

3.5 TRANSPORTATION COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

Comment 3.5-1 (Letter #1 Clifford H. Schwartz, December 10, 2008 and at the Public Hearing, December 10, 2008): The most obvious impact on our area is the large increase in traffic. The mitigation measures that the applicant has presented for addressing the traffic situation seem extreme and do not adequately take into account the concerns of surrounding business owners.

***Response 3.5-1:** Based on input received during the public review process, among other things, the Applicant expects to pursue the As-of-Right, Residential and Convenience Retail Alternative presented in the DEIS/DGEIS. Under this development plan, the commercial component of the project would be reduced by more than 85 percent resulting in a significant reduction in traffic related impacts.*

A Revised Traffic Study, dated February 27, 2009, has been submitted with this document which demonstrates a sizeable reduction in project-generated peak-hour traffic volumes of up to 60 percent. As a result of the reduced traffic volumes, the mitigation measures proposed have been scaled back and are no longer expected to require the acquisition of private property. Refer to Appendix E for a copy of the Revised Traffic Study and concept plans depicting improvements.

Comment 3.5-2 (Letter #1 Clifford H. Schwartz, December 10, 2008): The maps in Figures 3.5-30 through 3.5-35 state that they are not drawn to scale, so it is impossible to determine with any certainty the impact of the proposed road changes.

***Response 3.5-2:** Figures 33 through 36 in the Revised Traffic Study, dated February 27, 2009 and contained in Appendix E herein, are drawn to scale. These figures depict the conceptual widening of the roads associated with NYSDOT's plan for exit ramp improvements in the area of the Rock Hill hamlet center. Subsequent discussions with the Town's consultants resulted in a refinement of the proposed widening, which is depicted (to scale) in Figures 1 and 2 at the end of Appendix E of this FEIS. The State proposes to reduce access to all properties in the immediate vicinity of the west bound exit ramp except for Dutch's Tavern. The As-of Right plan proposed herein would require a reduction in access to Dutch's Tavern, which would impact its parking. The Applicant has proposed to mitigate this impact in discussions with the property owner through the relocation of parking to the rear of the building.*

It should be noted that there will be no impact on the Rock Hill Fire Department driveway as the widening of Glen Wild Road does not extend to that point.

Comment 3.5-3 (Letter #1 Clifford H. Schwartz, December 10, 2008): At this late stage we are still left wondering about whether the proposed road expansion for Phases 1A and 1 would wipe out the parking for the Trading Post and Dutch's.

***Response 3.5-3:** The project related traffic mitigation measures are proposed to be constructed within the existing right-of-way.*

The NYSDOT is not proposing to move the right-of-way or take property, just to take the right of access across all but 25 feet of the front of each of the effected properties.

Refer to Response 3.5-2 for additional information regarding this issue.

Comment 3.5-4 (Letter #1 Clifford H. Schwartz, December 10, 2008): At full build-out, the map in Figure 3.5-31 suggests that land would need to be taken to reconfigure Rock Hill Drive, Katrina Falls Road, and Glen Wild Road as 4 and 5-lane roads. It is unclear whether the businesses along those roads would lose all their parking.

Response 3.5-4: The composition of the project has changed resulting in a dramatic reduction in project-generated traffic. Proposed mitigating measures are no longer needed as set forth in the DEIS. It is no longer proposed to acquire private property for improvements. Due to the proposed reduction in access associated with the NYSDOT improvements (see Response 3.5-2), the only parking that will be impacted by the Proposed Action will be at Dutch's Tavern. The Applicant, in discussions with the property owner, has proposed to mitigate this impact through the relocation of parking to the rear of the building.

Comment 3.5-5 (Letter #1 Clifford H. Schwartz, December 10, 2008): Assuming you can't make a left turn across a 4-lane road, businesses on the south side of Rock Hill Drive would be inaccessible from the westbound lanes of Rock Hill Drive and vice-versa.

Response 3.5-5: It is not proposed to install a physical barrier in the center of the roadway. Motorists will be able to make a left-turn across the double yellow line to enter or exit the highway in compliance with Vehicle and Traffic Law.

Comment 3.5-6 (Letter #1 Clifford H. Schwartz, December 10, 2008): It is unclear whether Pizza the Rock would survive or whether any of the other businesses would be viable.

