



*Hudson Highlands
Environmental
Consulting*

71 Colonial Avenue
Warwick, N.Y. 10990
www.HudsonHighlandsEnviro.com

(845) 986-5350
FAX (845) 986-9492
E-mail highlands144@gmail.com

MEMORANDUM

November 15, 2021

Response to 10/5/21 AKRF Memo

In the referenced memo, AKRF offered comments related to annotations on Appendix A (written comment letters) that referenced the locations in the FEIS of responses to the provided comments. Not all the suggestions from AKRF were implemented. These included the following comments in the memo:

4. Lynn Rogoff (pg. 30): We could not find the subject of the AKRF suggestion in the Rogoff comment, and therefore could not make the suggested change.

5. Dave Merandy (pg. 32): The Merandy comment addresses the developability of the proposed conserved land, not the definition of a conservation subdivision. The reference to Response 2.18 is correct.

6. Richard Butensky (page 33): The Butensky comment suggests that the Conventional Subdivision alternative is preferable to the proposed Conservation Subdivision. The reference to Response 4.3 is correct.

15. John Mangano (pg. 113): The first referenced part of the Mangano comment addresses increased traffic on Route 9, which was outside the scope of the DEIS, and is properly not addressed in the FEIS.

The second referenced part of the Mangano comment addresses impacts on schools and school taxes, which was outside the scope of the DEIS, and is properly not addressed in the FEIS.

16. Linda and Jack Weinstein (page 114): See above discussion on Magnano comment.

19. Irvine Flinn (pg. 134): The Flinn comment addresses increased traffic and greenhouse gases, which was outside the scope of the DEIS, and is properly not addressed in the FEIS.

21. Paul and Anna Kantor (pg. 150): The points regarding increased traffic in this comment were outside the scope of the DEIS, and is properly not addressed in the FEIS.

22. Letter from Glassbury Court resident (name illegible) (pg. 157): See above discussion on Magnano comment.

24. Diana Hird (pg. 162): The Hird comment dealt with traffic safety on Route 9, Horton Road, and East Mountain Road North (EMRN), which was outside the scope of the DEIS, and is properly not addressed in the FEIS. It is also noted that under the current proposal, neither Horton Road or EMRN are utilized, so issues of traffic safety on these roads are irrelevant. The issue of traffic safety on EMRN can be revisited should the Planning Board decide to seriously consider access from EMRN as an alternative, but that was not the subject of the Hird comment.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen M. Gross
Principal, Hudson Highlands Environmental Consulting