEQR requirements.	CEQR Manual
351.	81, 82	Watershed protection should be the primary goal. But if the plant must be built, building it in NYC will cut off people living in upper Westchester from receiving filtered and clean water. This would be catastrophic for upstate water users.	The primary goal of the SEIS is to analyze the potential impacts of the alternative WTP sites in order to make a decision about the best site for the WTP. One of the impacts of the siting decision is that if the preferred site is in the Bronx, upstate users of Croton water would continue to receive unfiltered Croton water, as they do today.	2.4.1.
352.	83, 93,	Comments made by the public must be really acted upon and not just merely responded to. The NYCDEP must have a more open door policy. There is no regional approach to planning.	This Response to Comments lists numerous specific actions that will be included in the Final SEIS. NYCDEP tries to be as open as possible.	Universal