Library Copy

Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement

THE GREAT ESCAPE

For

Great Escape Theme Park LLC

June 2001

Volume 1 of 3 Executive Summary and Comments/Responses

Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement

For

The Great Escape Theme Park, LLC
Proposed Expansion
US Route 9
Town of Queensbury
Warren County, New York

Lead Agency:
Town of Queensbury Planning Board
Town Center, 742 Bay Road
Queensbury, New York 12804
Contact: Craig MacEwan, Chairman
(518) 761-8220

Prepared by:

The LA Group
Landscape Architecture and Engineering, P.C.
40 Long Alley
Saratoga Springs, New York 12866
Contact: S. Jeffrey Anthony and Dean R. Long
(518) 587-8100

Lemery MacKrell Greisler LLC
Attorneys at Law
10 Railroad Place
Saratoga Springs, New York 12866
Contact: John C. Lemery, Esq. and
Jack R. Lebowitz, Esq.
(518) 581-8800

Creighton Manning Engineering, LLP
4 Automation Lane
Albany, New York 12205-1683
Contact: Shelly Johnston
(518) 446-0396

ENSR
6601 Kirkville Road
East Syracuse, New York 13057
Contact: Scott Manchester
1-800-950-0506

Pelton Marsh Kinsella
1420 W. Mockingbird Lane, Suite 400
Dallas, Texas 75247
Contact: Dan Hester
(214) 688-7444

Richard R. Leinbach
21 Olena Drive
Whitesboro, New York 13492
Contact: Richard Leinbach
(315) 736-1323

Clough Harbour and Associates
3 Winners Circle
Albany, New York 12205
Contact: Steve Nissan
(518) 453-4500

Ryan Biggs Associates, P.C.
291 River Street
Troy, New York 12180
Contact: Mark Kanonik
(518) 272-6266

Hartgen Archeological Consultants
27 Jordan Road
Troy, New York 12180
Contact: Karen Hartgen/Matthew Kirk
(518) 283-0534

Date of Acceptance of DGEIS: July 28, 2000
Date of Public Hearing: August 29, 2000
Close of Comment Period: October 27, 2000
Date of Acceptance of FEIS: June 21, 2001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1-1

SECTION 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

2.1 Summary Comments and Responses 2-1

2.2 Index by Commenter 2-668

2.3 Index by Topic 2-672

SECTION 3 PUBLIC HEARING TRANSCRIPT AND WRITTEN COMMENTS 3-1

3.1 Transcript 3-2

3.2 Index to Transcript 3-56

3.3 Written Comments 3-79

SECTION 4 EXHIBITS AND APPENDICES

4.1 2000 Sound Studies

4.2 Locations of Profiles, and Profiles

Figure
- 4-2 Location Map for Figures 4-2A thru 4-2E
- 4-2A Line of Sight Profiles
- 4-2B Courthouse Estates Profile – Existing and Proposed (vert 1" = 300')
- 4-2C Courthouse Estates Profile – Existing and Proposed (vert 1" = 100')
- 4-2D South Side Profile – Existing and Proposed (vert 1" = 300')
- 4-2E South Side Profile – Existing and Proposed (vert 1" = 100')
- 4-3 Section Location Map for Figures
- 4-3A Sections 1 and 2
- 4-3B Sections 3 and 4
- 4-3C Sections 5 and 6

4.3 Visual Analysis 2000 – 2001

4.4 Tap Structure

4.5 Water Quality Data Charts

4.6 Revised level of Service Reports

4.7 Price Study of Study Area Neighborhood Property Value Changes

4.8 DGEIS Notices of Completion

- State Environmental Quality Review: Notice of Completion of Draft Generic EIS and Notice of SEQR Hearing
- NYS Department of Environmental Conservation: Environmental Notice Bulletin, August 9, 2000
- The Post-Star article: Town of Queensbury Planning Board Notice of Completion of Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement and Notice of Public Hearing

4.9 Great Escape HydroCAD Data Files
4.10 Figure 4.10, Shuttle Bus Route
4.11 NYSDEC Visual Impact Program Policy Statement
4.12 NYSDEC Noise Impact Program Policy Statement
4.13 Distance to Residential Uses Map
4.14 Stormwater Report (Summary)
SECTION 5 ERRATA 5-1

SECTION 1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("FGEIS") has been prepared by Great Escape Theme Park LLC ("Great Escape", "the Applicant" or "the Park") for the lead agency, the Town of Queensbury Planning Board ("the Planning Board") in accordance with SEQR's procedures at 6 NYCRR 617.9(b)(8) which require that following the public comment period on a draft EIS, a Final EIS shall be prepared for a proposed action which will include "...copies or a summary of the substantive comments [on the draft EIS] and their source...and the lead agency's responses to all substantive comments", as well as any "revisions and supplements" made to the draft EIS.