Response 3.5-6: Based on the change of the Proposed Action to the As-of-Right Residential and Convenience Retail Alternative presented in the DEIS/DGEIS, it is no longer proposed to acquire private property for improvements. The Applicant is not proposing to eliminate private parking or to alter access to Pizza the Rock. The traffic generated by the project will provide many new customers for the existing local businesses, supporting them and helping them to thrive. Refer to Responses 3.5-1 and 3.5-2.

Comment 3.5-7 (Letter #1 Clifford H. Schwartz, December 10, 2008 and at the Public Hearing, December 10, 2008): We need scale drawings that show how traffic will be able to cross from one side of Rock Hill Drive to the other at each development stage, exactly how much parking would remain at each development stage, and the ingress and egress patterns for each business at each development stage, so that individual business owners can assess and comment on the impacts of the revised road network on their businesses.

Response 3.5-7: All proposed mitigation measures are presented in Figures 33 through 36 of the Revised Traffic Study (Appendix E), which are drawn to scale. These measures have been refined and are shown on Figures 1 and 2 which can be found at the end of Appendix E of this FEIS. Motorists will be able to make a left-turn across the double yellow line to enter or exit Rock Hill Drive; it is no longer proposed to acquire private property for improvements. Refer also to Response 3.5-6.

Comment 3.5-8 (Letter #4 Sheldon Bellovin, December 2, 2008): With the influx of possibly 1900 families and possibly an excess of over 3000 or more automobiles and delivery vehicles

used daily by the residents, can you imagine or realize the congestion and pollution on our roads, intersections and highways.

Response 3.5-8: *Peak-hour traffic has been reduced by up to 60 percent from the volumes presented under the Proposed Action presented in the DEIS/DGEIS and the proposed mitigation measures will eliminate potential air-pollution-causing congestion.*

Comment 3.5-9 (Letter #4 Sheldon Bellovin, December 2, 2008): The air pollution probably will increase dramatically with the amount of automobiles and delivery vehicles used daily by this huge amount of population increase.

Response 3.5-9: *Refer to Response 3.5-8.*

Comment 3.5-10 (Letter #4 Sheldon Bellovin, December 2, 2008): There are potentially very significant impacts stemming from such a large massive project of this scale in a relatively remote rural area. It may contribute disproportionately to accelerated generation greenhouse gases, based on the daily driving to jobs or services for residents.

Response 3.5-10: *Peak-hour traffic volumes have been reduced by up to 60 percent and the proposed mitigation measures will minimize greenhouse-gas emissions to the maximum extent practicable.*

Comment 3.5-11 (Letter #10 Susan Roth, AICP, Hudson Valley Planning and Preservation, December 9, 2008 and at the Public Hearing, December 10, 2008): The number and nature of the changes proposed for area roads indicate that the project should be scaled back to a size that can be accommodated with fewer changes, and without the need to acquire private property. Traffic should be analysed at the completion of each development phase, and mitigation measures should be revised before construction begins on future phases.

Response 3.5-11: *The project generated traffic has been significantly reduced and can be accommodated without acquiring private property. Traffic has been analysed for each proposed development phase and mitigation measures have been developed accordingly. It is noted that the Applicant may, for cost-saving reasons, choose to implement all of the identified improvements commensurate with the first phase. The Applicant will analyze traffic at the completion of each development phase and, if necessary, mitigation measures would be revised before construction begins on future phases.*

Comment 3.5-12 (Letter #10 Susan Roth, AICP, Hudson Valley Planning and Preservation, December 9, 2008 and at the Public Hearing, December 10, 2008): At least one property owner indicated an unwillingness to sell property to provide for improvements under the current development scenario, since she would lose parking for her business. In addition, the Association members believe that the proposed traffic impacts would lessen the quality of life currently enjoyed in the hamlet. With a reduction of the total project densities and square footage of commercial buildings, traffic impacts generated from the project would be reduced. The developer should provide a revised analysis of mitigation measures required to accommodate a project of such reduced scale.

Response 3.5-12: *It is not proposed to acquire private property for improvements. The Applicant is not proposing to eliminate private parking or to alter access to private*

property, other than at Dutch's Tavern, where mitigation is proposed (see Responses 3.5-2 and 3.5-4).

