



MEMORANDUM

TO: Jay Beaumont, Chairperson
Members, Town of Montgomery Planning Board

FROM: Bonnie Franson, AICP CEP

RE: RDM Neelytown Business Park FEIS Completeness Review
Neelytown Road & Beaver Dam Road, Town of Montgomery; SBL 36-1-33, 33-1-91, 36-1-11.221,
36-1-11.23, 36-1-11.1, 36-1-10.1, 36-1-11.211, and 36-1-11.21250.1)

DATE: April 10, 2026

CC: Sue Hadden, Planning Board Secretary
Rich Hoyt, Esq., Planning Board Attorney
Jamison Zajac, PE, Planning Board Engineering Consultant
Justin Ferrazano, PE (for the Applicant)

This memorandum addresses review of the draft Final Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Neelytown Business Park. The Final Environmental Impact Statement is the Lead Agency's document, and the Planning Board needs to be satisfied with its content. **New/revised comments appear in bold.** If a comment is addressed, it has been deleted.

General Comments

- 1. The date of the FEIS needs to be updated – it is dated June 27, 2025 although submitted in January 2026.**
- 2. The document should be reviewed again to address residual errors from recent revisions (e.g., deletions and formatting inconsistencies). For example, on p. 3, the text states: “The Project Site is has”because a deletion was made.**
- 3. In some instances, a response is provided in the response letter, but not in the FEIS document. For example, we raised the question – “With regard to the residences, what will they see regarding Warehouse 1, which is closer – add description.” The response is provided in the response letter, and no revision is made to the FEIS document. The substantive responses in the Colliers response letter need to be inserted into the FEIS.**
- 4. In general, some of the responses are generic and only refer back to the appendices. At a minimum, a summary responses is needed so that the commenters, especially local residents, are able to read a response without having to sift through pages in an appendix. Many of the responses are in the Colliers response letter – they need to be added to the FEIS.**
- 5. In general, it is not customary to have FEIS comments organized by commenter, rather than topic. Note that NPV had to sort through comments, come up with a numbering system, to assign the comments to relevant staff. Our comments have been listed based on that numbering system. We have included the annotated FEIS so that the applicant can see the response where NPV has comments. Also, please number all the commenters comments. The transcript should be annotated with the number of the comment as well for ease of reference. Not addressed.**
- 6. In Table 2, indicate the individuals whose comments you have responded to. Not addressed – no change?**
- 7. Is the acoustical study in the FEIS up to date? A response to an NPV comment indicates the most recent version of the noise study is dated November 8, 2024 – the FEIS includes a noise study from 8/27/24. Not**

addressed on p. 57 of the FEIS, it still refers to a November 8, 2024, acoustical study being the most recent document.

8. Please address the status of the wetlands and review for incidental take permit, and include any correspondence from NYSDEC. **This is in process and the FEIS will need to be amended to include the correspondence and outcomes of the ITP process with the NYSDEC. The Applicant indicates a revised PCN must be submitted.**

