

### **Section I. Project Description & Section II. SFEIS Executive Summary**

Both of these sections should be revised to address changes to be made based on Planning Board comments regarding Section III. Response to Comments on the SDEIS

### **Section III. Response to Comments on the SDEIS**

#### **III.C. SDEIS Response Sections Corresponding to the SDEIS**

##### **III.C.1.B**

1.B-2A: Hours which amplified music can be played should be reasonably restricted as part of the site plan. This should be stated in the SFEIS.

1.B-6:

Response a): This makes no sense.

Response c): The existing mature trees serve as effective stormwater systems. The loss of this eco-service has not been analyzed but should not be discounted.

Response d): The area alongside First and Second Avenues requires further analysis to determine its hydrology and wetland status. This area is at a lower elevation than the adjacent wetland and has the potential to be inundated during storms events and other times.

It should be noted that the EAC has received positive identification from Cornell Cooperative Extension that the plant which has colonized portions of this low elevation area is *Arundinaria gigantea* (Walt.) Muhl., a native high-wildlife-value Facultative Wetland species with the potential to indicate the presence of wetlands.

1.B-7:

Response c): The rationale of this comment is to address the potential of significant adverse impacts as a result of this project.

1.B-14 – B-15: The applicant's response does not answer or address the submitted comments.

1.B-16: It is the applicant's opinion that engineered retaining walls are more secure than natural hillsides. This statement ignores recent engineered retaining wall collapses. Analysis of bedrock should be submitted.

1.B-17: Certification of clean fill should be required on the site plan. This should be noted in the SFEIS.

##### **III.C.2**

2.4: Have the images been revised? Re: lower lying areas: see **III.C.1.B**. Response d).

2-9: Does not address gas heating or gas pipeline. This response does not address state and local renewable energy goals. The existing Project site has an abundance of mature trees which serve as effective stormwater systems. The loss of this eco-service has not been analyzed but should not be discounted. Risks to birds from large expanses of windows are not addressed.

2-11 - 2-12 Mitigation to prevent bird window strikes should be addressed in the site plan and should be noted in the SFEIS. The proposed large expanses of windows will be located at some of the highest elevations in our town which is within the Atlantic Flyway Migratory Route. Waiting for bird mortality and hoping that future residents would address this is unacceptable.

### **III.C.3**

3-1 See **III.C.1.B.** Response d). The Wetland Consultant’s report should be provided.

### **III.C.4**

4-2, 4-5, 4-6, 4-9: The applicant’s responses do not answer or address the submitted comments.

4-3 See **III.C.1.B.** Response d).

### **III.C.5**

5-1 Bioretention systems with native plants are recommended in the NYS Stormwater Design Manual (Appendix H). The proposed infiltration system handles stormwater but is devoid of eco-service benefits to improve and protect wildlife biodiversity. Large expanses of non-native grass lawns with high maintenance requirements should not be considered in this project which proposes so much environmental loss due to the tremendous amount of tree removal, disturbance of slopes and natural typography, tremendous increase of impervious surfaces, and impacts from noise and artificial lighting – all tremendously impactful to the existing wildlife (to include birds and the insects which feed them and their broods). Bioretention systems with native plants should be proposed.

5-2 The applicant’s response does not answer or address the submitted comments.

5-7 See **III.C.5.** 5-1

### **III.C.6**

6-1 See **III.C.5.** 5-1

6-3 See **III.C.2.** Response 2-11 – 2-12

6-6 This should be stated as “The number of mature trees (6 – 40” DBH) proposed to be removed is 443. The number of trees (less than 6” DBH) to be planted is 450.” As stated, the applicant’s response appears to minimize the impact of tree removal.

6-9 The Landscape Plan submitted during the Site Plan Review should specify that invasive plants will continually be controlled, and that an ongoing Landscape Maintenance Plan Agreement will be required. The SFEIS should note this.

6-13 See **III.C.1.B** Response d):

6-12 – 6-14 An updated Tree Inventory which identifies the tree species by both common and scientific Latin nomenclature, and their GIS location, should be performed during the Site Plan review process. The Town’s Tree Warden should verify the findings. This should be noted in the SFEIS.

### **III.C.12**

12-6 Construction should not be permitted on Sundays or nationally recognized holidays.

### **III.C.17**

17-6, 17-9 – 17-12, 17-14, 17-16: The applicant’s responses do no answer or address the submitted comments.

Donna Sharrett, Planning Board Member