

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO THE DGEIS

I. WRITTEN COMMENTS:

**A. GARY P. MOSTERT, SUPERINTENDENT
LATHAM WATER DISTRICT
312 WOLF ROAD
LATHAM, NEW YORK 12110**

February 27, 1989

1. Comment:

Page 17-Paragraph 3

Reference made to replace existing tank should read, "An additional standpipe with minimum of 1.0 MG will be necessary."

Response:

Page 17-Paragraph 3 of the DGEIS has been modified accordingly. A copy of the revised Page 17 is included in Appendix 1 of the FGEIS.

2. Comment:

Page II-84-4. Water:

The factor of two (2) is based on actual demand, not computed demand.

Response:

Page II-84 of the DGEIS has been modified accordingly. A copy of the revised page II-84 is included in Appendix 1 of the FGEIS.

3. Comment:

Page II-85- c. Storage:

Reference made to replace existing tank should read, "An additional standpipe with minimum of 1.0 MG will be necessary."

Response:

Page II-85 of the DGEIS has been modified accordingly. A copy of the revised page II-85 is included in Appendix 1 of the FGEIS.

4. Comment:

Page II-91- Math Error

$506,248 \times 3.35 = 1,695,930$

Response:

Page II-91 of the DGEIS has been modified accordingly. A copy of the revised page II-91 is included in Appendix 1 of the FGEIS.

5. Comment:

Page II-93- Math Error

$506,248 \times 3.35 = 1,695,930$

Response:

Page II-93 of the DGEIS has been modified accordingly. A copy of the revised page II-93 is included in Appendix 1 of the FGEIS.

B. BERTHA M. GOLAN
1060 LOUDON ROAD
COHOES, NEW YORK

February 16, 1989

1. Comment:

Water supply: At the present time, water is taken from the Mohawk River and the Town reservoir. Given the scenario outlined in the recommendations, we may face water shortages and dangerously low levels in the Mohawk if a new supply of water is not concurrently arranged as the new developments are built. Pure water is a precious commodity; we in the Northeast take it for granted. We must plan ahead and consider some "worst-case scenarios" like serious droughts and dropping of the water tables.

Response:

As indicated in the DGEIS, for the 20 year planning period, it is projected that water usage will increase by ± 1.4 MGD. This is the equivalent to an average flow reduction in the Mohawk River of ± 3 CFS. The gauging station at the Vischer Ferry Dam west of the Latham Water District Mohawk View Filtration Plant indicates that for 4 years of record, the average daily

flow on the Mohawk River was ± 6200 CFS. While there are no anticipated impacts from drawing additional water from the Mohawk River, as indicated in the DGEIS, the Latham Water District would have to apply to the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation for an increase in water usage.

2. **Comment:**

Drainage: Roads do not absorb water. The Boght area, as recognized by the report, presents some serious drainage problems even without the addition of more roads. I do not believe the drainage measures outlined in the report will be sufficient to avoid flooding in certain areas, particularly the newly developed housing area.

Response:

As part of the detailed engineering review for subdivision and site plans proposed within the study area, the Town will ensure that all future development is consistent with current Town of Colonie stormwater management requirements. This, in conjunction with a capital improvement plan for the construction of centralized detention within the study area, will ensure adequate stormwater management for future development.

3. **Comment:**

Sewage: Little or no consideration has been given to improvements or new additions to the sewage system. Surely the addition of homes as well as proposed office complexes is going to be a sizeable strain on the existing infrastructure. Steps should be taken at the onset of construction rather than after the fact when the community faces major problems and major repair.

Response:

Extensive discussions of existing and future projected conditions of sanitary sewers and treatment for the study area is provided in Section II-H, Utilities, of the DGEIS. Specifically, during planning period 1 there were no identified improvements necessary. During planning period 2 the Town Of Colonie Pure Waters Department indicated that ± 4000 LF of the Salt Kill/Dry River Trunk Sewer east of Lansing Lane may need to be upgraded.

For the purposes of the DGEIS, it was assumed that developers will be responsible for installation of sanitary sewers within their project boundaries. A capital improvement plan may be developed by the Town to ensure the Salt Kill/Dry River Trunk Sewer improvements are made as development warrants.

4. **Comment:**

Traffic Management: This is the area of greatest concern to me personally. I live on Route 9 and lost footage on my front yard when Route 9 was widened some twenty years ago. I cannot believe anyone would propose to construct a six-lane highway in an area zoned commercial/residential...I cannot understand the reasoning behind the proposal to widen Route 9...We need to develop more municipal transportation, such as a Park and Ride facility.

Response:

Widening of Route 9 to 6 lanes by the year 2009, as identified on Exhibit II-G-12 of the DGEIS, is not a proposal by the Town. The recommendation is a projection of what improvements would be necessary to maintain existing levels of service and capacity related to future potential development identified on Exhibit II-B-3 of the DGEIS.

There are 5 potential alternatives the Town could pursue in regard to future conditions on Route 9. These are discussed below.

One alternative would be to construct 6 lanes on Route 9 to meet the projected traffic in the study area as specified in the DGEIS. This would ensure future levels of service and capacity which would be consistent with current conditions. However, this would impact many residential and commercial properties to the point where they may no longer be habitable.

A second alternative would be to implement reduced levels of improvement on Route 9, which could include turning lanes and shoulder improvements. This would mitigate some traffic impacts associated with projected future

development. However, traffic delays, when compared to current conditions, would increase. The Town Board would have to make a policy determination of what level of service would be acceptable so an appropriate transportation mitigation plan could be developed. This alternative would reduce the impacts to residential and commercial properties along the corridor.

The third alternative for consideration by the Town would be the implementation of Transportation Systems Management (TSM) techniques as specified on pages II-66 to II-77 of the DGEIS. These techniques include ride-sharing, variable work hour programs and/or transit programs.

To ensure that 6 lanes would not be needed on Route 9 to maintain current levels of service and capacity, TSM techniques would have to reduce projected 2009 traffic by 30%. Implementation of these techniques will effectively reduce other improvements necessary within the study area. Therefore, if they are implemented, a reevaluation of potential roadway improvements should be conducted.

A fourth alternative for consideration is the reevaluation of allowable land use density within the study area. Allowable land use densities would have to be reduced to the point where there was a 30% decrease in projected 2009 traffic to eliminate the need for a 6-lane highway. Altering densities would have the same effect as implementing TSM techniques, (ie., reduce the level of Route 9 improvements,) and would reduce other necessary roadway improvements within the study area. If allowable land use densities are reduced, potential roadway improvements should be reevaluated along with additional mitigation measures proposed for other areas addressed in the DGEIS (utilities, stormwater, municipal services, etc.).

The final alternative would be to allow development to occur as per the projections in the DGEIS without implementation of the additional travel lanes to Route 9. This approach would not facilitate cumulative traffic impact review and comprehensive mitigation implementation. Development proposals would be reviewed on a project by project basis and only direct impacts would be identified. Implementation of this alternative would result in increased traffic delays along the Route 9 corridor.

C. **MR. HARRY HOWANSKY & MRS. ARLENE HOWANSKY**
145 BOGHT ROAD
WATERVLIET, NEW YORK

February 24, 1989

1. **Comment:**

Our Comments are directed solely at the recommended decisions regarding the traffic problems at the intersection of Haswell Road, Boght Road and Elm Street.

We have lived at that intersection since 1961 and have over those years observed the increase in traffic and the accelerated rate at which accidents have occurred. We have seen the horrible results, have called the police and ambulance, and have literally, on occasion, even mopped up the blood.

The report concludes that the rate of accidents occurring (of a particular type by State D.O.T. definition) does not justify any additional traffic controls beyond the existing stop signs on Haswell Road going east and on Elm Street going west.

The report further suggests that clearing sight obstruction is the real need. We are not transportation and traffic experts, but our "on-the-scene" experience tells us that those recommendations are not sufficient to improve or lower the accident rate at that corner. Drivers violating the stop signs cause most of the accidents. But the accident severity is greatly increased by the drivers exceeding the speed limit while traveling north and south through the intersection. We strongly feel that when traffic control is finally implemented, it must cause a reduced speed while approaching the intersection. Our personal opinion is that a full traffic control signal will do that but it is according to the report not warranted. We do not feel that a flashing caution will accomplish an improvement because most of the accidents occurring there involve local people who grow accustomed to the situation and will ignore it. We also feel that laying blame in such an accident is difficult and often the real offender is not punished.

In our opinion, that is not however true in relationship to violating a stop sign. We would recommend a four-way stop for the intersection. This we believe would get greater respect by drivers and even if an accident occurred because a driver violated a full stop, chances are that the driver slowed down considerably in approaching the intersection. The slow down itself will cause less severe damage to humans and equipment.

Response:

The installation of a four-way stop control at an unsignalized intersection should be considered when traffic volumes from all approaches are approximately equal and when there is a significant delay of vehicles entering the intersection. Neither of these two conditions are satisfied at the Boght Road/Haswell Road intersection. To arbitrarily interrupt through traffic by causing it to stop results in a high incidence of intentional violation and when vehicles do stop, speeds are often higher between intersections to make up for lost time. In addition, the introduction of a stop sign on a through street such as Boght Road would cause motorists to stop unexpectedly creating the potential for rear-end accidents.

D. RUDOLPH NADEAU
RD #1 JOHN STREET
COHOES, NEW YORK

March 10, 1989

1. Comment:

I am writing regarding the proposed change of Route 9. I have lived in Boght Corners for many years and object to making Route 9 wider. It makes no sense to have six lanes in Boght Corners and two lanes in Loudonville. I do not feel it is necessary. It will only increase the traffic. It will make access to side roads very difficult and very dangerous. I also object to the noise it will create.

Response:

See Comment I, B, 4, Bertha M. Golan, February 16, 1989.