The square footage of commercial buildings has been reduced by 87.5 percent and the traffic impacts of the project have been reduced accordingly (peak-hour traffic volumes have been reduced by up to 60 percent). The Applicant has submitted a Revised Traffic Study (dated February 27, 2009) indicating the mitigation measures required to accommodate the reduced-scale project.

Comment 3.5-13 (Letter #11 Pamela M. Eshbaugh, P.E., NYSDOT, December 15, 2008):

The last paragraph of Page 3.5-4 discusses a DOT project encompassing NYS Route 17 Exits 109 to 115, excluding Exit 113. The report states that construction is expected to begin in 2009 and will be completed in 2011. Due to current fiscal constraints, this project is under review for change. Please remove the references to time frames for this project.

Response 3.5-13: All references to time frames for the referenced DOT project have been removed from the Revised Traffic Study.

Comment 3.5-14 (Letter #11 Pamela M. Eshbaugh, P.E., NYSDOT, December 15, 2008):

Table 3.5-3 beginning on Page 3.5-10 of the DEIS lists 56 developments are that proposed in the vicinity of the Rock Hill Town Center project. For traffic projection purposes, it was assumed that all of these projects will occur and will be completed by 2014. While this assumption presents a worst-case scenario in terms of traffic generation, it is highly unrealistic.

Response 3.5-14: The inclusion of the 56 projects was done at the direction of the Town Consultant. If some of these projects fail to materialize, traffic operating conditions will be better than projected.

Comment 3.5-15 (Letter #11 Pamela M. Eshbaugh, P.E., NYSDOT, December 15, 2008):

In light of the high degree of uncertainty regarding the construction of the projects listed in Table 3.5-3 of the DEIS, we reserve comments on the full build-out scenario at this time. Once Phases 1A and 1 have been completed, a new Traffic Impact Study should be prepared for the remainder of the development. The TIS should be reviewed and approved by our Department prior to the start of any construction of the final phase.

Response 3.5-15: The Applicant is willing to undertake traffic monitoring and a subsequent Traffic Impact Study, if required, after the first phase of the development is complete.

Comment 3.5-16 (Letter #11 Pamela M. Eshbaugh, P.E., NYSDOT, December 15, 2008):

On Page 3.5-26, it is stated that 33 feet of right-of-way on the Katrina Falls Road approaches to Lake Louise Marie Road "will be just sufficient to accommodate the proposed widening." A width of 33 feet may be sufficient to accommodate three travel lanes (each 11 feet wide), but it is not wide enough to provide the necessary shoulders, drainage, signs, and other appurtenances. It is noted that the Traffic Impact Study (March, 2007) originally proposed the widening of Katrina Falls Road to four lanes from Rock Hill Drive to Lake Louise Marie Road rather than three lanes as currently proposed. It is assumed that the widening was reduced to three lanes in order to avoid impacts to the NYS Route 17 bridges over Katrina Falls Road.

Response 3.5-16: *A Revised Traffic Study has been submitted for the modified project (Appendix E). The widening of the Katrina Falls Road approaches to Lake Louise Marie Road is no longer planned.*

Comment 3.5-17 (Letter #11 Pamela M. Eshbaugh, P.E., NYSDOT, December 15, 2008): In the last paragraph of Page 3.5-28, it is stated that "Increases in traffic volumes on the mainline of NY Route 17 associated with these projects should be evaluated in the State's plans." Please be advised that our Department does not have any formal "plans" or studies that evaluate the capacity of NYS Route 17 in the project area. It should be noted that the 1-86 projects will not add capacity for future development. The 1-86 projects are necessary to improve ramp geometry, complete partial interchanges, provide standard vertical clearance on the mainline, acquire strips of private property at ramp termini for access control, and other measures as determined necessary by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) for future interstate designation.

Response 3.5-17: *Comment Noted.*

Comment 3.5-18 (Letter #11 Pamela M. Eshbaugh, P.E., NYSDOT, December 15, 2008): On Page 3.5-41, the report indicates that "It is the Applicant's opinion that because these additional improvements are necessitated by the relocation of the existing ramps to satisfy Federal Interstate design standards, the responsibility for implementing these improvements should rest with the proponent of that project, namely the NYSDOT." Our Department strongly disagrees with this statement. Any highway improvements that are required to accommodate a proposed development are solely the responsibility of the project developer.