Comment No.	Comment
Chapter 1: Introduction and Project Summary	
p.3	New sentence that reads “ Furthermore, the Forest Patch Preserve...” – seems to be incomplete... “within the.....?”
p.4	“Appendix X” is mentioned in the first full paragraph. Is this just a placeholder because there is no Appendix X? Appendix K would make sense here.
p. 5	With regard to the residences, what will they see regarding Warehouse 1, which is closer – add description. This comment is not addressed – add response in the response letter to the FEIS. Specifically address whether the buildings will be seen on the north side of I-84.
p. 5	Site disturbance here is 86.08 acres – previously noted as 95.8 acres (see p. 3). It is now listed as 87.66-acres – please confirm whether that is with or without the land bank. We did not find any land disturbance limits on the grading and drainage plans.
p. 5	There is discussion about there being no water tank on this site. Should note the distance to the Town water tank and why there will be no impact. The language has been updated to include the distance to the Town water tank; however, there is not an expanded discussion of why there will be no impact. In particular, the response letter, p. 4/69, indicates there is potential for blasting. That narrative needs to be added to the FEIS.
p. 6	Please spell out NYSSMDM – it is not referenced elsewhere in the FEIS. Contrary to the response letter, we do not find it spelled out where referenced – add to FEIS.
p. 6	Please clarify whether the Operation and Maintenance Manual is for stormwater management, or for overall maintenance of all components of building and site. Language initially discusses stormwater, but then includes discussion of the building façade, etc. This comment is not addressed as stated in the response letter.
p. 7	The plans appear to have been last revised 6/27/25, not 3/28/25. This comment remains, with the most recent revision now appearing to be 12/12/2025 (and not 6/27/25 in the response letter). Please revise.
p. 6	In the first paragraph, the FEIS should indicate if the actual layout has changed, in terms of building footprint, parking, or layout. This comment is not addressed in the FEIS. Specifically, has the layout changed in terms of the building footprint, parking, or layout?
p.6	Figure 2 shows zoning, not surrounding land uses. Same thing regarding Figure 1. Amend figures. This comment is not addressed – insert a land use figure for one of the images, and caption the other as the zoning map.
p. 10	It is confusing to discuss the Alt. 3 layout to the wetland discussion, without explaining the purpose of the additional information. What has the PCN been filed for – the proposed action and/or Alt. 3? This comment has been addressed. However, we await additional response from NYSDEC to determine if it is adequate. An amended PCN is going to be submitted, as per the Colliers response letter.
p. 10	Confirm that stockpiles are shown on maps. In the FEIS, add the response from the Response Letter.

Comment No.	Comment
p. 11	Provide a list of the traffic improvements required here. This comment has not been addressed in the FEIS – add the following from the response letter: “The traffic improvements required as a result of the project are the widening and introduction of right and left turn lanes at the site access on Neelytown Road, the installation of a 360 degree camera for vehicle detection at the intersection of Neelytown Road and Beaver Dam Road (as discussed with OCDPW) and the furnishing and installation of radar detection at the intersections of NYS Route 208 and the I-84 EB and WB Ramps and NYS Route 208 and Hawkins Drive (as discussed with NYSDOT).”
p. 12	Regarding the statement as to who will be responsible for the site utility maintenance requirements, this should be discussed. Will the current Applicant sell the buildings? Or will they own them? This comment has not been addressed – please add response from response letter: “If the applicant maintains ownership of the development, they will be responsible for the site utility maintenance. In the event the applicant decides to sell the project, the new ownership group will bear the responsibility of the utility maintenance.”
p.12	While nothing has changed from the DEIS to the FEIS, the noise section needs additional information about the analysis from the Acoustical Study since this is an Executive Summary. Should also mention that all noise requirements are met. Also, there should not be reference to “noise improvements” – it should be “ambient noise levels”
p. 13	What is the amount of the one-time fee? This comment has not been addressed.
p. 13	The Ambulance District indicated they would have a significant adverse impact. This is not addressed. This comment has not been addressed. Substantive narrative is being provided in the response letter (p. 7/69), not the FEIS.
Chapter 1: Comments and Responses	
Letter #1 Comments based on the transcript of the Town of Montgomery Planning Board Public Hearing, December 9, 2024 (Comments not numbered in FEIS)	
1.2	Will the entrance to Neelytown Road be fully accessible to Warehouse 2? Also, provide more information regarding the new intersections on Beaver Dam Road, and if they meet sight distance standards. Address road on Beaver Dam Road and whether improvements proposed/required. Provide the response in the response letter in the FEIS.
1.3	This comment should also address the statement regarding speeding on Beaver Dam Road stated in the transcript. Provide the response in the response letter in the FEIS.
1.4	Defer to the Planning Board engineer regarding blasting. This response is inconsistent with the response letter (p.4/69), which states: “It is anticipated that compliance with the recommendations of the geotechnical report will minimize the potential for impacts associated with the deepest cuts, including the unexpected potential for blasting. Based on all of the geotechnical investigation prepared to date, it is not anticipated that blasting will be necessary and that excavation will be possible without the need for any blasting. However, as there is a small depth of uninvestigated substratum in the area of the deepest cuts that will be excavated to grade the site to its proposed elevation, if bedrock is encountered in that area that cannot be cut or scraped, a blasting permit will be sought based upon a plan and all applicable Town requirements will be complied with.” The FEIS should acknowledge the potential for blasting and discuss a protocol.
1.5	Comment partially addressed: Berm won’t address all visual concerns but will mitigate most of them. Address whether the lights on the second warehouse are elevated in a manner where they will be visible. Add reference to Appendix with noise study. Specifically, address