**E. FRANK AND BEVERLY PAWLOWS
1058 NEW LOUDON ROAD
COHOES, NEW YORK**

March 10, 1989

1. Comment:

We, the landowners, feel we will be the losers when the development in the Boght area begins. We feel we have no choice in losing our land frontage. Developers will profit, we will not...We do understand this desirable undeveloped land is very desirable to development also. What we can't understand is the additional two lanes to be added onto Route 9. Not only does it devalue our homes, but the added traffic on the highway will create a higher noise level just outside our window. Expanding the Northway would be a more reasonable project...We don't feel we should be on the losing end while the newcomers will gain all that we once considered our happy neighborhood.

Response:

In regard to additional lanes on Route 9 see Comment I, B, 4, Bertha M. Golan, February 16, 1989.

Improvement to the Northway as suggested in the above comment would not alleviate the need for the additional lanes suggested in the DGEIS. While "pass through traffic" will account for 20% of the overall traffic in 2009, the majority of additional traffic will result from development within the study area. However, as indicated in Comment I, B, 4, construction of additional lanes on Route 9 is one of five alternatives regarding traffic improvements in the study area.

F. JANE G. KELLY
P.O. BOX 386
LATHAM, NEW YORK

March 13, 1989

1. Comment:

I, Jane G. Kelly, residing at 1055 Loudon Road, RD #1, Box 299, Cohoes, New York 12047 wish to file a disagreement against widening Route 9...from four lanes to six lanes.

I wish to be notified of any meeting held in this matter.

Response:

See Comment I, B, 4 Bertha M. Golan. February 16, 1989.

G. CLAUDE CHARLBOIS
18 ROOSEVELT AVENUE
GLENS FALLS, NEW YORK

March 13, 1989

1. Comment:

Curb Cuts: The study recommends limiting curb cuts along some roadways. How can the Town deny a property owner access to a roadway along the frontage of his property?

Response:

The Town would not prohibit access to a person's property. However, the Town does have the authority to implement requirements such as: combined access for abutting lands; increased minimum lot frontages on critical roadways; where possible, require new lots to access secondary roads as access to primary roads; and requiring the construction of service roads or internal secondary roadway systems.

2. Comment:

Storm Detention Maintenance: The study recommends ongoing payments to the Town for maintenance of stormwater detention facilities constructed during the course of developing one's property. How can the Town justify assessing the original owner/developer, 5-10 years after development, for ongoing maintenance of these facilities? Fairness aside, is it practical to rely on revenue from someone who may not be associated with the locale?

Response:

Costs associated with stormwater management as indicated in Section II, F, Surface Water & Drainage, Section II, M, Economics and Appendix 3 of the DGEIS, are related to capital improvements. On-going maintenance after construction is not included. These costs would be absorbed through the Town's general tax fund. As noted in the DGEIS, maintenance of centralized facilities is more cost effective when compared to maintenance of scattered individual management areas.

3. **Comment:**

Schools: The study recommends construction of additional schools. Is this recommendation based on a temporary "blip" in the number of school aged children? Schools have recently been closed in the Town. Alternative solutions should be thoroughly explored prior to assessing tax payers and/or property owners who wish to develop their land via impact fees, for school building that may stand empty in 10 years.

Response:

It should be noted that the need for construction of additional schools by the North Colonie Central School District was a result of the review of projected population for the 1999 planning period.

At the present time, as indicated in Section II, M, Economics of the DGEIS, impact fees are not a legal mechanism in New York State for collecting monies for improvements associated with new development. Therefore, under current New York State Law, the Town has no authority to collect or administer monies generated by new development for school capital improvement costs. However, through the planning process the Town does have the authority to reserve lands needed for future school locations. Fair market value must be provided to owners of any land deemed necessary for future school development.

4. Comment:

Impact Fees: How will the Town address the legality of impact fees assessed to property owners/developers, in light of current ruling by the New York State judiciary?

In 1987, the Town changed the zoning in the R-2 districts increasing minimum lot sizes by 50%. Please tell me how this "penalty" was taken into consideration or will be considered when new penalty or "impact fees" are levied.?

Response:

As indicated in Comment 3 above and in Section II, M, Economics of the DGEIS, currently impact fees are not a legal mechanism in New York State for collecting monies for improvements associated with new development.

H. JON A. BRANDER
1042 NEW LOUDON ROAD
COHOES, NEW YORK

March 13, 1989

1. Comment:

I am writing to you to comment about the proposed widening of Route 9 from Columbia Street to Boght Road as described in the Boght Road GEIS. I live on that section of Route 9, and any widening of the road will make my house unlivable and significantly reduce the value of my property. My wife and I have lived there for over ten years and have worked hard to improve and upgrade our house, making it more livable and valuable. Any changes in the width of Route 9 will negate all of our work. In addition, we and most of our neighbors would lose almost all of the trees in our front yard, further reducing any screening from the increased traffic.

Response:

See Comment I, B, 4 Bertha M. Golan, February 16, 1989.

2. Comment:

I have read through the entire document and am appalled at the callous disregard for the current residents in our part of the Town. We rated approximately one line of consideration from the authors, to the effect that taking away our property would have a significant impact on those living there. Most of the people in our neighborhood have lived there longer than we have (many for 20-30 years), paying taxes all the while. You now propose to run roughshod over us and destroy our neighborhood for the sake of development. To add insult to injury, we all know that our taxes will increase to pay for all of the improvements needed, despite what was written in the report about the possibility of the developers funding them.

It seems to me that the Planning Board has its priorities reversed - your responsibility is to the current residents and taxpayers, not to the developers and future residents. Rather than approaching the problem from the viewpoint of letting development occur and then upgrading the infrastructure to meet the new needs, you ought to look at it from the opposite side - given the current infrastructure, state of development and likely financial resources available, how much development should be allowed? You should not expect current residents to bear the burden of increased traffic and noise virtually at their front door, having their property devalued, and then expect them to pay the bill through increased taxes. Note that I am not saying that development should be stopped, but that it should be controlled in a responsible fashion for the benefit of all. The current plan does not even come close to meeting this goal.

Response:

As indicated in the DGEIS, the purpose of the study was to evaluate growth in the study area for the 10 and 20 year planning periods. The Town and its consultant evaluated several residential and commercial development alternatives and chose ones that were most reasonable based on past growth trends and projected future growth trends.

This study was undertaken to evaluate growth, potential impacts and necessary actions to mitigate those impacts. As a result of the DGEIS, the Town has a perspective on the level of mitigation required. Now the Town has the information to pursue a course of action consistent with Town goals and policies. For example, as specified in Comment I, B, 4, five alternate scenarios for Route 9 improvements have been identified. Ultimately the findings statement prepared by the Town for the project will identify the chosen course of action based on weighing of residents concerns along with its consistency regarding the general Town goals and policies.

In conclusion, the DGEIS was prepared by the Town as a planning tool, rather than a proposal or plan indicating how future development will

occur. It is to be used as a barometer to quantify future conditions and allow educated decisions by the policy makers in the Town.

3. **Comment:**

I also question whether widening Route 9 will provide a long term solution to the traffic problem. As people in California have found out, once you improve a road more people tend to use it and the new road usually fills to capacity quickly. Usually, all you do is delay the problem for a few years, not solve it. One possible solution would be to improve public transportation in the area. With such a large concentration of businesses and homes in the area, it could be a practical alternative, on which was given short shrift in the GEIS.

Response:

As indicated in Comment I, B, 4 and in Section II, G, Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the DGEIS, public transportation is one alternative to widening Route 9 to six lanes.

4. **Comment:**

As I mentioned earlier, I took the time to read the entire GEIS, and I have found a number of errors, and inconsistencies that lead me to questions the information in the rest of the document. For example, in the section about the terrains and soils in the Boght area, one map shows our house in an area with one grade, while a second map shows the grade being twice as steep. The section on historical sites refers to the Witbeck house on Route 9 at the Route 7 interchange. Obviously the authors never took the time to visit the site, because the house was removed when the interchange was built. Was this information just copied from the EIS for the interchange? If so, what other shortcuts were taken in preparing the Boght Road GEIS? These might seem like minor points, but such errors plant a seed of doubt in my mind and lead me to questions the validity of the conclusions.

Response:

In regard to the discrepancy about the slopes, existing mapping was utilized for the exhibits noted in the comment above. Due to the scale of mapping (1" = 2000') there may be minor discrepancies when evaluating particular individual sites. The exhibits were included in the DGEIS to present overall conditions within the study area.

In regard to the Witbeck House, it was removed when the Route 7 interchange was constructed. It is also true that an individual site visit and inventory of each identified site was not conducted. New York State Office of Parks and Recreation & Historic Preservation files were utilized to compile the list of historic structures. Even though structures may not currently occupy their original sites, it is valuable from an historic perspective to identify those previously occupied sites for future archaeological study, if appropriate. As specified on page II-108 of the DGEIS, "other sensitive locations include areas where structures have been identified but are no longer standing".

5. **Comment:**

Finally, I want to complain about the way in which this planning is being done. Neither I nor any of my neighbors to whom I have spoken have ever received any notification from the Planning Board about any of the meetings concerning the Boght Road GEIS. I don't know whether you are legally bound to mail advance notices to the residents in the immediate area, but it would seem to me to be the correct way to do things considering the impact this plan will have on our lives.

Response:

The progress of the Boght Road - Columbia Street DGEIS was consistently discussed at Public Planning Board meetings. On July 12, 1988, at its regularly scheduled meeting, the Planning Board passed a motion that the cumulative impact of development in the Boght Road - Columbia Street Area may have a significant effect on the environment and that a DGEIS be prepared. The secretary of the Boght Community Action Group was in attendance at this meeting.

