

2.2 WRITTEN COMMENTS

A. The following comments were provided by David W. Ahl, Director of Development, Galesi Group, in a letter dated October 22, 2007.

Comment 1: Throughout the draft GEIS/Master Plan there are suggestions about future land use; it is our feeling that the land use plan does not maximize the developable potential of the Park. In particular, with respect to the proposed new access road, we would prefer to have the road located further west and along the perimeter of the property, if possible, to reduce the amount of developable land that will be taken. As a property owner within the Park we also feel that there needs to be discussion about compensation for land used for the road and other non-development uses.

Response 1: The location of the new access road has been slightly modified from that shown in the DGEIS (Figure 1). Regardless, it should be noted that the Master Plan is intended to simply identify the concept of the new access road. Its final location would be subject to a significant design and approval process that would take in consideration many factors including existing road crossings, topography, conflicts with existing or proposed uses, park circulation, availability of developable land, new or existing parking areas, ingress and egress issues etc.

The location of the new access road is preliminary and would have to be analyzed further during detailed design. Land owners and business owners within the park would be part of that design process, in an effort to further minimize impacts and maximize developable land.

Comment 2: We strongly oppose any plans to develop office and retail space at this location. These building uses would be more appropriate for the Scotia-Glenville commercial districts. It is our opinion that the greatest strengths of this Park are its location and industrial infrastructure; therefore we should focus our redevelopment efforts that utilize these attributes.

Response 2: Comment is noted. The study area is located over the General Recharge Area (Zone III) of the Schenectady/Great Flats Aquifer. There are land use regulations that prohibit certain industries and land uses in Zone III, due to their potential impact on the underlying aquifer. Consequently, given the environmental sensitivity of the area, it is appropriate to consider office and retail uses in addition to industry and warehousing.

Additionally, the preferred uses identified during the stakeholder interviews

include office and technology based companies with potentially limited retail along Route 5 to support the tenant's needs and act as a buffer for the surrounding land uses.

Comment 3: Elimination of 7th Avenue - we disagree with this recommendation. It may be needed for park circulation.

Response 3: With the elimination of 7th Street, the traffic would be redirected to the new access road and could also use the secondary access route. Internal circulation, including the elimination of 7th Street, would have to be evaluated in more significant detail as part of the design process for the new access road.

Comment 4: Landscape buffer of 200' seems excessive; test track eliminates developable land; is it necessary?; buildings 405 and 406 have existing tenants in them; is demolition necessary?; Based upon poor rail service provided by the existing carrier, is another spur necessary?

Response 4: The 200' landscape buffer was intended to provide a suitable buffer between park activities and residential areas. The test track that is proposed is being considered by Super Steel, and is essential to their operations.

The demolition of buildings 405 and 406 are considered an option worth pursuing as part of the Master Plan. Market forces will ultimately dictate whether rehabilitation of the buildings or demolition to provide a larger building site is the preferred approach. Similarly, development of additional rail spurs will be driven by market forces. The Master Plan simply indicates that it is possible to develop additional rail sidings, if the market can support it.

Comment 5: Security is not lacking; it is provided by municipality

Response 5: The lack of security was identified as a constraint of the SGIP because several existing tenants expressed a concern about park security during the planning process.

Comment 6: Building 706 has been rehabbed and is currently occupied 100%; we disagree with this comment

Response 6: A visual inspection of the interior was not performed, however, the visual inspection of the exterior indicated that the exterior walls are cracked in numerous locations, the surface of the masonry walls are in poor condition and many windows were covered in plywood.

Comment 7: Marketing strategy - SGIP is well positioned for distribution as well as light industrial it does not have well developed rail access

Response 7: Comment is noted

Comment 8: We don't believe that there is an office demand at SGIP

Response 8: Comment is noted

Comment 9: We don't recommend sidewalks-it has been our experience that the maintenance of sidewalks in an industrial park is cost prohibitive

Response 9: Comment is noted

Comment 10: Land Use and Zoning-need to focus more on distribution; no mention of Empire Zone; this is a critical point to convey

Response 10: Comment is noted.

Comment 11: Should consider Metroplex as the organizer of the Association

Response 11: Comment is noted.

Comment 12: Need an agreement among property owners on a track maintenance program; who pays for?