Comment No.	Comment
	visibility from the commenter's home (Weber). Comment remains – this is generically addressed in the response letter (p. 9/69) For the noise portion of the comment, directly reference Appendix I (the Acoustical Report).
1.7	Comment partially addressed. Based on the orientation of the building to the commenter's home, loading docks do face in the direction of the Weber home. This should be acknowledged. Address whether the sound wall effectively screens the dock doors and the trailers. Again, be specific to this specific residence – the FEIS does not specifically respond to this property owner. Add the response from p. 9/69 in the response letter.
1.8	Additional information should be provided regarding the context of the site in relation to surrounding forested areas and a discussion of the Natural Resource Inventory (2020) should be included. The response indicates it is acknowledged but does not address concerns on wildlife or the role of the surrounding forest, or how RDM will or will not impact it. Also, when will NYSDEC comment on the forest removal. That needs to be done prior to closing out SEQR. This is an open item and will need to be updated based on NYSDEC input. Discussion of the Town NRI should still be added.
1.9	Please also add that the Town's ecological consultant also visited the site in June 2023 during review of the DEIS. In addition, provide an update on the NYSDEC review of the project site regarding the Indiana bat and need for an incidental take permit. Add language from response letter (p. 9/69) to the FEIS.
1.10	Need to address comments addressing speeding along Beaver Dam Road. Indicate the percent of traffic anticipated to use Beaver Dam Road. Need to specifically summarize what the studies say about impacts to the north of I-84, not just refer to appendices. Add response on p. 10-11/69 of the response letter to the FEIS.
1.11	Comment not addressed. What is the correct up-to-date information regarding ambulance service. Add response on p. 10/69 of the response letter to the FEIS.
1.12	Are vernal pools present on the site? The response addresses the new jurisdiction of the wetlands along Neelytown Road - address presence of any vernal pools. Add response on p. 11/69 of the response letter to the FEIS.
1.13	Comment not addressed. The requested information was not added, and the information should not rely on NYSDEC review of wetlands. In addition, it is our understanding that the questions on the forest patch relate to the potential need for an incidental take permit – please clarify. This response will need to be updated based on the outcome with NYSDEC.
1.15	Does Appendix O address potential salaries? Given the Applicant's experience with warehouses, general observations should be made. Add response on p. 12/69 of the response letter to the FEIS.
1.17	Comment not addressed. A review of all property values within ½ mile radius does not address impacts on property values immediately adjacent to a warehouse – most of the homes within a ½ mile radius are not next to a mega-warehouse. No support is provided relative to this response. This is a conclusion for which no evidence is provided: <i>"It is worth noting that the property values of these three isolated dwellings, in the I-1 district where no new residential uses are allowed, are anticipated to increase in value for potential development that is allowed in the I-1 district."</i> Add response on p. 12/69 of the response letter to the FEIS.
1.18	Need to specifically address the comment – can traffic movements be restricted to left turns only on Beaver Dam Road? What is implication of doing that? Add response on p. 13/69 of