At the October 18, 1988 Planning Board Meeting, Clough, Harbour & Associates was authorized to initiate lead agency status in accordance with SEQRA. A scoping session was held at the Town of Colonie Engineering Services Department, November 15, 1988 at 9:00 A.M., to discuss issues to be included as part of the DGEIS. Written notices were sent to all identified involved agencies. In addition, a general notice dated November 3, 1988, along with the proposed scoping document was circulated to a number of interested groups including the Eastern Latham Neighborhood Association, The Old Loudon Road Neighborhood Association and the Boght Community Action Group. The session was attended by 17 people including 2 people from the Boght Community Action Group. The scoping session was also discussed at the Planning Board Meeting held that same evening.

At its November 22, 1988 meeting, the Planning Board declared itself lead agency for the DGEIS. Subsequently it issued a positive declaration at the November 29, 1988 Planning Board Meeting.

On February 7, 1989, at its regularly scheduled meeting, the Planning Board accepted the DGEIS as complete. At this time the document became available for public review and comment. Although optional under Section 617.9 of SEQRA, the Board adopted a motion to hold a public hearing on March 2, 1988. The document was made available for public review at the library. The public comment period ran from February 7, 1989 to March 13, 1989, longer than the 30 day comment period required by SEQRA.

A legal notice was published in the Times Union, February 14, 1988 advertising the date and location of the SEQRA public hearing. This notice was published in a newspaper of general circulation in the area of potential impacts and effects of the action, more than 14 days in advance of the public hearing as required under part 617.8 of SEQRA.

The public hearing held March 2, 1989 at the Town Hall was attended by residents, developers and other concerned citizens.

I. **MR. & MRS. DAVID BENAMATI
1 LANDOR LANE
COHOES, NEW YORK**

March 8, 1989

1. **Comment:**

In regard to the widening of Route 9 through our Boght Community, it is in our estimation a very bad idea. This is not a thoroughfare but a small community. It is a residential area.

It would be much too dangerous for the residents who live off this Route 9, who have to come onto this roadway from their driveways. Besides enough of our residential property has already been taken away from our homes in regard to highways.

Please do all in your power to keep Route 9 through our Boght Community a four (4) lane highway as is.

Response:

See Comment I, B, 4, Bertha M. Golan, February 16, 1989 and Comment I, H, 2, Jon A. Brander, March 13, 1989.

J. **CAPITAL DISTRICT TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
JOHN P. POORMAN, STAFF DIRECTOR
5 COMPUTER DRIVE WEST
ALBANY, NEW YORK**

March 13, 1989

1. **Comment:**

As an interested SEQRA agency, the CDTC staff has reviewed the traffic element of the draft GEIS for the Boght area and offers the following

comments for possible discussion with the consultant for the study. It appears that the estimated growth in "background" traffic levels on the major highway (Route 9) through the Boght area is somewhat low in view of the fact that Route 9 traffic is heavily influenced by through traffic and in view of continuing growth in commuting between Saratoga and Albany counties.

- a. The use of a higher background growth rate is supported by a review of traffic counts compiled by CHA and the NYSDOT (attached). Between 1978 and 1988 average daily traffic on Route 9 increased by 3.2 percent; and in the period 1978-83 prior to completion of new Route 7, growth averaged over 4.0 percent annually. It should be noted that very little development occurred in the Boght area during this time.
- b. The significant pressure for new development in southern Saratoga County together with likely Northway congestion (LOS E expected within the planning horizon for the GEIS if current growth continues) points to continuation of current 3-4 percent traffic growth on Route 9 short-term and at least 2 percent long-term without significant Boght development.
- c. To account for variability and uncertainty in long-term background traffic growth rates, we suggest that a range in growth rates be used. One way to do this would be to test the sensitivity of highway improvements proposed under the GEIS to determine the adequacy of proposed improvements to support higher thru-traffic originating in or destined for areas to the north of the GEIS study area.

Response:

The New York State Department of Transportation Region One Planning Department was contacted during the preliminary stages of the traffic analysis to help determine a background growth rate to be used over the twenty year planning period. Although traffic volumes on state highways have increased 3-5 percent, NYSDOT could identify no real growth trends resulting from construction in the area over the past several years. Therefore, it was agreed that a background growth rate of two percent per year over the next twenty years would give an upper limit of traffic growth for the study area.

While a range of growth rates could be used to test the sensitivity of highway improvements by providing a range of possible future conditions, the accepted methodology for this study was based on a worst case scenario of the two planning periods, 1999 & 2009 to meet the requirements of SEQRA.

It was felt that providing on analyses of short term (1999) and long term (2009) roadway improvement needs would provide the Town of Colonie with the base information to evaluate the level of roadway improvements necessary for a reasonable growth scenario.

K. ARMAND MARION
454 BAKER AVENUE
COHOES, NEW YORK

March 9, 1989

1. Comment:

At this time, I wish to bring to your attention Section II, F Surface Water and Drainage pp 34-41 of the report. As noted on page 35, Area 5, which encompasses my residence contains 1,093 acres with "surface water flow draining into a tributary with no major detention facilities." This unnamed tributary crosses my property and, where my driveway crosses the tributary, the tributary flows through a 3 foot diameter steel culvert approximately 20 feet in length.

Historically, during periods of a heavy thunderstorm and/or spring thaw, we have routinely experienced water flow which strains the capacity of the culvert. Occasionally (usually during a spring thaw), the culvert cannot accommodate water flow resulting in flooding of upstream lands, a 6 foot increase in water depth and overflow of the tributary onto my driveway and lawn. On one occasion, the water reached to within 20 feet of my residence.

Section II-F of the report addresses the impact of increased stormwater flows resulting from development plans in my area and details runoff under existing and proposed conditions. As derived from Exhibit II-F-2, peak 5 year storm drainage in Area 5 is projected to increase 4.9% assuming a 1999 buildout and 80.5% assuming a 2009 buildout.

I am concerned that as the Town considers a stormwater plan for Area 5, it strive to limit peak surface drainage flow in Area 5 to current levels or below. Further, it is critical for the Town to implement improvements both necessary and critical in the lower reaches of the drainage area in order for such area to accommodate potential increased drainage. Although various stormwater management techniques can be applied, including those aimed at water detention with upstream conveyance facilities as well as certain recharge techniques, I am firmly convinced because of my experience over the years that the existing culvert through which this drainage must pass at best is barely adequate.

It is critical for the Town to accurately assess proposed surface drainage in order to assure me that any Town approved upstream development and/or upstream stormwater management techniques will not result in water flow which cannot be handled by the existing 3 foot diameter culvert. Otherwise, the Town must agree that, as part of any approved upstream

development and/or implementation of any upstream storm water management techniques, it include in Town plans a replacement of the existing culvert with a larger capacity culvert or culverts.

Since the replacement of the existing culvert with that of a larger capacity requires the Town to have access to private property, I can assure you that I will cooperate with the Town in every reasonable way in order to accomplish the desired result. Should the Town deem the existing culvert adequate, I insist that at any time in the future during or after completion of Town approved upstream development, the Town be held responsible if the existing culvert proves to be inadequate to handle future actual drainage. Further, the Town will at its own expense take appropriate action at such time and make necessary remedies to ensure that the culvert is replaced with that of suitable size so that flooding on my property will not occur.

I trust that the Town will give serious consideration to the topic of surface drainage and to the replacement of the existing culvert on my property with that of a larger capacity.

Response:

The technical assessment of surface water and drainage in the DGEIS was a generic evaluation of drainage within the study area. Its purpose was to identify, at a conceptual level, the applicability of centralized stormwater management facilities which, from a construction and maintenance standpoint, are more desirable than project specific facilities. Included as a main component of the study was an identification of strategic locations for centralized structures and base line cost estimates for acquiring, constructing and providing conveyance to those facilities.

The assessment was not prepared as a final engineering design document. Therefore, it did not include the level of engineering analysis for specific parameters within each watershed which would be necessary for facility construction, ie., existing pipe sizes and capacities. Prior to implementation and construction of the stormwater management recommendations identified in the DGEIS, the Town will prepare detailed engineering analyses and design plans for each watershed within the study area.

L. WARREN E. COOK
1000 LOUDON ROAD
COHOES, NEW YORK

March 3, 1989

1. Comment:

Since we had heard - through "the grapevine" that a "secret" meeting was to be held on March 2nd we attempted to obtain verification - Town Hall that afternoon -

- A. There was no notice on the the bulletin board.
- B. The receptionist told us that, "There is no meeting scheduled tonight."
- C. Two secretaries and their two department heads denied knowledge of any meeting, but, asked that we return and advise them if we learn that there is to be a meeting.
- D. The janitor on duty denied knowledge of any scheduled meeting.
- E. On our way out we were overtaken by another person who had overheard our various inquiries. This person confirmed that there was in fact a meeting scheduled.
- F. Both you and Kevin DeLaughter advanced that the Times Union "ran a notice" last month about a meeting. Now, it's fact, the Times Union will give good coverage to murder, rape, vandalism and errant policemen in Colonie; but, unless the story includes Wolf Road, it's buried. They are based in Colonie, but prefer to give full coverage to the hill Towns, Guilderland and other outlying areas. While they sometimes acknowledge the Town of Colonie, they ignore Latham, and it seems, have never heard of Boght - the provincial residents of Boght belong to St. Mary's parish, receive their mail from Cohoes, and read all about Clum's Corners, Hoosick Falls and Petersburg in the Troy paper. The Record has never heard about Latham, or the Boght area either.

Response:

See Comment I,H,5, Jon A. Brander, March 13, 1989.

2. Comment:

The professional engineering firm did a fine job outlining their proposals - from sewers, schools, utilities, etc, to traffic. They did not give any rationale for their proposal to build another road to Cohoes. Why is this needed? And, if needed, why does it cross Route 9? And, intersect with Dunsbach Ferry Road?

Response:

All traffic improvements identified in the DGEIS were based on the assumption that future traffic conditions after projected development should be consistent with current traffic conditions (level of service and capacity). As indicated on pages II-57 through II-58 of the DGEIS, "The construction of a new roadway connecting Vliet Street in Cohoes directly to Route 9 will provide additional east-west access in the northern portion of the study area. This new roadway is intended to serve the projected development anticipated in this area as well as directing traffic from Columbia Street where it intersects with Route 9."