Response 12: Comment is noted.

Comment 13: Additional rail sidings may not be necessary

Response 13: Refer to the response to comment 4 on page 9.

Comment 14: Performance Standards--current operations are 24/7 for some tenants, restricting hours of operation from 7:00am to 6:00pm is not feasible; noise levels recommended are too low based upon existing usage

Response 14: It is recognized that some tenants currently operate 24/7. Assuming that these tenants can operate within the required noise thresholds, this should not be an issue. Please note paragraph 2, page 45 under Noise in the DGEIS. New structures and site plans should be designed to meet the required

thresholds.

The DGEIS did not recommend specific noise levels. It did recommend that any noise increase be limited to less than 5dBA as measured at the property line of the SGIP. As noted in the DGEIS, increases in noise levels between 5 and 10 dBA, is considered intrusive. To determine existing noise levels and address potential noise impacts, the NYSDEC guidance document *Assessing and Mitigating Noise Impacts, 2001* should be utilized.

Comment 15: 600' from property line for buildings is unreasonable-dramatically reduces amount of developable land.

Response 15: The “above listed uses”, particularly new uses shall be located to the maximum extent possible towards the interior of the SGIP. Existing uses shall take reasonable steps to reduce conflicts between adjacent residential and institutional uses in the SGIP.

Comment 16: Sidewalks should be eliminated; 7th Avenue should not be abandoned; 600 ft buffer eliminated; Hours of operation are not practical

Response 16: Comments noted.

Comment 17: Same comment on 600'; Chain link fencing is currently used, this is an industrial park

Response 17: Comment is noted.

Comment 18: We need to use wall-packs for safety; Lights dimmed or turned off after dark is unrealistic and not safe.

Response 18: Comment is noted.

Comment 19: We should have 1 fire district

Response 19: As indicated in section 2.7 Land Use and Zoning in the DGEIS, the park is split into two fire districts, with the eastern half of the park served by Scotia Fire District 4 and the western half served by the Beukendaal Fire Department. Fire District boundaries should be redefined so the park is entirely in one district. One district would ensure that the park has uniform coverage and all park tenants have equitable taxes and insurance rates.

B. The following comments were provided by Thomas Linder, Temple-Inland Corporate Services, in an electronic mail dated October 22, 2007.

Comment 1: A Copy of the Scotia-Glenville Industrial Park “Draft” Generic Environmental Impact Statement & Master Plan was forwarded to my attention from Temple-Inland Plant Management located at Scotia-Glenville Industrial Park (SGIP), Building #803. Upon review of the material provided, and on behalf of Temple-Inland’s plant management, Temple-Inland has no comments regarding the “plan” at this time. The SGIP “Draft” Generic Environmental Impact Statement & Master Plan appears complete and thorough and has little, if any, impact upon our business operations at Scotia-Glenville Industrial Park (SGIP), Building #803.

Response 1: Comment noted.

C. The following comments were provided by Berger, DuCharme, Harp & Clark, LLP on behalf of Adirondack Beverages, Corp. and Norampac Schenectady Inc., in a letter dated October 31, 2007.

Comment 1: Adirondack and Norampac are opposed to the final plan and any version of the plan which establishes a connector highway for through traffic from either the Exit 26 location to Route 147 or from Route 5 to Route 147 which utilizes the existing roadway Patent Parkway because of the catastrophic impact this proposed through roadway would have on operations at these companies.

The plan does not reference a parking solution for the existing businesses in the SGIP. Adirondack and Norampac currently utilize Patent Parkway areas for employee, visitor, and general parking purposes and the "Plan" which includes changing Patent Parkway into a through highway would eliminate that parking without providing options for these companies. Parking solutions are only vaguely referenced in terms such as "Opportunities to encourage transit use by park employees will be identified" but such opportunities are never really revealed in the plan and there is no solution shown. There is no real public transit in this area and no dedicated area is shown for such parking. The Plan notes that "no parking would be allowed on the primary access road". (See page 2, item 1.1 of Master Plan). The existing parking arrangement is what works. The companies cannot function without parking for the workforce, their vendors, and their customers.

Response 1: Refer to the response to comment 1 on page 8.