Pursuant to SEQR's provisions for EIS preparation and public comment at 6 NYCRR Part 617, on July 28, 2000, the Town Planning Board accepted the Applicant's Draft Generic EIS ("DGEIS") dated July, 2000 as complete for purposes of commencing public review and issued its "Notice of Completion of Draft Generic EIS and Notice of SEQR Hearing" ("the Notice"). DGEIS documents were made available at that time for public review by providing review copies at the Town Offices, the Crandall Public Library and to four interested neighborhood and community organizations and several local newspapers which had previously requested the document. The Notice of the availability of the DGEIS and the opportunity for comment at a public hearing and in writing was also published in the The Post-Star on August 8, 2000, as well as the state Environmental Notice Bulletin in its August 9, 2000 issue[1].

Pursuant to the Notice, a SEQR public hearing was held on August 29, 2000 in the auditorium of the Queensbury High School at which 43 individuals and organizations offered oral comments on the DGEIS. As SEQR and the Notice required, the record of the public hearing was kept open following the hearing until October 27, 2000 to receive further written public comments. The originally noticed deadline for written comments to be submitted was September 11, 2000; the lead agency extended that deadline for an additional 45 days because of many requests of interested persons for additional time to make comments. With that extension, the public comment period on the Great Escape DGEIS was ultimately over 90 days, far in excess of SEQR's procedural requirements for public review.

An additional 87 individuals and organizations filed written comments by the October 27, 2000 filing deadline, for a total of 130 individuals or entities commenting on the DGEIS at either the public hearing or in written comments. These commenters include 31 comments by organizations, including neighborhood organizations, local businesses and business organizations, and other government agencies. The latter include the independent consultants and staff of the SEQR "lead agency" Town Planning Board, the SEQR "involved agencies", the State Departments of Environmental Conservation ("NYS DEC") and Transportation ("NYS DOT") which must issue state permits for the Project,

[1]The notices are reproduced in the appendices section of the FGEIS, Section 4.8.

as well as several "interested agencies", including the Warren County Planning Board and the Adirondack/Glens Falls Transportation Council. Per SEQR's procedures, Section 3 of this FGEIS contains a verbatim transcript of the August 29, 2000 public hearing, as well as complete copies of the 87 written submissions.

This FGEIS contains additional visual and audible noise studies performed in 2000 during the review period for the DGEIS, as was suggested by many commenters, as well as complete responses to all substantive comments made on the DGEIS. The FGEIS Table of Contents lists all exhibits and appendices in Section 4, including additional sound studies, profiles, the updated visual analysis, revised traffic level of service reports and SEQRA notices. Section 2.0 of this FGEIS provides summaries of all 640 separate comments made by the public and a response to each substantive comment. Responses to substantive comments were developed with the input of the Applicant, the Town's environmental consultant, The Chazen Companies, and the involved agencies. The responses were reviewed and developed by the Planning Board at workshop sessions on May 31, 2000. Where the Applicant and the Lead Agency and/or its consultant have not agreed on the response, the differing positions are both provided. Section 4.0 of the FGEIS contains appendices, including the new visual and noise studies and other new exhibits referenced in various of the 640 responses contained in DGEIS Section 2.0.

The major substantive issues addressed in the Final Generic EIS include:

- Further visual simulation studies were conducted for new rides and tall structures in the existing Park amusement area (Park Area A) in order to allow for improved visual review thresholds to be set. These thresholds insure that rides up to 200 feet in height can be sited within defined areas of the Park which will <u>not</u> be significantly visible to viewsheds to the east, including Glen Lake and the Fens, the Warren County Bike Trail and the Glens Falls Country Club (Response 246; Section 4.3); The Visual Threshold map locates three height zones: 115' to 135', 175' to 185', and 200', within which attractions of corresponding heights can be located without undue visual effects. The 115' to 135' height zone is located in the northern portion of the Park which is at a higher elevation relative to the rest of the Park and includes Ghost Town and the area around the Nightmare attraction. Zone 175' to 185' is located in the center of the Park and includes the area from the front of the Park to behind the Condor attraction to the Comet roller coaster and south to the area of the circus tent. The 200' zone is located in the area of the Park that is the topographically lower area of the Park which includes the Rainbow Ride, the Boomerang attraction and out to the west side of the Bavarian Palace.