Specifically, the Vliet Street Extension would be necessary to ensure that existing east-west roadways in the study area (Boght Road, Columbia Street) have levels of service and capacity similar to current roadway conditions.

**M. MR. & MRS. S. FRYDEL
566 BOGHT ROAD
COHOES, NEW YORK**

March 6, 1989

1. Comment:

I have been at the meeting of 3/2/89 and Clough, Harbour & Associates brought up on maps about a road from Vliet Street to Dunsbach Ferry Road. Now this road seems to me that it might be going through my property. I would like to know if there will be a road from my property to get on this road from either side as you will cut my property in half.

Response:

At this time the Vliet Street Extension is one of the potential mitigation measures for accommodating the increased traffic that could occur in the Boght Road area. As a result, the location of this extension shown on Exhibit II-G-11 of the DGEIS is conceptual. The specific alignment would not be determined until such time as the Town determined the extension

became necessary and alignment alternatives were studied. In addition, please refer to the response to Comment I, L, 2. Warren E. Cook, March 3, 1989.

2. Comment:

As widening the Route 9 in the Boght Corners area to six lanes will cause more traffic problems...

Response:

See Comment I, B, 4, Bertha M. Golan, February 16, 1989.

N. MR. PAUL LANDOR SR.
6 LANDOR LANE
COHOES, NEW YORK

March 13, 1989

1. Comment:

In regards to the sum of \$2,000 being paid for a building permit for any development in this Boght Area. I firmly oppose this or any other sum similar to this being charged to residents building a single family home or some small business establishment.

Response:

The DGEIS has identified costs associated with maintaining and upgrading services to adequately serve the potential projected development in the Boght Road - Columbia Street study area. These costs were then distributed amongst projected development to determine residential and commercial mitigation costs on a per lot and square foot basis respectively. The development mitigation costs will apply to all new development within the study area.

The Town should develop a policy regarding the implementation of the mechanism to collect any necessary development mitigation costs. Several funding options are available. The Town has determined that they have the authority under SEQRA to collect identified development mitigation costs. These development mitigation costs would be applied to all

developments and would be utilized to fund necessary capital improvements identified in the DGEIS.

Towns in New York State currently do not have the legal authority to collect impact fees at this time. However, if Towns are granted this authority, the implementation of impact fees would be considered.

2. **Comment:**

I am very much opposed to the widening of Route 9 between Boght Corners and Route 7 - Route 9 interchange to six lanes. The conditions are not the same here that exist at Wolf Road. Wolf Road has the Northway at the north to empty traffic onto and Central Avenue at the south end to empty traffic onto. The whole section is commercial, while the Boght area is one family, residential.

Response:

See written Comment I, B, 4, Bertha M. Golan, February 16, 1989.

O. **MR. LEONARD B. TREMBLEY**
499 COLUMBIA STREET
COHOES, NEW YORK

March 13, 1989

1. **Comment:**

Not taken into consideration, even though it is not in the Town of Colonie, is housing growth in the west side of the City of Cohoes. Presently, there are over 50 houses planned for the Columbia Street area. This could add significant amount of traffic to an already congested area.

Response:

The DGEIS projected traffic volume for roadways within the study area through both planning periods. Page II-54 of the DGEIS indicates that 80 percent of the projected traffic increase on study area roadways can be attributed to anticipated development within the study area. The remaining 20 percent of the projected growth can be attributed to factors such as development outside the study area and general increase in car ownership.

2. Comment:

With all the new homes and businesses, additional traffic makes for a dangerous (already dangerous) situation. These new homes will more than likely be occupied by young couples who will probably have children. With a lot of traffic and children, this will make very hazardous conditions. Two possible solutions are a) sidewalks or b) these developments be restricted to local traffic only.

Response:

The Town of Colonie Planning Board will consider the installation of sidewalks in subdivisions on a project by project basis. If sidewalks are considered warranted, they will be incorporated into the site design of the specific project.

3. Comment:

Set the fee for building lots at \$5,000 per lot. If someone can afford a \$150,000 home, they can afford an additional \$5,000. Or a sliding scale schedule could be implemented as follows:

a. up to \$100,000/lot	\$2,000 fee
b. up to \$125,000/lot	\$3,000 fee
c. up to \$150,000/lot	\$4,000 fee
d. up to \$175,000/lot	\$5,000 fee
e. up to \$200,000/lot	\$6,000 fee
f. over \$200,000/lot	\$7,000 fee

Response:

See response to Comment I, N, 1. Mr. Paul Landor Sr., March 13, 1989.

4. Comment:

I do not live on Route 9 in the effected area but I have to side with those people who are against the widening of the section of road targeted as six lane highway.

Response:

See Comment I, B, 4, Bertha M. Golan, February 16, 1989.

5. **Comment:**

In addition, before the report is finalized, the Town should hold another hearing to report how the comments are supposed to be included in the report.

Response:

Part 617.8 of SEQRA does not require that a public hearing be held on a DGEIS. Due to the scope of the DGEIS and the public interest in this document, the Town held a public hearing following the procedures outlined in part 617.8 of SEQRA. There are no plans for additional public hearings on the Boght Road - Columbia Street DGEIS.

P. **CAROL AND DONALD KEILEN
1010 NEW LOUDON ROAD
COHOES, NEW YORK 12037**

March 11, 1989

1. **Comment:**

On Friday, March 10, 1989, we received a memo from a fellow Boght resident regarding a proposal to take place in our neighborhood. It indicates that the Engineering and Planning Department in the Town of Colonie will be voting on this proposal, Monday March 13, 1989; and if this proposal is accepted, they will go to the next step. Until we received this memo, we had no idea of this proposal.

Response:

The DGEIS prepared for the study area does not represent a proposal or plan for a specific level of development. The document is to be used only as a planning tool to project potential future development and identify appropriate mitigation measures to minimize impacts associated with that development. For more information please see Comment I, H, 2, Jon A. Brander, March 13, 1989.

2. Comment:

Traffic on Route 9 is too fast now! A six-lane highway will make it faster. Needless to say, we are violently opposed to this proposition, and WE DO NOT WANT TO LOSE APPROXIMATELY 30 FEET FRONTAGE!

Response:

See written Comment I, B, 4, Bertha M. Golan, February 16, 1989.

Q. MERTON AND ELEN McELWAIN
1044 LOUDON ROAD
COHOES, NEW YORK

March 13, 1989

1. Comment:

We stand firmly opposed to the new proposals for the projected Boght development resulting from the Clough, Harbour & Associates study.

Response:

See Comment I, P, 1, Carol and Donald Keilen, March 11, 1989 and Comment I, H, 2, Jon A. Brander, March 13, 1989.

R. LOUISE L. AND BRIAN D. LIFFORD
RD #1 - 7 FOREST AVENUE
COHOES, NEW YORK

March 10, 1989

1. Comment:

We are writing regarding the possible widening of Route 9. We recently purchased a new home in Boght Corners. One of the main reasons we chose to stay in the area was the character of the community. A six-lane highway would change that completely. We avoided buying property in Clifton Park because of the traffic and the highways. We feel the extra lanes will only serve to increase traffic. If people are looking for a "super highway" they have the Northway as an alternative. The increased noise level from the additional traffic would also be very objectionable. Access to side roads off Route 9 would be extremely difficult and dangerous.

Response:

See written Comment I, B, 4, Bertha M. Golan, February 16, 1989.

2. Comment:

We also object to the way these proposals are presented. The whole matter was very secretive. It was not even posted at the Town Hall.

Response:

See Comment I, L, 1, Warren E. Cook, March 3, 1989.

S. LORRAINE BEAVER
RD 1 PINE AVENUE
COHOES, NEW YORK

March 10, 1989

1. **Comment:**

I am writing concerning widening of Route 9 in Boght Corners. No matter what the growth is over the next 20 years, that road should not be 6 lanes wide. What is the reason for the Northway? Widening the road at the Boght and not going right thru to Albany makes no sense.

Response:

See written Comment I, B, 4, Bertha M. Golan, February 16, 1989.

T. ANTOINETTE B. CURLEY
1056 LOUDON ROAD
RD NO. 1, BOX 196
COHOES, NEW YORK

February 28, 1989

1. **Comment:**

My husband and I are deeply concerned and distressed about plans for the future, to widen Route 9 from Columbia Street to Boght Corners. According to the news clip in The Record, Troy, New York, of February 8, 1989, recommendations have been made to widen Route 9 in this area, to six lanes.

When Route 9 was widened, about twenty-five years ago, I was forced to give up a portion of my property in front of my house. If the road in our area were widened once again and additional land were taken in front of our house, the value of our house would decrease considerably. The noise of the traffic would greatly increase and we would no longer be able to open our windows in spring, summer and fall, on the front of the house.

Response:

See comment I, B, 4 Bertha M. Golan, February 16, 1989.

U. NORBERT J. BLUM
32 SKYVIEW DRIVE WEST
COHOES, NEW YORK

March 7, 1989

1. Comment:

The study only marginally touched upon fringe area impact such as vehicular gridlock at Latham Circle from an additional 3,000 cars from Route 9 North during the next 10 years. Traffic densities tend to increase equally along converging roadways. Since there are four major roadways converging at Latham Circle, it is reasonable to expect an additional 12,000 cars at this location -- four times the 3,000 increase projected for Route 9 North.

How is this traffic to be handled without requiring a major expansion of the circle by DOT.

Also, the study does not appear to include residential and commercial developments along the outside fringes of the study area. There are many new homes being built along Sparrowbush Road, and a major expansion of Latham Circle Shopping Center presently being constructed. These and other fringe developments...impact on the area -- significantly adding to the impact loads to be generated from the Boght community study area.

To what extent have these additional impacts been included in the Clough Harbour study? Instead of a projected increase of 3,000 cars on Route 9 North, there could be 5,000 - 20,000 at Latham Circle -- when considering the additional traffic commercial development generates from outside the area.