Comment No.	Comment
	the response letter to the FEIS regarding the effect of closing accesses on Beaver Dam Road.
1.19	The comment references a version of the acoustical study (November 8, 2024) that post-dates the one provided with Appendix I (August 27, 2024). Has the most recent study been submitted? Comment not addressed. It still refers to a November 8, 2024, study, with the referenced study being from August 27, 2024. Please change the date on the response, or provide a November 8, 2024, study if it exists.
1.21	The response states that the <i>“fiscal benefits are necessarily estimated without consideration of speculative property tax incentives”</i> – however, Table 3.M.10 in the DEIS does review the effects of a 485-b – this should be reworded. In addition, Appendix O includes tax revenues during a PILOT period. Lastly, can the developer seek an IDA from the County? Should address this as a response. Remainder of Don Berger comments regarding availability of employment needs to be added as a comment. Add response on p. 14/69 of the response letter to the FEIS.
1.24	Comment not addressed. Additional information regarding the accuracy and method of the housing market analysis should be provided. If updated information has been released by the US Department of Housing & Urban Development, it can be included. Delete reference to “our” as this is the Planning Board’s FEIS. This comment has not been addressed regarding “our” and the additional data in the response letter needs to be added.
Letter #2 Orange County Department of Public Works Review Comments, January 17, 2025	
	No further comments.
Orange County Department of Planning Review Comments, January 23, 2025 (Note: one of the comments not separately numbered)	
3.1	Comment addressed, except indicate whether NYSDOT had comments. Add reference to the email from Jason Brenner in Appendix G of the FEIS.
3.6	Will light sources be visible from Beaver Dam Road (north and south) given the elevation of Warehouse 2? This response needs to be updated. The Town does not have a lighting consultant. In addition, the question is not footcandles, but whether the luminaire will be visible because of the elevation of the warehouse.
3.8	Has NYSDEC completed its review of endangered species? This is in progress and will likely require further revision.
3.9	Defer to Planning Board engineer regarding stormwater impacts and flooding. Comment not addressed. Comment needs to directly address the concern of runoff onto agricultural lands.
Full Letter #4 MHE Review Comments, January 24, 2025 (NPV defers to the Planning Board Engineer, but see several comments below)	
4.1	As part of the Findings Statement, language will be included that only warehousing is evaluated in the DEIS (and no cold storage), and that future SEQR review will be required if a different use is proposed. Please revise the response to address that blasting may be required for those areas where the deep tests did not occur.
4.23	Comment not addressed. It does not appear that tank maintenance, inspection, etc. details were added to the redlined DEIS section. The response on p.17/69 of the response letter should be added to the FEIS.

Comment No.	Comment
4.26	Not addressed – comment indicates it is to be provided for the Planning Board’s review – need to discuss with Board.
4.32	Comment partially addressed. The potential impacts paragraph in Chapter 3.0 should discuss the visibility of the water tank – not just a description of it. It is also unclear if the renderings in the Chapter have been updated to the ones that show the water tank, as the renderings are small and difficult to read.
4.41	Has the Applicant met with or consulted with OCDOH? Are they reviewing the plans at this time?
Letter #5 KALA DEIS Review Comments, January 27, 2025 (KALA review)	
Letter #6 KALA Site Plan Review Comments, January 27, 2025 (KALA review)	
Letter #7 Maybrook Fire Chief Review Comments, January 27, 2025	
7.1	Comment addressed.
Letter #8 NPV Substantive Review Comments, January 27, 2025	
8.3	Comment not addressed. The redlined version of the cultural resources report has not been provided. References to a shared/combined trailer storage area remain throughout the revised DEIS (Appendix B) which need to be removed. In addition, the cultural survey attached to the FEIS identifies three storage warehouses, although now only two are proposed. It is unclear which report the response addresses. It appears the reference has been removed, although the document is not redlined – comment addressed.
8.4	If not already appended to DEIS or FEIS, please add email exchange to FEIS. If the document, reference the page/location in the response. Where is the PCN and email exchange added – to which Appendix?
8.11	The Natural Resource Survey or Wetland Report should be updated to reflect the actual wetland morphology. Incomplete – as per the response letter: “Their [Colliers] team is in the process of preparing a new Wetland & Watercourse Delineation Report to discuss the results of their field investigation, which will include detailed descriptions of the morphology, soils, vegetation, and hydrology of wetlands and streams delineated on site, as well as completed data sheets for all representative data points collected during their comprehensive investigation.”
8.17	Response does not address comment – can booths be accommodated if needed, and not affect internal layout as a result of queuing, etc? Most of the large distribution warehouses along Neelytown Road have a guard booth that have to check the security seals on the back of the trailer before accepting the trucks into the yard. This includes Cardinal, Unfi, Medline, Home Depot, FedEx, and others. Can guard booths be installed without affecting traffic movement to either warehouse. Please show where theoretical booths may be added and not affect the remainder of site’s circulation.
8.20	Not addressed – the Planning Board should discuss. This is regarding the PM2.5 and PM10 analysis, which was not predicted as required by the Scope.
8.26	Confirm that banked parking lot and interior driveway allowed within the setback. Still to be addressed by the Town.
8.27	Not addressed? In reviewing the DEIS, there does not appear to be any revised language or it is not redlined. Note that it is supposed to be explained within the response as well. Comment not addressed – add the revised language as a response to this comment.
8.32	Not responsive to impacts to homes on Beaver Dam Road. Still not addressed in the FEIS – add response from response letter (p. 12/69).