- Additional audible noise data from new studies performed by both the Park's consultants and independently by the Town validates the DGEIS noise analysis and its conclusions (Responses 51, 480);

    - The further noise monitoring done near Glen Lake indicates that the original monitoring location near the lake shore at Birdsall Road is generally representative of the noise levels at other shoreline locations at the Lake (Response 57; Section 4.1 of this document);

  The Park proposes to continue annual noise monitoring in each of the three receptor neighborhoods at the established sampling locations, to allow for appropriate data comparisons over time. Additionally, the Applicant recommends that a 5 dBA noise threshold be adopted as a Finding herein to set the threshold levels at which increased noise would be deemed significant and require supplemental studies according to SEQR. This, any change in the Park's operation which would not increase noise levels above 5 dBA above the "baseline" determined by monitoring would be deemed non-significant and within the impact thresholds established in this FGEIS.

- The Traffic Impact Study contained in the DGEIS has been confirmed by the reviewing agencies and affirms that the Applicant's recommended traffic mitigation will preserve levels of service for Route 9 traffic at equal or better levels than the present, despite projected growth in Park attendance. While there will be some increase in traffic on surrounding roads such as West Mountain Road, Sweet Road and Round Pond Road, such increases do not rise to levels that would be considered significant according to standard engineering practices. (Responses 92, 368);

    - As suggested by the "involved agencies" NYS DOT and the Town, the Applicant has proposed to tie traffic mitigation thresholds to traffic counts rather than attendance levels as initially proposed in the DGEIS. The vehicles will be counted at the Park entrances on the west side of US Route 9 and reported to the Town Planning Department.(Response 258).

- The analyses in the DGEIS and FGEIS suggest that the project will have no significant adverse water quality impacts on Glen Lake or the Fens. Nevertheless, the Planning Board believes it prudent to require the Applicant to conduct a long-term water quality monitoring program. As detailed in the FGEIS Response 101,

collection of five sample sets over the operational season will be analyzed for conductivity, total suspended solids and total phosphorus.

- The Planning Board anticipates requiring several measures beyond those proposed in the DGEIS to mitigate impacts to water quality as a result of stormwater runoff, including the use of swirl concentrators which filter oil and other debris from stormwater flows.

- The Planning Board intends to further review the details of the Applicant's grading and drainage plans during site plan review.

    - Stormwater quantity and quality from the site will be controlled to pre-development levels. At the regulatory threshold of the 50 year event, 10.99 cfs will be released from the site, compared to 11.62 currently. (Response 386).

    - Contrary to the suggestions of many commenters, available data suggests that Glen Lake water quality at present is <u>not</u> threatened. Extensive long-term monitoring data indicates that the lake is at the low end of the "mesotrophic" lake classification, with under 10 ppb of the critical nutrient parameter Phosphorus and 2.9 ppb Chlorophylla. (Responses 63, 64, 72, 150)

    - Phosporous loadings to the Glen Lake watershed from the Park from the design storm event will decrease from today's 1.19 pounds to 1.06 pounds of Phosporous post-development because of Applicant's improved proposed wastewater system. (Response 55).

    - Although the current on-site septic systems at the Park have no demonstrable impact on Glen Lake water quality, the proposed wastewater treatment plant will reduce nutrient loadings to the soils in the watershed at least 90-95% from present levels. (Response 63; 434);

- The Applicant has indicated its commitment to connect to a public sewer, if and when one becomes available, but proposes to use its interim upgrades for the near-term until public sewer is physically available. (Response 233).

- Many commenters suggested various alternatives which would reduce the need for construction of impervious surfaces, including

a parking garage and use of paving blocks. The Applicant's position is that these alternatives are infeasible because of operational, cost and maintenance considerations. (Responses 35 and 416). The Applicant has alternatively suggested the use of porous pavement in many of its seasonal lots to increase permeability. The Lead Agency will consider the information submitted by the Applicant and the various commenters when making its Findings on this issue. (Response 107).

- The FGEIS verifies that grading and clearing associated with the Project would not significantly change noise transmission from the Northway to the residential neighborhoods in the Study Area because published studies suggest that the amount of vegetation to be cleared does not function as a significant noise barrier and because where existing grades block direct transmission of noise from the Northway to residential receptors, such grades will continue to exist. (Responses 6, 39, 222).

- A noise berm as suggested by commenters is infeasible, because the Northway and noise sources on the road are elevated below the receptor neighborhoods. Hence, such a berm would need to be approximately 50 feet high, and even if built, would be of questionable effectiveness. (Response 121).