Response:

See comment I, O, 1, Mr. Leonard B. Trembley, March 13, 1989.

2. Comment:

One of the primary reasons for Alternate Route 7, as set forth by the New York State Department of Transportation Environmental Impact Statement several years ago, was that the roadway would reduce traffic volumes on major roadways throughout Latham, Watervliet, and the surrounding area.

This has not happened, of course, and traffic volumes in Latham today are considerable higher -- and increasing each year -- than before Alternate Route 7 was constructed.

Why? Because Alternate Route 7 increased the value of commercial zoned properties in Latham and fostered the commercial developments which have occurred since that time. To a lesser extent, the same roadway increased the value of residential zoned lands which are now under pressure for development.

When does this growth end? For how many years can the Town of Colonie expect Boght community residents to idly stand by and watch their neighborhood community given over to the millions of dollars generated for commercial and residential developers?

How much longer do you expect us to accede to your planning philosophy that states, "Anyone can build anything they want to in the Town of Colonie because the Planning Board's role is not to evaluate the validity of any proposal." It is precisely this philosophy which generated the need for LUMAC, that was 25 years overdue, and exactly this philosophy which has created the "miracle mile" in Latham.

Along with many other Boght community residents, I vehemently oppose any further additional commercial development of Route 9 North. Your Planning Board has literally sold the Latham community to any and every commercial business that has ever wanted to build anything whatsoever.

Response:

The Town of Colonie Planning Board's authority for review of residential and commercial development proposals is vested in the Town Zoning Law and Subdivision Regulations. Authority for the preparation and content of these documents rests with the Town of Colonie Town Board. Original preparation and any subsequent amendments to the above noted documents was subject to required public hearings. As a result of the above, the Planning Board cannot deny residential or commercial development proposals if they conform with the requirements and specifications of SEQRA, the Town Zoning Law, and the Town Subdivision Regulations.

3. **Comment:**

In addition to the comments above, the Clough, Harbour study makes no mention of sidewalks -- another sure indication of the extent given to residents and their needs.

Let's have sidewalks! If we are going to invest all this money for community improvements, residents throughout the Boght area should be given sidewalks as a necessary form of human transportation: walking.

Response:

See Comment I, O, 2, Mr. Leonard B. Trembley, March 13, 1989.

4. **Comment:**

The Clough Harbour statement that, "Due to migratory patterns and ability to utilize a large range, it is difficult to identify bird species that

inhabit the site. For this reason, a list of birds has not been compiled." is a copout in ecological responsibility.

It does not take much imagination to know that the area support pheasants, quail, owls, robins, bluejays, nuthatches, cardinals, sparrows, morning doves, hawks, mocking birds and several dozen other species of birdlife -- all of which are endangered by the removal of habitat that will occur as a result of developments.

Response:

The DGEIS states on page II-30 that increased development will reduce available habitat for all wildlife species. The NYSDEC significant habitat files did not indicate the existence of any rare or endangered plant or animal species (page II, D, 30). The DGEIS has recommended that in areas which have been identified as having a high wildlife potential by the Town (Exhibit II-D-2), on-site wildlife surveys for rare or endangered species should be conducted during site plan review.

Many bird species are well adapted to inhabiting suburban areas (robins, blue jays, cardinals). In addition, it is their ability to cover a large range that will allow these species to survive. Strict adherence to green space controls as well as the protection and creation of greenspace and parklands will reduce potential impacts.

5. Comment:

The priorities of the Town of Colonie Planning Board are clearly evident for the Latham area in what has been built there. These priorities are business and commercial development, automobiles and vehicular traffic, visual chaos and environmental confusion. Latham has become what it is -- the clearest demonstration of planning by ignorance.

The Town of Colonie can no longer afford planning by ignorance and default -- by setting commercial, business, automobile, visual chaos, and environmental confusion priorities above the greater human needs of area residents.

- * We have wildlife in the Boght, agricultural lands, many residents, and ecological environment and all this needs to be protected from endangerment.

Response:

See Comment I, H, 2, Jon A. Brander, March 13, 1989 and Comment I, P, 1 Carol and Donald Keilen, March 11, 1989.

6. Comment:

We have residents who deserve the right to sewers before any thought is given to sewers for projected developments.

Response:

See Comment I, Y, 1, Albina Della Rocco, March 7, 1989.

7. Comment:

Pocket Parks: These are an excellent idea and any amenities of this kind - built into the program and specifically for residents -- should be incorporated in all plans. Both children and adults need places in the neighborhood, within easy walking distance, for playground activities and getting close to nature.

We desperately need to think in terms of protecting the wildlife we do have in the Boght -- before they become endangered species by allowing the destruction of those that are not endangered.

After three decades of global environmental destruction, there is absolutely no excuse for a Planning Board not to recognize their ecological responsibilities.

Response:

Pocket Parks are discussed on pages II-118 and II-119, of the DGEIS. In regard to wildlife, see Comment I, U, 4 above.

8. Comment:

Solar Energy: As an architect, I know for a fact that every house in the Town of Colonie could have been built with considerable greater energy efficiency -- at no additional construction cost -- through a greater awareness and use of passive solar energy.

I also know that the Planning Board, as well as the Building Department and other Town Officials, cannot require that buildings be solar designed. But what the Planning Board can do -- and should do -- is strongly encourage the use of solar energy in building design. There could be some form of credits given to developers employing solar heating methods and techniques...

The New York State Energy Office could be used as an important resource for technical information, possible tax credit or grant stimulants, or other forms of assistance to developers and builders.

Response:

Construction within the Town currently meets the New York State Uniform Fire Prevention and Building Code and New York State Energy Codes. At this time the Town does not intend to require any additional design standards.

9. Comment:

Global Deforestations: We can all do something about our global environmental energy crisis!

Part of the problem, as most people know by now, is the vast cutting and removal of trees that is taking place all over the world. Trees consume carbon dioxide and produce oxygen. Atmospheric scientists are certain the global temperature will increase 2°C to 8°C during the next century. An estimated 60% of this problem, brought on by the greenhouse effect, is caused by increasing levels of CO₂ which cannot be absorbed by trees due to global deforestations.

It would be the ecological thing to do for the Planning Board to work out a way to assure the preservation of as many trees as possible -- and require developers to provide two trees for every tree removed.

We can no longer afford to indiscriminately rape the land for economic greed! We are members of a global community and must begin to recognize that it is our responsibility to save the Earth -- not the responsibility of our children who will inherit the mess we have created.

Response:

The Town of Colonie Zoning Law includes greenspace requirements for commercial uses as well as minimum lot sizes for both commercial and residential uses. Although the Town can encourage the planting and preservation of trees for both aesthetic and environmental reasons within Town boundaries, it does not have jurisdiction over other municipalities and governmental agencies.

10. Comment:

The basic planning issue in the Boght Community is the constitutional right of a citizen to have protection from the intrusive actions of government.

The Town of Colonie, through its Planning Board, has intruded upon the rights of every citizen to a life of peace and privacy free from the intrusions of people from other communities. By allowing Latham to be developed as a major commercial shopping and business district in the northeast, the Town of Colonie has encouraged people from throughout the greater Capital District and beyond to descend upon the Latham community at the expense of area homeowner residents.

An estimated 75% of the vehicular traffic in Latham is driven by non-residents who live outside a three-mile radius from Latham Circle. The numerous lanes of traffic on Route 9, between Latham Circle and Dunsbach Ferry Road, would not be necessary if this fact were not true. The Town of Colonie has allowed Latham to be developed for the shopping and economic convenience of people who live outside the area -- intruding upon the constitutional rights of citizen taxpayer residents to a community of peace and privacy.

These intrusive actions by town government have resulted in a community where greater benefits are enjoyed by those who live outside of Latham and the Town of Colonie than those who live within these environs. Latham has been allowed to develop as a convenient location for commercial development, ... with total disregard to Latham homeowner...

It is suggested that 30% of Latham commercial developments be closed down for a 30% reduction in traffic along Route 9 from Columbia Street Extension to Boght Road. This will enable the Boght Community to be developed without having to construct two new lanes of traffic. There is nothing ludicrous or wrong with tearing buildings down to make way for new developments. Professional demolition experts are important contractors in the building industry.

Buildings can be demolished as easily as they can be constructed, in fact easier, and ripping down is equally important as building up.

Response:

See written Comment I, V, above.

The Town of Colonie has no authority to close down existing commercial operations that operate legally. If these buildings are torn down to allow for new developments there is no guarantee that traffic conditions would not grow worse than those that already exist or are predicted.

V. BRUCE GOULD
R. D. #1 BOX 190
COHOES, NEW YORK

March 10, 1989

I. Comment:

Below are my concerns about the proposals of the Development Plan of the Boght area traffic

A widening of Rt. 9 from Boght Corners Rd. to Rt. 7 from 4 - 6 lanes.

A wider road would be detrimental to this area for the following reasons:

- * Health - people living adjacent to Route 9 will have increased levels of auto pollutants (oxides of nitrogen, oxides of sulfur, lead and asbestos from brake shoes), also increased noise pollution to where it may detrimental to health.
- * Safety - a wider road to most people means "go faster"; people crossing or pulling into traffic from this are run this increased hazard of increased cars plus speeds.
- * Property value decrease - who wants to live let alone buy a home on a 6 lane highway!

Suggestions for cutting back on need for a larger highway.

- * Increase min. lot size for building from 18,500 to 25,000 or 26,000 sq. ft. to lower population demands.
- * Lowering speed limits through this area to get people "back on the Northway - a majority of traffic now is from Saratoga County.

Response:

See Comment I, B, 4, Bertha M. Golan, February 16, 1989.