Comment No.	Comment
8.33	Specifically indicate whether there have been discussions held with the IDA. "At this time" only suggests it can occur in the future. Not addressed - If a PILOT calculation remains in the document, it should be extended over a more realistic time frame.
8.36	Comment partially addressed. Although additional screening is proposed, a visual simulation of these viewsheds has not been done. Please address Pelton Farm views. Add discussion from response letter (p. 22/69)
8.37	Comment not addressed. A lighting summary discussion should be provided. Provide an explanation in this response, not just a reference to the plans. The response does not address visibility to residences north of I-84. Visibility of the luminaires from dwellings north of I-84 not discussed.
8.41	Comment addressed – has DEC signed off on the plantings being located around the wetlands? This is still in progress, as per the response letter.
Letter #9 Neighbor 1 Planning Board Meeting Comments, January 27, 2025	
9.1	This response does not address all the comments raised. At a minimum, since it appears most if not all were raised during the public hearing, reference should be made back to those responses. From a noise standpoint, the response should also reference the findings of Appendix I (the Acoustical Study) to further show that noise will not be an issue. Planning Board should review.
Letter #10 Neighbor 2 Planning Board Meeting Comments, January 27, 2025	
10.1	The response is inaccurate – minimal impact to the surrounding residences – this response should be specific to the neighbor that issued the comment. Further, it is expected this residence will be impacted, and it will not be minimal. The response should specify all the measures that are being pursued to minimize those impacts to the greatest extent. Add the specific mitigations to the response from response letter (p.24/69)
Letter #11 Comments based on the transcript of the Town of Montgomery Planning Board Public Hearing, January 27, 2025	
11.1	No further comments.
Letter #12 NYS Department of Environmental Conservation Review Comments, January 30, 2025	
12.1	Not substantively responsive. Provide a discussion of the wetlands that are now being regulated, the j.d. that was secured, alternatives considered, etc. For example, why cannot parking areas be relocated outside of the adjacent area, including those proposed to be landbanked. As the FEIS states in response to other comments, this is a speculative development. So, the need for the amount of parking is likewise speculative. The response in the response letter (21-22/69) needs to be added. This is an open item.
12.2	Comment not addressed. Any further assessments of plants and animals and the need for an incidental take permit is part of the SEQR process. This response should specifically indicate what has been sent to the NYSDEC, include same in an appendix, and should indicate whether NYSDEC will require additional mitigation measures. This is an open item until NYSDEC indicates they are satisfied with what has been submitted.
Letter #13 NYS Department of Transportation Review Comments, February 5, 2025	
13.1	For these comments, the Applicant should meet with the NYSDOT and determine whether the changes to the Traffic Impact Study, and the proposed mitigation measures, are acceptable to the NYSDOT. Update the FEIS to provide the response from response letter (p. 26/69)
13.2	
13.3	
13.4	