Response 3.5-18: *Widening beyond the existing NY Route 17 EB Ramps was precipitated by relocation of the ramps, not development of the Rock Hill Town Center. With the reduced size of the project, the widening is no longer required. The Applicant continues to work with the DOT on this matter and will install a traffic signal at either terminus location for the eastbound ramps depending on where the ramp terminus is as the project progresses.*

Comment 3.5-19 (Letter #11 Pamela M. Eshbaugh, P.E., NYSDOT, December 15, 2008): In Section 33.19 Site Access and Circulation (Page 15-45), it is stated that "sidewalks are not necessary and that pedestrians and bicyclists can be safely accommodated on the residential streets internal to the development." The decision to not provide sidewalks is contrary to the idea of promoting a walkable community and conflicts with the *Sullivan 2020* report's Strategy 2.1 to "Promote walkable communities by installing and repairing sidewalks in new and existing development." As a transportation strategy, the report recommends in Strategy 3.22 to "-Enhance and promote the use of bicycles and walking as viable forms of transportation by supporting the provision of safe public facilities, including multi-use trails, bicycle routes, bicycle lanes, and sidewalks." We urge the developer to reconsider their decision to not provide sidewalks.

Response 3.5-19: *It is now proposed to provide sidewalks throughout the private residential streets in the development as well as along Rock Hill Drive. Signalized pedestrian crosswalks with pedestrian signal heads and push buttons will be used as necessary where street crossings are proposed. The sidewalk location and configuration along Rock Hill Drive will be finalized during site plan review.*

Comment 3.5-20 (Letter #11 Pamela M. Eshbaugh, P.E., NYSDOT, December 15, 2008):

The revised Traffic Impact Study indicates that 1,500 trips are anticipated during the Saturday Midday Hour. On Page 8 of the TIS Executive Summary, it is noted that the proposed traffic improvements for Phases 1 and IA are projected to accommodate the generation of up to 1,500 peak-hour trips. It appears from this information that if the peak hour volumes are slightly higher than predicted on Saturday afternoons, traffic will not be accommodated.

***Response 3.5-20:** A Revised Traffic Study has been submitted for the As-of-Right, Residential and Convenience Retail Alternative presented in the DEIS/DGEIS. The revised project generates significantly less traffic during Saturday Midday Hour compared with the project proposed in the DEIS/DGEIS and, as indicated by the commenter, future background projections are conservatively high. As such, it is most likely that the traffic will be accommodated on the network as improved by the proposed mitigation measures.*

Comment 3.5-21 (Letter #11 Pamela M. Eshbaugh, P.E., NYSDOT, December 15, 2008):

A LOS "D" is projected during the Friday PM peak hour at the intersection of Lake Louise Marie Road with Katrina Falls Road. On Page 8 of the TIS Executive Summary, it is stated that "the signalization of the intersection... is an alternative which will be pursued only if the Town wishes to maintain additional right-of-way on either side of Katrina Falls Road at that location." This right-of-way will be necessary to accommodate the signal as part of the full build-out improvements. Page 3.5-27 of the DEIS/DGEIS also notes that "installing a traffic signal will reduce the overall peak-hour delay to less than 15 seconds and provide a Level-of-Service "B" or better conditions on all movements" during the Phases 1 and IA time period.

***Response 3.5-21:** As indicated in the Revised Traffic Study for the As-of-Right, Residential and Convenience Retail Alternative project, it is no longer proposed, nor is it necessary, to install a traffic signal nor to widen the intersection of Lake Louise Marie Road with Katrina Falls Road.*

Comment 3.5-22 (Letter #11 Pamela M. Eshbaugh, P.E., NYSDOT, December 15, 2008):

The "Build Mitigated AM-2014" run indicates a westbound left turn volume on Rock Hill Drive of 390 vehicles/hour. A dual left should be evaluated because the volume exceeds 300 vehicles/hour.