W. JOHN A. TRIBBLE, SECRETARY
BOGHT COMMUNITY ACTION GROUP
21 WEST SKYVIEW DRIVE
COHOES, NEW YORK

March 12, 1989

I. Comment:

The methodology attempts to freeze in time the the current status and analyze from the perspective of the forecasted developments what impacts those changes will have. That frozen moment in time (the present) is actually in continuous motion. Therefore, the forecasted use of Route 9 assumes no further development in Clifton Park, the use of Boght Road and 9R assume no further development in Cohoes, etc. (See II-66). The projections in the study should only be used as estimates of the marginal impact of development in the study area, not as forecasts for the actual use of facilities. Note that the forecasted use of Route 87 for the year 2000 was 60,000 cares per day. That fact that we have reached that volume in 1989 is a reflection that the forecast was established without considering outside environmental factors. The traffic forecasts in the Clough Harbour report are subject the same criticism. This criticism

becomes consequential when considering possible mitigations. The mitigation strategies are targeted at the forecasted use, which is only the marginal impact, not the actually project use.

Response:

See comment I,O, 1, Mr. Leonard B. Trembley, March 13, 1989.

2. **Comment:**

The study does not include the second ten year impact on the education system. Given the relatively large impact on the educational system in the first ten years, its omission in the second ten years is a significant weakness. If residential construction has the impact of attracting young families, then the impact in the second ten years could be larger than the first ten years.

Response:

The DGEIS projected the increased school age population for both planning periods (II, I, 100-101). The associated tax impacts based on these student projections were also considered in the fiscal impact model (Appendix 4 of the DGEIS).

Complete information regarding potential impacts to the school system during Planning Period 2 was unavailable. According to our contact with Charles A. Szuberla, Superintendent of Schools. The school district does not project student populations beyond a ten (10) year period (see letter in Appendix 1 of the DGEIS dated December 8, 1988).

3. **Comment:**

The study mentions the habitat for wildlife, but the impact analysis only considers the destruction of habitat for endangered species. The study does not address the destruction of habitat for the variety of wildlife indigenous to the area. Nor does the study attempt to place any value on the destruction of that habitat.

Response:

Pages II-30 through II-31 of the DGEIS address potential impacts and mitigation measures to both rare and endangered wildlife and other wildlife

indigenous to the study area. In addition, Exhibit II-D-2 delineates potential wildlife habitat in the Boght Road Columbia Street area that has been identified as having a high wildlife potential. It has been recommended that rare and endangered species surveys be conducted in these areas during site plan review.

There are several ways of protecting wildlife habitat which are described on page II-31 of the DGEIS. These include Town of acquisition of certain parcels, low density developments including clustering and other unique site designs, transfer of development rights, and tax incentives to owners to maintain large parcels as open space.

4. **Comment:**

The total cost of mitigation strategies is somewhat unclear. The total cost of mitigation in Table II-M-3 of 51 million does not tie out with per unit costs in Table II-M-4 (See attached Table). These differences are due in part to the omission to Additional Police Personnel and the Other Educational Costs in Table II-M-4. However, there is still 2 million unaccounted for, which could be due to the underestimation of the per unit costs.

Response:

The costs of mitigation measures associated with projected development in the Boght Road - Columbia Street area total approximately 51.5 million dollars for both planning periods (Table II-D-3 of the DGEIS). These costs include both required capital improvements and other costs such as salaries for additional police and school personnel.

Table II-M-4 of the DGEIS estimates development mitigation costs, to accomplish the capital improvements listed on Table II-M-3. In regards to transportation costs, however, there is one difference that should be noted. The Capital improvement costs of 5.3 and 6.9 million dollars respectively through both planning periods, represent an estimate of the

total cost of roadway improvements in the study area as discussed on pages II-60 and II-63 of the DGEIS.

Approximately 80% of the increased traffic can be attributed to development in the study area boundaries and 20% to background traffic growth. As indicated on page II-60 of the DGEIS, there is a direct relationship between traffic growth and mitigative costs throughout the study area, thus only eighty percent (80%) of the total cost for the roadway improvements can be attributed to the projected development. As a result, the development mitigation costs shown on Table II-M-4 are based on 80% of the total cost of the transportation improvements. This 20% difference amounts to approximately 2.3 million dollars.

5. **Comment:**

The building of the Vliet Street extension has the potential to utilize developed as well as undeveloped land. Care should be taken in planning the actual location of the extension to minimize the utilization of developed land.

Response:

See written comment I.M. 1, Mr. & Mrs. S. Frydel, March 6, 1989.

6. **Comment:**

Suggestions to the Planning Board and the Town Board

Overall, the Clough Harbour report presents an opportunity to plan orderly development of the North Colonie community. Now that the EIS process is near completion the Planning Board may be anxious to move ahead with the proposals that have been backlogged for the past 9 months. The only tool that the Planning board has available to implement the proposed mitigations is the "negotiated development improvements". Given the extent of the potential impacts it is likely that this tool by itself will be inadequate. Therefore, it is recommended that the Town Board consider the following:

- a) Re-zoning some of the lands in the study area to assure a reduced level of growth.
- b) Re-zoning some of the commercial lands to limit their use to office use only and restricting the additional development of retail activities.

- c) Anticipating either a change in the State Law or legal rulings, the Town should also begin to prepare legislation for impact fees. The Town should also begin to lobby the State Legislature for a change in State Law which would assure the legality of the use of such fees.
- d) The Town will have to play an active role with DOT to assure that proposed mitigations along state highways will receive an expedited priority. We must not be caught in a situation with developments completed and a wait of two or three years for improvements in state highways.
- e) Recognizing that much of the areas problems stem not from internal development, but instead from North South through traffic, the Town should begin to work closely with DOT and Capital District Transportation Commission to develop long term plans for the resolution of the areas transportation difficulties.

Response:

Points a) through e) will be addressed in order.

- a) *This study primarily focused on a reasonable growth scenario based on development pressures, building trends and the availability of undeveloped land in the Boght Road - Columbia Street area. Section III, Alternatives of the DGEIS discusses varying development densities including re-zoning of the study area.*
- b) *See response a, above. The development projections shown on Exhibit II-B-3 of the DGEIS considered retail versus office space uses, based on potential traffic impacts. Page II-11 of the DGEIS notes that the designation of general office rather than a regional shopping facility in the area of Century Hill Drive, Columbia Street and Route 9 resulted from the potential magnitude of traffic impacts associated with a regional shopping facility. If this area was designated as retail the required highway improvements would be prohibitive. The office designation will result in at least a 25% reduction of vehicle trips as compared to retail uses.*

c) *See Written Comment I, N, 1, Mr. Paul Landor, Sr., March 13, 1989.*

d) *In order to ensure appropriate mitigation coincides with future development, the preparation of Capital Improvement Plans will be coordinated with a variety of agencies, including the NYSDOT.*

e) *See response to d, above.*

X. **WILBUR SMITH ASSOCIATES
CONSULTING ENGINEERS
25 KRAFT AVENUE
ALBANY, NY**

March 9, 1989

1. **Comment:**

Surface Water and Drainage

While the discussion of Area 1 (p. II-35) recognizes the existence of the City of Watervliet's dam located in the Dry Creek, it does not recognize the capacity of this 74.5 foot high by 475 foot (crest) wide dam. The 1988 Estimated Cost of Drainage improvements required for the development of Area 1 does not show a value for this major drainage structure. As this existing dam may provide all of the detention needed for Area 1 and its maintenance is the responsibility of the City of Watervliet, the Estimated Cost should be adjusted accordingly.

Response:

Based upon available information, an analysis of the City of Watervliet's dam was conducted and the results were included in the DGEIS. These initial results indicated that the dam was in need of repair and may not have adequate capacity to accommodate projected stormwater flows from the study area.

Subsequent to the DGEIS, the preliminary results of a dam study performed by the City of Watervliet were made available. These results indicated that the dam is reasonably sound and would most likely have adequate

capacity to accept excess runoff from projected development within the study area. However, it should be noted that the Town of Colonie would have to negotiate with the City of Watervliet for utilization of the dam.

If the dam can be utilized by the Town of Colonie, costs for land acquisition and detention facility, construction would be negligible.

Thus, the revised estimate of costs would be as follows:

<u>Drainage Area</u>	<u>Estimated Costs*</u>	<u>Estimated Cost Per Acre</u>	
		<u>Commercial</u>	<u>Residential</u>
1	\$ 600,000	\$2,340	\$1,170

*costs include storm sewer installation & culvert improvements.

Should the Town be unable to negotiate with the City of Watervliet for use of the dam, the development mitigation costs in the DGEIS would be applicable.

2.

Comment:

Transportation/Economics

The Transportation Section of the report includes estimates for costs of required improvements to sections of and intersections on State Routes 9, 9R, and 2. The cost of these improvements total \$7,210,000 or approximately 59% of the 12,200,000 estimated costs for all recommend improvements. The report (p. II-63) assigns 80% of these improvement costs to new development.

The Economic Section of the report (p. II-131) states that funding sources such as state aid or grants were not calculated as it is difficult to estimate what would be available. An equitable estimate of state involvement would be the costs of improvements made to state-owned facilities.

The assumption of no state aid gives no consideration for the state taxes, especially motor fuel which the development of the subject area will generate. This, in effect, will make the new residents pay twice for the same improvements.

Response:

The purpose of the cost estimates developed in the DGEIS was to provide a summary of costs in 1989 dollars associated with the growth scenario evaluated. Once the Town has developed a Capital Improvement Plan which will identify specific needs and appropriate capital projects, the availability of state or federal funding, grants and other sources of aid

can be evaluated for their availability. To date, discussions with the NYSDOT have indicated that there are currently no plans for state roadway improvements in the study area.

3. Comment:

Fiscal Impact Analysis

Appendix 4 (p. 24) shows the Assumed 1989 value of new residential construction at \$125,000/unit.

Using the total non-residential Market Value of \$47,067,966 (p. 24, appendix 4) and additional 1,437,480 square foot of non-residential building space projected for 1999 (Table II-B-1, p. II-8), the Assumed 1989 value for new non-residential construction is \$32.74/square foot.

