

3.12 Fiscal Impact Analysis

Comment 3.12-1 (Letter to Planning Board, December 16, 2011, Robert Geneslaw): Pages 3.12-7, 8. Fiscal Impacts to Pleasure Lake Dam, does not identify any fiscal impacts to the dam, and indicates that "no further mitigation is proposed." (underline added). What mitigation is proposed?

Response 3.12-1: Since no fiscal impacts to the dam are anticipated, no mitigation is proposed. The wording was no intended to suggest that any mitigation was proposed.

Comment 3.12-2 (Letter to Planning Board, December 16, 2011, Robert Geneslaw): The purpose of the environmental analysis is to provide the lead agency (in this case the Planning Board) with the best available and realistic information or projections so that the Board may make the most informed decision.

The DEIS allocates costs to various governmental entities based on a U.S. Census estimate that 32.9% of the housing in the Town is occupied by seasonal residents.

The 32.9% figure is then applied to the 142 school-age children that are projected to live in the development upon completion, a figure based on the proportion of the school-age children to the overall population. That is a reasonable approach to estimating the number of school-age children.

Response 3.12-2: The projection is reasonable assuming a future resident population with seasonal characteristics similar to the overall town population. However this estimate was provided as a worse case scenario, per SEQR regulations, assuming the property was marketed to the general population after approvals. However this is not the intent of the project sponsor. The project is designed for a religious population and is intended to be marketed to that group.

Comment 3.12-3 (Letter to Planning Board, December 16, 2011, Robert Geneslaw): As is evident the developments approved, built and occupied over the last decade or more are religious in occupancy (with few exceptions). Therefore, we believe it would be more accurate to calculate public fiscal impacts based on a seasonal religious community.

If the Board is interested in examining a "worst case" scenario, for the purpose of school costs, that scenario would be a year round non-religious development. We do not think looking at that alternative is necessary, since throughout the DEIS and the public statements of the project sponsor and its representatives the intent is to develop a seasonal religious community. Such a scenario could be included as part of the analysis of impacts of a conventional subdivision. In our opinion using the 32.9% ratio of seasonal residents/year round residents, for purposes of analyzing this development is not relevant.

Response 3.12-3: This topic was discussed at the Planning Board work session on January 12, 2012. It was agreed that analysis of what impacts are anticipated from seasonal occupancy by the religious community would be appropriate to address this comment. A detailed memorandum on these impacts was prepared by TMA, dated January 11, 2012, and is included as Appendix D.

Comment 3.12-4 (Town of Fallsburg Planning Board Meeting, December 8, 2011, Ken Lang): I have a concern as a neighbor to the parcel with the taxing structure and the environmental impact. There's a discussion about seasonal use and it doesn't fit as seasonal. It's not a seasonal use project. And so that would be my comment.

Response 3.12-4: The development is designed for and is intended to be a seasonal use project for the religious community, similar to other projects in the Town of Fallsburg. The mixed use of seasonal and year round residents was projected as a worst case scenario as required under SEQR. The homes are built to a year round standard as required by the NYS Building Code, not because they are intended for a year round occupancy. See Appendix D for a further description of anticipated fiscal impacts..

Comment 3.12-5 (Town of Fallsburg Planning Board Meeting, December 8, 2011, James Creighton): Getting back to your question about the seasonal use. The reason why that becomes so significant is that the DEIS makes use of several dozen times that this is a seasonal use facility. This is being reviewed and produced, the environmental impacts are being evaluated based upon seasonal use, Basically two and half to three months out of the year. And yet, when you look at the documents, they admit that 66% of the units are going to be there full time, not seasonal, not for three months. That's a huge concern. I think that's a technical defect. I think this is not being shown to you as a seasonal use. There are certainly going to be people who are going to be using it seasonally, and we welcome them for that use. But this is going to be used for year round residences. And I don't know if there is any way to restrict the use of that, then it really needs to be presented to you with the environmental impacts being set forth for what it would look like for being used as it is intended to be, as year round use with all the town services and all the school services that are going to be required. Regardless of their indication that this is a religious community, that's going to not be using the school system or much of the school system. There is still going to be the situation where they are entitled to certain school services for handicapped individuals or other special services. There are huge impacts. And I think this going to certainly cost the town a lot of money. Their suggestion that the town intake of taxes is going to cover it and there being no net effect. I'm a little skeptical of that because on a project of this size, it almost never happens that way. I wouldn't as someone pays a lot of town taxes and school taxes, I'm concerned about taxes and I think the community should be too. And I think it should be presented and evaluated based on it of being a full use.

Response 3.12-5: See response to comment 3.12-4.