Comment 2: Adirondack manufacturing operations include parking and staging in the Patent Parkway area with constant traversing of persons, trailers, tandem trailers, and vehicles from Buildings 501, 601, and 701 to the 2.27 acre site owned by Adirondack on the north side of Patent Parkway (referred to as the "undefined trailer parking" area on Figure 3 of the Plan) and a through highway will cut off the current free access between these sites making the 2.27 site virtually unusable, or at best, dangerous to both the personnel in the park and the vehicular traffic using the highway. Norampac similarly utilizes the Patent Parkway roadway for trucking and access to its bays and docks on either side of their building. The Patent Parkway Roadway is utilized as a turning area for trucks jockeying for position and proper alignment for parking along the sides of the buildings.

Response 2: Refer to the response to comment 1 on page 8.

Comment 3: The details of the northerly highway to run along the existing Patent Parkway location are not shown in the plan. The existing right of way for Patent Parkway (sometimes referred to in older surveys as 1st Street) is only 50' wide and not adequate for a through highway. Expansion to the south would cut into the perimeter properties of Buildings 501 through 801 and possibly into the Buildings themselves effectively ending the operations of Norampac and Adirondack. Expansion to the north would eliminate Adirondack's use of the 2.27 acre parking and staging area (as well as adversely impacting other properties to the north) and effectively curtail or force operations to discontinue.

Response 3: Refer to the response to comment 1 on page 8.

Comment 4: Any plan for general improvement of the SGIP must respect the water lines and concerns of Adirondack as an ongoing enterprise involved in the manufacture of beverage products. A complicated underground piping system is now in place and has been in place for many years to move water from the site shown on Figure 4 (Existing Ownership) and denominated as the "ABI Acquisition Corp". This parcel is now owned by Adirondack and constitutes a water source as the site contains wells and pumping devices to serve the company. Any infrastructure changes contemplated as a part of the Plan must not interfere with this water supply.

Response 4: Comment is noted.

Comment 5: Construction impacts of a northerly roadway of the Study limits within the park are understated. The construction of a highway within 10 feet of a bottling plant with the resultant dust and vibration will jeopardize the sterile

nature of the packaging process which must comply with strict FDA (Federal Drug Administration) guidelines as well as the testing processes in the quality control areas which rely on precise measurement with sensitive instruments. Norampac also requires a dust free environment for its equipment and machinery within the buildings to operate properly and its calibration equipment is most sensitive to exterior shaking or vibration. The construction process would also generate the same parking issues previously raised to an even greater degree.

Response 5: Comment is noted. These issues would have to be addressed in greater detail as part of the design process for the new access road, which will occur sometime in the future.

Comment 6: The implementation schedule and responsibility matrix at Table 2-1 is unrealistic and as a practical matter will be very difficult, if not impossible to work out as shown. The local property owners and businesses within the park are shown as being responsible for the creation of a Business Improvement District ("BID"), targeting other companies as a part of a marketing plan and developing the marketing plan, construction of the new primary access road, extending the sanitary sewer areas over those currently served by septic, opening up purported existing but inactive 16" waterline as necessary, address storm water quality treatment and improvements through the SPDES and SWPPP environmental processes, and coordinate electric and gas connection and activity that crosses overhead lines with National Grid.

There is no cost estimate associated with any of these processes which are being allocated to the business owners in whole or in part. My clients do not plan on footing this cost and trust that alternative arrangements are being made for these infrastructure improvements.

Response 6: It is agreed that developing a business owners association or other type of management structure will be a challenging task. However, it is considered essential if the park is to realize its maximum potential.

Comment 7: Adirondack requires additional space within the park contiguous to its current operations and has been in communication with the last three (3) Town Supervisors and administrations as well as the Metroplex group within the County concerning expansion of company operations and the acquisition of the lot known as 401 Corporations park from the federal government. The master plan makes no reference to this expansion which must be dealt with in order to secure the continued operation of the company at the SGIP location.

Response 7: Use of the federal land for expansion by Adirondack Beverages is an option, when the federal disposition process is complete. Further discussion should be pursued once a new owner or owners have been identified.