On a comparison basis, the unit cost of new residential construction would yield \$62.50/square foot for a 2,000 square foot home. A residential square foot value equal to the non-residential value would provide a 3,818 square foot home for the Assumed 1989 \$125,000/unit value. There appears to be an inconsistency in the development of Market Values for Commercial vs. Residential construction in the fiscal impact analysis as presented.

Underestimating Market Value results in understanding tax receipts which causes an overestimation of funding shortfalls. As these funds will have to be made up by development contributions, consistent accurate estimates are vital.

Response:

The values used in the Fiscal Impact Analysis were conservative to avoid over-estimating tax revenues. Square foot values for non-residential building space which includes office, retail and light industrial uses was estimated from the Town of Colonie assessment roles of recently constructed properties of this type. A weighted average was then calculated, resulting in a market value of \$32.74/square foot.

The estimation of home values was also based on information from the Town of Colonie assessor's office. In 1988, the average assessed value for a home in Town was less than \$5,000. By applying the equalization rate the average market value would be approximately \$61,000. However, many of

these properties have not been reassessed for several years and due to the recent escalation, of property values, may be under assessed.

New construction is generally assessed at a higher rate than existing homes as a result of the assessment being based on the actual sale price of the home. For this reason an average value of one hundred twenty-five thousand (125,000) dollars appears reasonable for new construction.

Y. **MRS. ALBINA DELLA ROCCO
VICE PRESIDENT BOGHT COMMUNITY ACTION GROUP
12 LANDOR LANE
COHOES, NY**

March 7, 1989

1. **Comment:**

There's a sewer system coming down Landor Lane which I was told I could not connect to because I was too low. Joe Wunderlik had this job. I believe I was talking to an inspector of this job. He told me I need a pumper. I said, where do you want to put one. He said the town does not want pumpers because the town does not want to maintain them.

This sewer line comes down Landor Lane and then very conveniently went up between the Guptil property and the Russian Cemetery, which I believe was a waste of sewer lines.

As you know, the water table becomes high at certain times of the year.

It makes me angry to see these developers coming into our Community and making use of our sewer system. We have lived here for years and no sewer system. I still have to pay a small amount of sewer taxes.

Response:

A developer whose property is located within the sewer district boundaries, or has received approval from the sewer district for a district extension, has the right to connect into the system at his cost. The Town, to the greatest extent possible, can require that a developer accommodate potential hook-ups for existing homes. However, the Town cannot legally

require a developer to assume the costs for accommodating those hook-ups for existing residential homes.

2. Comment:

The Dump in our Community is a disgrace. It is such an eye sore as an entrance into the Town of Colonie.

Response:

The Town of Colonie Landfill, which is outside the project study area, is permitted by the NYSDEC. It is in compliance with parameters set forth in the Part 360 permit.

3. Comment:

I can remember when these homes along Route 9 in the Boght had long beautiful lawns in front of their homes. Just like Loudonville. These homes have lost a good portion of their lawns. I can't see how you can take much more of their property and meet up with your zoning law on frontage. People that live in these homes along Route 9 will have a terrible time getting in and out of their homes without getting killed in the process (which has happened over the years).

Response:

See Comment I, B, 4, Bertha Golan, February 16, 1989.

4. Comment:

We have phoned and written letters to the Transportation Dept. on lowering our speed limit; it did no good.

Response:

Route 9 is under the jurisdiction of the NYS Department of Transportation. Therefore, the Town has no jurisdiction over the posted speed limit on Route 9.

5. Comment:

I would like to see a stop light sign some where along Route 9 near the entrance to the Colonie Town Pool, (which is Old Loudon Road). When heading south passing the Colonie Town Pool road (Old Loudon Rd.) there is a slight grade and a slight bend in the Road making the stop light ahead

un-noticable until you are almost on top of it, causing people to slam on their brakes. I have noticed the many tire marks in the road.

Response:

According to the NYSDOT "Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices" the minimum site distance necessary for the traffic light on a roadway with a speed limit of 55 MPH is 625 feet. A field survey of the southbound lanes on Route 9 as they approach the Route 9R intersection was conducted. Findings of this field survey indicate that the sight distance approaching the Route 9R traffic signal exceed the 625 foot site distance requirement specified above. Therefore, a signal ahead sign does not appear to be warranted under NYSDOT requirements. However, since Rt. 9 and Rt. 9R are State highways, the ultimate approval/disapproval of a signal ahead sign is under the NYSDOT jurisdiction.

6. **Comment:**

In the surrounding fields there are some small streams that become more active at certain items of the year.

When these, Dividers are put in, will they interrupt these streams and cause flooding onto surrounding property?

Response:

Drainage divides as stated in the DGEIS refer to the natural boundaries between adjacent watersheds which are usually depicted as natural high points between drainage areas. They are not artificial or man-made additions to natural drainage system.

7. **Comment:**

I am concerned about a map that was shown of the Boght that had a lot of red in the Boght Corners area.

I believe that some of that red came down over 9R-Boght Road in the Boght. This side of 9R is zoned A-2 residential.

I hope there will be no side stepping of any numbers or changing of words of any kind in order to change our residential zoning law for office space.

Response:

The Exhibit referred to above (see Exhibit II-B-3 in the DGEIS) indicates project 1999 residential development in yellow and project 2009 residential development in red. There is not projected commercial/office uses projected in the vicinity of Landor Lane.

Z. CHARLES A. SZUBERLA
SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS
NORTH COLONIE CENTRAL SCHOOLS
NEWTONVILLE, NEW YORK

March 22, 1989

I. Comment:

Student Enrollments - Present district projections indicate a student population growth of 991 students by September 1998. The Clough Harbour study projects 1646 additional students by September 1999, from the study area alone. The schools' projections cover the entire district and it is not possible for me to isolate that portion of the 991 projected for the study area. Suffice it to say, the impact of development in the study area, which Clough Harbour estimate to be 256 percent higher than present district projections, will be both significant and negative for the schools and the taxpayers who support 75+ percent of the school budget.

Such unrestricted development would not only entail added costs, but would have great impact on such school quality factors as class size, instructional spaces, and stability of attendance areas. As regards the latter factor, the principal strengths of the North Colonie community reside in its small, personal, neighborhood schools and responsive local government. Unbridled growth, with its attendant disruptions, detracts from these quality features of the community and its schools.

Specifically, such increased enrollment growth in the Boght area would have the following impact on our schools:

Elementary - 334 more students by 1999 than currently projected. This would require construction of an additional K-6 school. The estimated cost of such a facility, based on 1989 dollars and construction costs, is \$7 million. The recurring annual personnel costs to staff such a facility would be on the order of \$1.25 million.

Grades 7 and 8 - In grades 7 and 8, the additional 100 students would require at least 4 classrooms in addition to those called for in current expansion plans and the full-time equivalent of at least 5 teachers. Given today's average costs for classroom additions and

present teacher salary and benefits costs, the dollar impact at the junior high school level is projected at approximately \$800,000.

Grades 9 - 12 - Our current projections indicate no need for added space in grades 9 - 12 through the 1990s. The added 222 students drawn from your projections would create a housing problem for us. I would estimate the need for approximately 9 additional classrooms and 14 staff. Added costs would be in the vicinity of \$2 million.

Further, the Clough Harbour study shows even larger numbers of school-age children generated by proposed development in the study area, for the period 1999 to 2009. The school district does not attempt to project beyond a 10-year period, hence I am unable to comment definitely on such impact. It should be clear, however, that the results for the schools and the taxpayer will be equally negative.

Response:

Impacts to increased school enrollments based on December 8, 1988 correspondence with the North Colonie School District (DGEIS, Appendix 1) are discussed on pages II-100 to II-102 of the DGEIS. Further clarification with the school district has resulted in the revised impacts stated in the above comment. Pages II-100 to II-102 of the DGEIS have been corrected to reflect the new estimates (Appendix 1).

Based on the revised estimates there is a need for 1 rather than 2 elementary schools, fewer additional junior high and high school classrooms and decreased staff requirements which reduces the fiscal impact originally projected in the DGEIS. This also results in lower Development Mitigation Costs than those shown in Table II-M-4 of the DGEIS.

Total costs associated with the required school improvements are currently estimated at 11 million dollars for planning period 1. The associated Development Mitigation Costs will be \$4,400 per dwelling unit rather than the \$7,600 originally projected. Pages II-130 through 132 are included in Appendix 1 of the FGEIS and reflect these changes.

3. Comment:

Need for Elementary School Site - If such development for the Boght area is ultimately approved by the Town, I would urge the Town to require developers to make available to the school district at least one 10 acre school site at reasonable cost. I am prepared to recommend such site purchase to the Board of Education. Upon Board approval, public approval via referendum or specific budget line would be required.

Given the projected residential and commercial land use for the study area, the school site should be in the area east of Boght Road and north of Route 7. Ideally, such site would be located in the middle of the largest development proposed for that area, to allow for a maximum number of student walkers, and would not be isolated from a significant portion of the neighborhood by a major traffic artery. Further, such major developments would be required to provide sidewalks to facilitate walking to school and/or playgrounds.

Response:

A potential school site, in the general location mentioned above has been conceptually located on Exhibit 1 of Appendix 4 of the FGEIS. This location is within an area projected for residential growth as shown on Exhibit II-B-3 of the DGEIS.

4. Comment:

Costs/Revenues - It is clear from the Clough Harbour projections of costs/revenues that there will be significant deficits for each of the 10-year planning periods for the school district. Hence, it is important for the Town, in dealing with developers to attempt to minimize such deficits through more controlled development, or the assessment to developers of some portion of the resultant added school costs, in the form of provision of school site(s), sidewalks, easements for walking students, or the like.

Response:

Revenue projections used for the fiscal impact model (DGEIS, Appendix 4) were generally conservative in order to avoid overstating potential revenues. The reason for this conservative approach is the uncertainty of the availability of state and federal aid for both the school district and Town.

