

K. STATEMENT REGARDING THE DGEIS STUDY

The following comments are taken from an unsigned written statement dated April 16, 1996. A copy of the statement is provided in Appendix 1.

1. Comment:

It appears, if this plan is adopted, it could be detrimental to future development and carries financial impacts to current land owners and future residents that are not equitable in the study area, as compared to the rest of the town.

Response:

The implementation of mitigation costs for the Study Area is consistent with long range land use studies for other portions of the Town of Colonie (Airport Area GEIS (1991) and Boght Road - Columbia Street Area GEIS (1989)). Mitigation costs have been implemented for these areas.

The purpose of implementing mitigation costs is to provide an equitable means of paying for improvements in the area. These costs were determined through evaluation of impacts and mitigation in the DGEIS. Deficiencies in infrastructure and other community related impacts that are a result of existing development were identified and excluded from the total required mitigation, leaving only the mitigation required for potential future development. Costs to provide this mitigation to future development were estimated and distributed. The mitigation costs have a strong foundation in the DGEIS and are distributed in a manner that will equitably address the amount and location of future development.

2. Comment:

Recent news media reports (Times Union) the Census Bureau showing that the Town of Colonie population growth rate declined from original census projections which could cloud the current Impact Statement. Further, the LUMAC report was done in 1988 and data from that growth period may not apply at this time or for the future growth of Colonie.

Response:

The Census Bureaus data that indicated the Town of Colonie experienced a 5.6% decrease in population from 1990 to 1994 was successfully challenged. The Census Bureau now estimates the Town's population increased from 76,497 to 79,829 between 1990 and 1994. For further discussion, refer to response to Comment G.7.

3. **Comment:**

Twenty years is a long time for a township to collect taxes and a long time for growth. It seems to us that taxes collected during this time, coupled with good money management anyone should be able to handle a projected growth development scenario.

Response:

Refer to the response to Comment K.1.

4. **Comment:**

The acknowledgment page of the impact statement study shows that "property Owners Within the Study Area" were heard. We would like to know more about this such as: how many owners were contacted, and what the make up was, and a list of the questions and answers to the questions.

Response:

Property owners within the Study Area and the public in general were given the opportunity to participate in the Scoping Session prior to the preparation of the DGEIS. Some of these people did choose to participate. Their comments, along with those from other agencies and organizations, help to formulate the Scoping Document, on which the DGEIS is based, and are, therefore, acknowledged and appreciated.

5. **Comment:**

Mitigation fees are unfair to the young business people of the future because, it puts them in a position of not being competitive with the market place. Mitigation fees are unfair to the existing land owner, because they are also in a position of not being competitive in the market place and the value of their lands may depreciate causing additional hardship. Mitigation fees are unfair to townships, because future land owners will not be induced to build in a township that requires such fees. Instead people will invest in surrounding townships or areas where such fees are not charged.

Response:

Refer to the response to Comment K.1.