***Response 3.5-22:** At DOT's suggestion, consideration was given to providing a double left-turn movement on the westbound Rock Hill Drive approach to the Route 17 WB ramps. However, because of right-of-way limitations, this could only be accommodated with a left-turn lane and a shared left-through lane, which required that split phasing be provided for eastbound and westbound traffic. The split phasing substantially reduced the amount of time available for the westbound through movement, resulting in poor operating conditions on that movement during the critical peak hours. This measure, therefore, was considered undesirable when a single left-turn lane was determined to function adequately without impacting the westbound through movement.*

Comment 3.5-23 (Letter #11 Pamela M. Eshbaugh, P.E., NYSDOT, December 15, 2008):

The "Build Mitigated Friday-2014" run for Rock Hill Drive and the NYS Route 17 westbound ramps indicate that the 95 percentile volume exceeds the capacity for the NYS Route 17 westbound off-ramp and the westbound left turn from Rock Hill Drive onto the NYS Route 17 on-ramp. The back of the queue on the off-ramp will be substantially closer to the travel lanes of NYS Route 17 and further reduces the existing non-standard stopping sight distance.

Response 3.5-23: *The Revised Traffic Study indicates that, the proposed timing of the signal favors vehicles exiting Route 17 WB at Rock Hill Drive. This will prevent queuing on the off-ramp from spilling back into the highway deceleration lane.*

Comment 3.5-24 (Letter #11 Pamela M. Eshbaugh, P.E., NYSDOT, December 15, 2008):

Any improvements related to the NYS Route 17/1-86 ramps, such as lane additions and signalization, must be reviewed and approved by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to ensure compliance with federal interstate standards.

Response 3.5-24: *The Applicant has met with FHWA and continues to co-ordinate with FHWA with regard to improvements related to the NYS Route 17/1-86 ramps.*

Comment 3.5-25 (Letter #11 Pamela M. Eshbaugh, P.E., NYSDOT, December 15, 2008):

We would like the developer or their consultant to submit the electronic Synchro files and report print-outs containing all the pertinent information (such as Level of Service, total delay, queue lengths, etc.) for Phase 1 and 1A. Additional comments will be provided after we review this material.

Response 3.5-25: *The Applicant has provided the electronic Synchro files of the Revised Traffic Study to the NYSDOT as requested (refer to the e-mail transmittal of 4/2/09, a copy of which is included in Appendix D of this FEIS/FGEIS).*

Comment 3.5-26 (Letter #11 Pamela M. Eshbaugh, P.E., NYSDOT, December 15, 2008):

Once we have reviewed the electronic Synchro files, we would like to meet with the developer, their traffic consultant, and other involved/interested parties to discuss this project. A meeting date in early February is desirable, so it would be helpful to receive the Synchro files as soon as possible.

Response 3.5-26: *The Applicant met with the DOT and the FHWA on February 17, 2009 to present the revised project. The minutes of this meeting are included in Appendix D of this FEIS/FGEIS.*

Following the February 17, 2009 meeting, the Applicant submitted revised capacity analyses to the NYSDOT. In its most recent correspondence on the matter (May 13, 2009), which arose out of a second meeting with NYSDOT and FHWA (via phone) on May 6 2009, the NYSDOT noted that "based on the information in the revised Traffic Impact Study and the revised Synchro files for the above-referenced project, it appears that an acceptable Level of Service will be provided along the NYS Route 17 Interchange 109 ramps during Phase 1 of the project." The NYSDOT requested and the Applicant has agreed that "a new traffic impact study be prepared at the completion of Phase 1 and prior to the commencement of any Phase 2 development." The extensive monitoring program proposed will ensure that each stage of the development will only go forward if traffic operating conditions can be maintained at the acceptable levels indicated in the FEIS. Refer to pages 1-12 and 1-13 and Response 3.5-31 of this document for information on milestones/thresholds, monitoring and future traffic volume assessments.

It should be noted that, the Town Engineer, Town Attorney, the Town's traffic consultant and a representative from the Sullivan County Department of Planning were all present at the May 6, 2009 meeting with the Applicant, the NYSDOT and the FHWA.

Comment 3.5-27 (Letter #15 Mrs. Scarano, December 31, 2008): We don't want the beautiful Glen Wild Road and old "turnabout" to have a "light" and 2 lanes with traffic.

Response 3.5-27: Comment noted.