In regards to the existing school district costs in the model, these were based on the most recent school district budget. As stated by Mr. Szuberla, the estimates of costs of providing new schools, additional classrooms and staff may be conservative due to factors such as inflation. As stated on page II-127 of the DGEIS, the values used in this analysis were not adjusted for inflation.

5. **Comment:**

Conclusion - It is my strongly held, opinion that the Town must not allow for such rapid development of the study area as is projected by the Clough Harbour study. To do so would be to adversely affect the quality of the North Colonie schools and would excessively burden the district taxpayer.

The community and its schools can accommodate to reasonable growth and development. The school district showed itself capable of dealing with such growth in the 1960's, although not without considerable pain in the form of large tax increases and defeated school budgets. The 6+ percent annual growth in school enrollment projected in the Clough Harbour study is beyond that which is reasonable.

Response:

No response necessary.

AA. **RICHARD W. CARLSON
DIRECTOR, PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
STATE OF NEW YORK
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
84 HOLLAND AVENUE
ALBANY, NEW YORK**

March 20, 1989

1. **Comment:**

In response to your February 7 letter regarding the Boght Road - Columbia Street DGEIS, we would like to submit the following comments:

- a. Existing Traffic Information - Count information used in the study is consistent with NYSDOT data available for the area. The current operational deficiencies that the report identifies are being reviewed by the Regional Traffic and Safety Group to verify whether we concur with those assessments of the adequacy of the State highway system.
- b. Population Projections - Ten and twenty year development projections always contain a significant element of uncertainty. We have no alternative projections to offer, but we note that the study issues

very substantial increase in population and housing over the next twenty years. We suggest a sensitivity analysis employing other assumed growth rates would be beneficial by portraying a range of possible futures.

- c. Trip Generation and Distribution - The methodologies referenced by the text appear reasonable for this type of analysis. Although we do not have the staff resources available to verify the report's travel simulations, we note that the TMODEL Software has been used successfully on a number of Department applications.
- d. Future Year Traffic Analyses - For the future years 1999 and 2009, a number of operation deficiencies were forecast and corresponding mitigation measures developed. A very significant benefit of this type of analysis is that it identifies those corridors where additional rights-of-way may be required to support future needed improvements. Such information should guide growth management strategies such as setback requirements, access restrictions, developer financial participation, initiate an on-going traffic monitoring program and periodic traffic impact updates. These would serve to trigger projects at critical locations as prescribed traffic thresholds are reached.
- e. Transportation System Management (TSM) - Programs such as ride-sharing, varying work hours and encouraging transit usage are promoted in the report as providing some measure of relief to future traffic congestion. The Department is a strong proponent of non-highway construction TSM measures and is available to offer technical assistance regarding their potential application here.

Overall, the DGEIS provides a good starting point for identifying and dealing with existing and emerging transportation issues in the study area. It can be used as a guideline for local land use decisions, and as a baseline for an on-going traffic monitoring program.

We thank you for the opportunity to comment on this document. We look forward to working with the Town of Colonie and other involved parties to find workable solutions for the area's transportation needs.

Response:

See Comment I, J, I, John P. Poorman, Staff Director, Capital District Transportation Committee, March 13, 1989.

AB. MARY JANE VALACHOVIC
PRESIDENT, THE TOWN OF COLONIE COALITION OF
HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATIONS
6 LINDA LANE
SCHENECTADY, NEW YORK 12309

March 30, 1989

1. Comment:

In reviewing this study the Town of Colonie Coalition of Homeowners Associations would be opposed to the widening of Route 9 in the Boght Area.

It is not clear what advantage would be achieved -- while businesses and residential homes along Route 9 would have to be eliminated.

We suggest as an alternative that the Cohoes Crescent Road be widened from Route 9 to the Cohoes City line; this would permit traffic access to I-787.

The Town of Colonie owns most of the land bordering the Cohoes Crescent Road, making the solution a viable one.

Response:

In regards to the widening of Route 9 see Comment I, B, 4, Bertha M. Golan, February 16, 1989.

The widening of the Cohoes Crescent Road to the City of Cohoes line would result in additional traffic problems within the City. The proposed 4 travel lanes on Cohoes Crescent Road would be reduced to 2 lanes at the City line which would create congestion from the required merging. In order to access I-787 from this roadway traffic would have to travel on City streets.

It has been estimated in the Traffic section of the DGEIS that approximately 80% of the projected traffic increase in the study area will be a direct result of development within the study area boundaries. The

remaining 20% will be a result of increased use of study area roads from sources outside the study area limits. As a result, some individuals traveling south on Route 9 from Saratoga County could utilize the Cohoes Crescent Road to access I-787 rather than the more southerly Exit 7 interchange. It is unlikely however that all drivers from Saratoga County utilize Route 9 solely to access I-787.

The widening of the Cohoes Crescent Road which is well north of the study area would do little to relieve traffic congestion on Route 9 resulting from development within the study area. The large number of vehicle trips that would be generated by the projected growth alternative studied in the DGEIS would require vehicle travel on Route 9 to access I-87 from Route 9 or I-787 from the Cohoes Crescent Road.

AC. **DAVID STOUT**
SR. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYST
NYSDEC, REGION IV
2716 GUILDERLAND AVENUE
SCHENECTADY, NEW YORK

APRIL 4, 1989

1. **Comment:**

The February 1989 DGEIS meets the requirements of the SEQR Handbook, Section V for an initial area-wide planning document. It has addressed the comments we raised in our lead agency coordination response of October 25, 1988.

We recommend the Planning Board accept this document. I am pleased the Town has proceeded with this planning process. Once the findings have been accepted, after the remainder of the SEQR process has occurred, the SEQR actions within the generic area will only need site specific impact evaluations in the future. However, since the planning period is 20 years and change is inherent in our world, it may become necessary to supplement the FGEIS in future years.

Response:

As required in the future, the Town will follow the appropriate SEQRA procedures for site specific impact evaluations and supplements to the FGEIS where appropriate.

AD. BOGHT, LATHAM AND MAPLEWOOD FIRE DISTRICTS

APRIL 13, 1989

I. Comment:

At our recent meeting on April 11, 1989, representatives of the three Fire Districts involved, Boght, Latham and Maplewood, hereby submit our projected costs that will result from the impact of residential and commercial development in the next twenty years.

1989-1999

ADDITION TO EXISTING STATION 50' X 70'

COST \$250,000.00

**MANPOWER 30 TURNOUT GEAR, TRAINING, S.C.B.A.(SELF
CONTAINED BREATHING APPARATUS)**

COST \$45,000.00

INSTALL SPRINKLERS IN HOMES

1999-2009

MANPOWER 30 TURNOUT GEAR, TRAINING, S.C.B.A.

**TWO ACRES OF LAND NEAR 260 BOGHT ROAD TO BE USED BY ALL THREE
DEPARTMENTS, THREE STALLS, OFFICE, STORAGE AND RESTROOMS**

COST \$800,000.00

PURCHASE OF A NEW PUMPER TO BE KEPT IN NEW STATION

COST \$180,000.00

**ONE E.M.S. VEHICLES TO BE SHARED BY THREE DEPARTMENTS AND KEPT
IN NEW STATION**

COST \$20,000.00

**BASED ON GROWTH OF 1400 NEW UNITS OR TOWN HOUSES
IN THE MAPLEWOOD PROTECTION DISTRICT**

Response:

See Response to AE below.

AE. **BOGHT COMMUNITY FIRE DISTRICT
APRIL 13, 1989**

1. Comment:

At a meeting on April 13, 1989 of the Boght Community Fire Commissioners, we hereby submit our projected cost that will result from the impact of residential and commercial development in the next 20 years in the Boght Fire District. The following estimates are based on 1989 costs.

First 10 year cost and estimate

One additional pumper	\$ 250,000
One ladder truck	500,000
New sub station	800,000
Land for station	80,000
Additions to Fire Station	1,000,000
Rescue board	100,000
Manpower equipment	60,000
E.M.S. vehicle	20,000
Maintenance per year \$6,000	60,000
Additional Insurance premiums	1,000,000

Second 10 year cost and estimate

Two new pumpers	600,000
Manpower equipment per year \$6,000	60,000
Additional insurance premium	1,000,000

Response:

Discussions with representatives of the Boght Community Fire District indicated that some costs identified for items in their April 13, 1989

letter were also included in the joint Boght, Latham and Maplewood Fire District letter dated April 13, 1989. Items identified in both correspondence include:

	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Planning Period</u>
Additional Pumper	\$250,000	2
New Sub Station	800,000	2
Addition to Existing Station	250,000	1
Manpower Equipment	45,000	1 & 2
E.M.S. Vehicle	20,000	1 & 2

Therefore, in order to ensure the above referenced equipment was not counted twice, adjustments were made to the 2 letters which resulted in the following total costs:

<u>Planning Period 1</u>	<u>Costs</u>
One Additional Pumper	\$250,000
One Ladder Trunk	\$500,000
One Sub Station	\$800,000
Land for Station	\$ 80,000
Additions to Fire Station	\$1,000,000
Rescue Boat	\$100,000
Manpower Equipment	\$ 60,000
E.M.S. Vehicle	\$ 20,000
Maintenance Per Year \$6,000	\$ 60,000
Additional Insurance	<u>\$1,000,000</u>
Total	\$3,870,000

<u>Planning Period 2</u>	<u>Costs</u>
One Additional Pumper	\$300,000
Manpower Equipment	\$ 60,000
Additional Insurance	<u>\$1,000,000</u>
Total	\$1,360,000

Tables II-M-3 and II-M-4 have been modified as a result of the above referenced cost estimates.

In addition to the above, the cumulative letter from the Boght, Latham and Maplewood Fire Districts indicated that consideration should be given to requiring sprinkler systems in residential homes. This would require revision of the local Uniform Fire Prevention and Building Code by the Town.