Comment No.	Comment
13.5	
13.6	The Planning Board should note that the NYSDOT has opined that the project be included in the “transportation district” established for Bracken Road. The response should indicate that the payment would be for the required mitigation. Planning Board to review with the Applicant.
Letter #14 Town of Montgomery Ambulance Review Comments, February 6, 2025	
14.1	“Comment noted” is not sufficient. The Montgomery EMS indicates they accept Community Benefit Agreements. Is this specifically to mitigate impacts? Will the Applicant enter into an agreement? Response on p. 26/69 of the response letter needs to be added to the FEIS. Planning Board should discuss.
Letter #15 Comments provided by Karina Tipton, February 14, 2025	
15.4	Indicating a wetland permit has been applied for does not respond to the substantive comment. Please address comment. Comment not addressed - submitting a permit application doesn't satisfy SEQR. The response must evaluate salt impacts on wetlands, evaluate unusual importance criteria, and alternatives analysis.
15.5	Not addressed. The EIS Scope indicated: To the extent a resiliency study being conducted by Orange County is made available (draft or otherwise) during preparation of the EIS, the stormwater analysis will discuss the recommendations of that study, and the project’s consistency with same. The commenter is raising a substantive comment related to the Scope. Comment not addressed in FEIS – need to add what is stated in the response letter (p. 28/69)
15.10	Add proposed hours of operation in the response. Indicate the extent to which trucks are visually screened. The following is to be added from the response letter: “The hours of operation will be 24/7 schedule, split between 3 shifts. This is indicated within the DEIS, Chapter 2, under subsection D. Construction and Operation. Trucks are visually screened by either the visual/sound wall, the large landscape berm, or landscape buffering. The only time it is anticipated that trucks will be seen is during exiting and entering the site along access driveways.”
15.12	The response to this comment does not specifically address the lack of solar panels proposed. Additionally, while the use of electric vehicles by employees is not controlled by the applicant, EV infrastructure such as charging stations could encourage the use of EVs at the site. The Greenhouse Gas Offsets section (page 204) does not discuss any mitigation measures that the applicant has committed to at this time. The Planning Board should discuss whether it would be appropriate to incorporate a defined number of EV charging stations. Elsewhere in the Colliers response letter it indicates 10 EV stations are being provided for building. Update the response.
15.13	This comment should indicate that the Applicant does not propose the use of solar panels, and that use of panels will be driven by the specific tenant, as set forth in prior responses. This comment has not been addressed – need to specifically amend response and indicate the Applicant is not proposing solar panels.
15.15	The specific impacts to the residential adjoiners directly across the street from the project have not been addressed, in terms of property values. The FEIS response needs to be revised as per the response letter.

Comment No.	Comment
15.17	Comment addressed. The Applicant needs to coordinate with the NYSDEC now to determine whether an incidental take permit will be required, and whether or not they will impose additional mitigations. Open item.
15.20	The additional documentation and review should be provided as part of the SEQRA process as well. The Planning Board should have a signoff (not permit) that the NYSDEC is of the opinion that mitigations are sufficient. It is unknown at this time whether they will require project modifications as additional mitigation. Open item.
15.21	See response to 15.20 – need comments from NYSDEC. Open item.
15.22	See response to 15.20 – need comments from NYSDEC. Open item.
15.24	Comment not addressed. See prior comments regarding dwellings adjoining the site along Beaver Dam Road. Add response from the response letter which is more relevant.
15.25	Comment not addressed. Written confirmation suggesting that this is outside the scope of the EIS should be included. Planning Board to address – regarding air quality analysis.
15.27	This comment relies upon review of the NYSDEC wetlands permit, and does not address the substance of the comment – what is date of aerial? What other buildout is occurring which may not be shown on the aerial? Also need final comments from NYSDEC. Update the response – this is also open item.
15.29	Need to address the wear and tear on infrastructure/roads portion of comment. Add response from the response letter.
15.31	Not addressed – see prior comments. Add response from the response letter.
15.33	As stated previously, the actual mitigations should be noted or otherwise refer to another response where they are. Add response from response letter (p. 31/69).
Appendices	
Appendix A	List of Commenters - No comments.
Appendix B	DEIS (comments address the redline changes)
p. 11	The wetlands are still under the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers. Issuance of a Nationwide should still be included in discussion. Same comment at p. 58. The Applicant indicates an updated PCN will be submitted to ACOE. This response should be consistent throughout the FEIS responses.
p. 31	Borings were not conducted at the locations with the deepest cuts for Warehouse 2. Additional discussion is needed to address whether or not bedrock could occur within these deeper locations. Add to the response in FEIS as noted previously.
p. 99	The Planning Board should discuss whether the Applicant is also to mitigate impacts to the Bracken Road/Route 208 intersection – see comments from NYSDOT. If so, the payment will need to be determined.
p.113	The Planning Board, as part of its scope, required that the change in particulate matter be predicted. This has not been done. For Planning Board discussion.
p. 134	The discussion on ambulance service seems incomplete. It seems there may be an adverse impact which is not being mitigated. If there is an emergency and service cannot be provided by Town of Montgomery ambulance, what happens? Also address the ambulance discussion of a community benefit agreement. Update the FEIS with response from response letter.
p. 138	We note that tax data are from 2022 – the Planning Board has asked for updates for other EISs (Medline). Planning Board should discuss.