Comment 3.5-28 (Letter #15 Mrs. Scarano, December 31, 2008): Lastly we do not want approx. 3,000 more motorists in town.

Response 3.5-28: The commercial component of the project has been reduced by more than 85 percent. A Revised Traffic Study, dated February 27, 2009, has been submitted which demonstrates a reduction in project-generated peak-hour traffic volumes of up to 60 percent. As a result, peak-hour trip generation has been reduced from approximately 3,000 trips to 1,100 trips, which would equate to approximately 550 motorists since inbound and outbound trips are counted separately.

Comment 3.5-29 (Letter # 18 William J. Pammer, Jr., PhD, Sullivan County Division of Planning and Environmental Management, December 19, 2008): The proposed traffic mitigation needs to be shown to scale. It is not clear whether the existing right of way provides adequate width for four lanes of traffic where there are currently only two lanes, and whether or not there would be a loss of parking.

Response 3.5-29: To-scale drawings of the mitigation measures have been included in the Revised Traffic Study. It is no longer proposed to acquire private property for improvements nor is the Applicant proposing to eliminate any private parking except at Dutch's Tavern (see Responses 3.5-2 and 3.5-4).

Comment 3.5-30 (Letter #19 Steve Gottlieb, Rock Hill Fire District, January 19, 2009): In addition, because of the additional traffic anticipated to be generated by the developer, a flashing warning light should be placed on the side of Glen Wild Road 500 feet from the Fire House in both directions; the light should be activated by our alarm and by a controller.

Response 3.5-30: Comment noted. The necessity for a flashing warning light has been diminished by the revised plan which will generate significantly less traffic. We suggest that a light not be required in Phase 1, and the issue be revisited prior to construction of future phases when traffic volumes will be assessed and compared with the thresholds set forth by the Town.

Comment 3.5-31 (Letter #20 Robert Geneslaw, Robert Geneslaw Co, December 31, 2008): The FEIS/FGEIS should indicate the responsibility for each of the proposed traffic improvements, provide an indication that the agency responsible for the road is prepared to grant conceptual approval, and include a proposed schedule for providing the improvements based on issuance of building permits, certificates of occupancy or other clearly measurable events.

Response 3.5-31: The Applicant is willing to implement all of the improvements recommended in the Traffic Study which are not related to the upgrade of NY Route 17 to interstate standards (essentially all improvements other than relocating the NY Route 17 ramps). The Applicant has met with the DOT and the FHWA to discuss the project and will be required to obtain approval from these agencies, as well as the Town of Thompson and the County of Sullivan to implement these improvements.

Recommendations for specific milestones and the phasing of improvements have been included in a letter from Adler Consulting, dated May 25, 2009, included in Appendix D, Correspondence of this document. The SEQRA Findings will include a matrix of all items with milestone thresholds, i.e. traffic, wastewater treatment, demographic considerations, etc. Traffic thresholds will be based upon the Adler recommendations which are accepted by or as revised based upon discussion with the Town of Thompson.

It is important to note that the FHWA and the NYSDOT will continue to have jurisdiction through the Site Plan approval process and the extensive monitoring program proposed by the Applicant will ensure that the maximum unit count will not exceed what the FHWA determines can be accommodated by the ramp configuration as currently proposed.

It is noted that the Applicant may, for cost-saving reasons, choose to implement all of the identified improvements commensurate with the completion of the first phase.

Comment 3.5-32 (Letter #20 Robert Geneslaw, Robert Geneslaw Co, December 31, 2008):

There should also be a schedule for interim traffic analyses, funded by the project sponsor, to confirm the traffic projections. If actual traffic levels from project related traffic differs from projections, modifications to the timing, locations, or nature of improvements may be made. This is referenced in the DEIS/DGEIS as part of a Master Development Agreement, but the elements should be in the DEIS/DGEIS.

***Response 3.5-32:** The Applicant will undertake traffic monitoring and interim traffic analyses, as the development progresses (refer to Response 3.5-31 and letter from Adler Consulting, dated May 25, 2009, included in Appendix D, Correspondence of this document).*

Comment 3.5-33 (Letter #20 Robert Geneslaw, Robert Geneslaw Co, December 31, 2008):

Since the project sponsor proposed a 15 year buildout, the FEIS/FGEIS should address the timing of dedication for the north-south road proposed to be dedicated to the Town and include provision for maintenance until dedication. Typically, dedication is not made until all heavy construction and most home construction has been completed. If that is to be the case, how will school buses be routed and how will children be protected from construction activities?