Comment 8: Adirondack and Norampac are two of the largest employers in the area and are clearly interested "Stakeholders" as that term is defined in the glossary at page ix of the executive summary. They are probably the most interested and impacted stakeholders under this entire plan. Both have been active and involved supporters of various improvements and collaborations within the SGIP for the last 30 years. The location of the proposed new primary access road is the principal issue that they have with this plan. That part of the plan threatens the very existence of these long time businesses in this area. It is respectfully suggested that any primary access road between Routes 5 and 147 either run further to the north (within the Scotia Sand and Gravel parcels as shown on Figure 4) with a feeder(s) southerly into the SGIP or that the primary access road not be a part of the plan as it is currently shown.

Response 8: Comment is noted; refer to the response to comment 1 on page 8.

D. The following comments were provided by Joe Daly of Super Steel in an electronic mail dated October 3, 2007.

Comment 1: Super Steel has been closely following the events to organize and improve the Scotia-Glenville Industrial Park. We feel that everyone in the community will be favorably impacted by decisions being made to create an industrial park well fit for the community and its surroundings.

We are in favor and understand the need to have the proposed access route connection of Route 5 and Route 147: But, have safety concerns if the placement isn't carefully evaluated.

We currently have two test tracks that would intersect with the proposed new bypass route.

These rails are used by SSSI to access the industrial park sidings and also serve as a run-away safety system during locomotive testing. We are currently able to safely operate on the Northeastern boundary of our property unobstructed. Moving forward with the proposed location, we have concern for the safety as well as imminent interrupted traffic flow we would inflict on the new roadway.

Response 1: The location of the new access road has been modified to minimize

conflict with Super Steel operations. Refer to the response to comment 1 on page 8 for further information.

Comment 2: We would like to propose two additional solutions for your review:

Proposal #1

Join all rail sections leaving the SSSI property to create one crossing. Upgrade and repair existing rail siding and allow SSSI conditional use. The greater lengths of this rail would provide a safe run-away test area and limit the need to close the crossing when we are operating in the area. Often times our projects have to repeatedly pass thru the existing switches on our property, while testing, and approach the sidings non-stop for a 48 hour period of time. This operation also keeps us away from the current residents along Route 5.

Proposal #2

Join all rail sections leaving the SSSI property to create one crossing, and fund a new test rail along the Western side of “A” Avenue. This option may be less favorable for our neighbors.

Response 2: Refer to the response to previous comment.

E. The following comments were provided by Joe Daly of Super Steel in an electronic mail dated October 19, 2007.

Comment 1: Super Steel is primarily concerned with negative impacts a new roadway may have on our business. Super Steel needs to continue to have the ability to do locomotive rail testing and also ship and receive product via rail.

Response 1: The Master Plan for the park is essentially a “30,000 foot” view of the park and recommendation on its long term direction. It does not provide the detail necessary to articulate the precise location of the new access road, new rail sidings and/or test track.

Moreover, test track improvements will likely proceed at a faster pace than the design and construction of the new access road. Therefore, as long as the layout of the test track(s) respects the concept of the future connector road, the Master Plan has served its purpose. Likewise, the designers of the future new access road will have to do likewise and design the road to respect the test track and minimize operational impacts.

F. The following comment was provided by Mark Kennedy from the State of New York Department of Transportation in a letter dated November 8, 2007.

Comment 1: There was no sight distance or traffic evaluations done as part of the DGEIS. Sight distance evaluations must be provided for us to agree with the proposed points of access. Traffic evaluations must be completed as the project progresses and submitted for our review and approval.

Response 1: The future development of the SGIP is too speculative at this point to proceed with a traditional traffic impact study. The DGEIS and Master Plan suggests that traffic impact studies be conducted as individual development projects surface. The new access road's intersection on Route 5 is conceptual at this time. The final location will be determined, in part, based on a sight distance analysis on Route 5. Refer to section 3.1.1 of the DGEIS for further information.

G. The following comments were provided by Philip Perazio from the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP) in a letter dated October 26, 2007.

Comment 1: OPRHP recommends that the above cited report be revised to include a project plan on which the areas recommended for testing and those not recommended for testing are clearly delineated and the justifications for each designation are explicitly indicated. OPRHP also recommends that the standard Management Summary form be included in the report.

OPRHP will continue consultation regarding the project once the requested information has been submitted.

OPRHP has no further concerns regarding standing structures.

Response 1: A revised report is currently being completed by Hartgen Archeological Associates, this report will include the above requested items and will be forwarded to the OPRHP upon completion for review.