Comment No.	Comment
p. 173	The vantage point should specifically be from the National Register residence located along Beaver Dam Road. Existing vegetation along Beaver Dam Road is not relevant, as the dwelling is on the south side of the road. Also confirm whether it was taken from that vantage point. In addition, address Gideon Pelton Farm. Add the response to the applicable comment in the FEIS – “As explained in comment response number 2, we established a new VP from the National Register-listed residence on the south side of Beaver Dam Rd (VP-11-1-PB), photographed 11/24/2025 (leaf-off). Simulations indicate that the existing vegetation is relevant and there is no façade visibility; minor roofline visibility is fully screened by added evergreen plantings. See Appendix M Visual.”
p. 185	Provide date of aerial map. July 2023.
p. 204	With the number of proposed vehicles at each warehouse, the Applicant should commit to providing some EV charging stations on site. Applicant has added 10 EV spaces to each building. Update the responses in the FEIS where appropriate.
Appendix C	Final Scope - No comments.
Appendix D	Involved/Interested Agencies – No comments.
Appendix E	Defer to Planning Board engineer.
Appendix F	Site plan - to be reviewed separately.
Appendix G	Traffic Impact Study - No comments – traffic studies rely on NYSDOT, County DPW, and Highway Superintendent reviews.
Appendix H	Archaeological Resources – see prior comments above.
Appendix I	Appendix I Noise Resources - appears to be outdated. One of the comments (p. 19) describes an acoustical survey with a more recent date. See prior comments – if the August acoustical study is the most recent, delete references to a November study.
Appendix J	<p>Geotechnical Study - The bedrock identification log does not address the areas of the site that will be cut for warehouse 2 even though the cur-fill exhibit illustrates massive cuts (72 + feet).</p> <p>The Patton Report was updated (November 5, 2024). It notes, under Evaluation, that some of the proposed stormwater control areas have not yet been investigated, and additional borings and /or testputs, and appropriate field tests, are required to assess both the stormwater control areas and the proposed retaining wall sections. When will this occur? See also, for example, under Section 4.4 which discusses additional need for borings for the retaining walls.</p> <p>The cut and fill condition map – the numbers are being obscured by the topography which is layered on top of it – you cannot see all the numbers. Please place cut and fill numbers over topography layer.</p> <p>For Warehouse 2, the cut/fill map shows cuts in excess of 70 feet along the southerly side of the building (where the bays are). The Patton discusses a maximum nominal height of 57 feet – is this report up to date? Does it take into account the large cuts? Also, the borings do not appear to go deeper than 54 feet, although there are 60-70 foot deep cuts. We raise the question for purposes of determining whether blasting could occur.</p>

Comment No.	Comment
	Need to update prior references in the FEIS to this comment as per response letter (p. 36/69).
Appendix K	<p>Ecological Studies - There have been no updates to the ecological survey.</p> <p>The 2.5-Mile Radius Forest Patch Exhibits prepared by Colliers Engineering and Design should include a scale and date of the aerial in response to comments. The forest patch map does not include a scale to confirm the 2.5-mile radius. Analysis has been updated and NYSDEC review is ongoing.</p>
Appendix L	No comment.
Appendix M	<p>Visual Study - The appendix is stamped “Draft for Review” – we presume this is for SEQR review, not the consultant’s client review?</p> <p>Color swatches should be provided to the Planning Board of the buildings – what appears on the screen and in printed copies can vary significantly from the actual colors to be used. To be provided.</p>
Appendix N	Updated Will Serve Letter - Has the Town provided the route for the sewer connection (route into the site). Addressed
Appendix O	<p>Community Impacts – the housing data are from 2/23 – not up to date, but not sure it is important to Planning Board. Check to see question regarding impact on home value.</p> <p>Employment data are from 2023. Are there sufficient employees?</p> <p>Is market getting soft for warehouses in area?</p>
Appendix P	Air Quality - no comments, except for prior questions on screening versus predicted measurements of particulate matter. Discuss with Planning Board.
Appendix Q	<p>Community Services</p> <p>Update to include any new DEC correspondence</p> <p>A map is identified as a hospital services map, but does not show hospitals – it seems to be duplicate of Emergency Services Map. Does not appear to be updated.</p>