***Response 3.5-33:** The north-south road is intended to serve as a primary collector road and, therefore, should have few, if any, children on it. It is proposed that the south and Southeast portions of the north-south road be constructed and completed as part of phase 1 with dedication offered to the Town as soon as all heavy construction associated with Phase 1 is completed. The developer would be responsible for maintaining the road until it is accepted by the Town. Once accepted by the Town, school buses could use the road. Prior to that, the relatively small number of school children could be driven by their parents to the southern end of the road or the parking lot for the commercial component of the project where they could be picked up and dropped off by the school buses. Construction of the northern portion of the development in Phase 2 would be accessed from the northern driveway on Glen Wild Road so that construction activity would not damage the dedicated portion of the north-south road.*

Comment 3.5-34 (Ellen Hoffman, Public Hearing, December 10, 2008): The idea of five traffic lights, I don't think there are five traffic lights in Monticello, you know, crowded, with Frontier like that. Frontier is sitting empty.

Response 3.5-34: *Comment noted.*

Comment 3.5-35 (Clifford Schwartz, Public Hearing, December 10, 2008): I am concerned that the physical alteration proposed for Rock Hill Drive, Glen Wild Road and Katrina Falls Road would destroy the existing business district and that the new center might not be economically viable.

Response 3.5-35: *It is no longer proposed to realign Glen Wild Road and Katrina Falls Road opposite each other at Rock Hill Drive. In addition, the As-of-Right, Residential and Convenience Retail Alternative development documented in the DEIS/DGEIS and this FEIS/FGEIS has a greatly reduced commercial component thereby all but eliminating potential impacts to existing businesses resulting from roadway changes and introduced competition.*

Comment 3.5-36 (Melinda Ketcham, Public Hearing, December 10, 2008): The DEIS/DGEIS has not adequately drawn to scale the expansion of Rock Hill Drive and Katrina Falls Road, and has not fully considered the impacts on expanding the roadway from two lanes. Expanding these roads will substantially affect the businesses, environment and overall character of Rock Hill.

Response 3.5-36: *A Revised Traffic Study with scaled drawings has been submitted. Motorists will be able to make a left-turn across the double yellow line to enter or exit Rock Hill Drive. The changes to the roadway configuration proposed are not expected to significantly impact the existing businesses, environment or community character.*

Comment 3.5-37 (Melinda Ketcham, Public Hearing, December 10, 2008): There will be overlap onto properties, that will occur from the expansion. There will be an increased amount of traffic congestion. There will be difficulty in traffic movement, and the commercial center of Rock Hill will lose its existing parking.

Response 3.5-37: *It is no longer proposed to acquire private property for improvements, nor is the Applicant proposing to eliminate private parking or to alter access to private property other than at Dutch's Tavern (see Responses 3.5-2 and 3.5-4). The Revised Traffic Study indicates that there will not be traffic congestion or any difficulty in traffic movement.*

Comment 3.5-38 (Anthony Porpora, Public Hearing, December 10, 2008): My main concern, I have many, but the one I'm talking about now is the traffic. The road, they have two different plans to do the road: One for the initial and then one for, I guess if they go with the rest of the project. The second one seems to go right through my building. If the Board is going to allow the first road to go through, I'm assuming that it's going to end up going to the second one.

We invested in Pizza the Rock. We both live in Rock Hill. I've lived here all my life. I would ask the Board that they wouldn't allow eminent domain to come in play. It's a small investment maybe, but for us it's a huge investment. It's our life, you know, children and hopefully retirement to think about. And more than that is our community which you need to think about. And I think everybody is on the same page. We want to keep Rock Hill growing in a steady pace, not too fast. And I guess that's about it.

Response 3.5-38: *The acquisition of property from the pizzeria at the corner of Rock Hill Drive and Glen Wild Road is no longer proposed. The project presented herein and as the As-of-Right, Residential and Convenience Retail Alternative in the DEIS/DGEIS will result in reduced traffic volumes and, therefore, requires substantially less mitigation.*