- The FGEIS verifies that the Project will have no effect on rare, endangered or threatened species or habitat, and that the resource inventories in the DGEIS are adequate. (Responses 84 and 351).

- The clearing and grading associated with the Project will not alter the existing vegetation and hillsides within the Route 9 and the state highway right of way. Current screening and topography on Route 9 will therefore be preserved. Lands outside of right of way however will be significantly altered and that there will be a significant alteration of the view from the Northway.

- Mitigation of impacts to cultural resources on a portion of the site between Rt. 9 and the Northway and north of the Coach House Restaurant will be performed subject to approval of the State Historic Preservation Office in accordance with the State Historic Preservation Act. (Responses 29, 601).

- The Applicant has argued that the proposed "festival parking" design is environmentally superior to the alternative of a typical commercial lot design with internal landscaped islands because it provides more effective screening options along the travel

corridors and it reduces the land area needed for clearing and paving and better performs the traffic mitigation function of providing for quick and convenient access from Route 9 and thereby reducing congestion and delays to through travelers. Disadvantages associated with this design are the lack of internal landscaping. The Planning Board also notes that effective screening along travel corridors could be achieved regardless of the internal design of the parking lot. The Planning Board will consider these factors when making its Findings regarding the design of the parking area (Response 40).

- The Applicant has argued that, contrary to the perception of many commenters, the Park has ample land for development and is well-buffered from adjacent land uses by natural resource lands and distance. (Response 248). The Applicant has further argued that the Park has more than sufficient room to add or reconfigure amusements in the 90 acre developable "upland" portion of the Park without intruding into the 250 acre "buffer" surrounding Area A. The Planning Board agrees with the Applicant that the proposed Project of constructing a parking and on-site traffic-management system together with the other proposed improvements also occurs on newly-acquired lands west of Route 9 will not expand the footprint of the existing amusement area within the 237± acres of Park Area "A". The Applicant has therefore argued that, compared to other theme parks, especially those nearer urban areas, the Great Escape has ample area and is adequately separated from adjacent land uses. (Responses 97 and 366). The Lead Agency is also aware of and will consider arguments made by residents that the Park is surrounded by residentially developed areas that are adversely affected by increased noise and traffic associated with the Park.

- The Applicant has argued that the parking lots should be lit by 50 foot tall lighting fixtures because they will most efficiently light the lots. The Applicant has further argued that adverse impacts will be mitigated by the use of "shoebox" style fixtures that will cast light downward and because the lights will be in use for a relatively small number of nights in the summertime and fall. The Planning Board will balance these arguments against its general policy of requiring lower light fixtures, which policy is expressed in draft form in the Town's proposed zoning ordinance. In making its Findings, the Planning Board will consider the potential visibility of tall light fixtures from nearby residential receptors.

- The Applicant has responded o suggestions that the proposed shuttle bus system be operated on a dedicated road by proposing a shuttle bus route (See FGEIS Section 4.10). The Planning Board believes that this is largely an operational issue and will therefore reserve the right to review how the system functions once it is operational.

The Planning Board will utilize the DGEIS and this FGEIS (collectively the "GEIS") to make Findings on the proposed project. The Findings will serve as the basis for the Board's decisions and subsequent actions with respect to the Project. The involved agencies are anticipated to make their own Findings on the project.

Complete indexes by commenter and topic appear at the end of the comment summary/responses section, FGEIS Section 3.1, as Sections 3.2 and 3.3 respectively.

L:\335\001\DGEIS RESPONSES\EXEC_SUM_FINALFINALB.DOC

SECTION 2.0 SUMMARY COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

All public and interested agency comments which were made during the public comment period were summarized into 640 separate comment summaries, which were then responded to by the Applicant on behalf of the lead agency, as SEQR requires. Section 2.1 presents the individual comments and responses, with the header identifying the source of the comment and the reference to the hearing transcript or written submission where the full comment can be found. Sections 2.2 and 2.3 are indexes to comment summaries and responses by commentor and topic. The full hearing transcript and written comments on the DGEIS as received by the lead agency was also fully reproduced in Sections 3.1 and 3.3, respectively.

COMMENT 1 **(Mr. Donald Sipp, 60 Courthouse Drive, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 17):**

Commenter questions whether audible noise levels tested at the Glen Lake monitoring station are representative given that the monitoring station is not within the line of sight of the Park as are the monitoring stations for Twicwood and Courthouse Estates.

RESPONSE 1

This site was originally selected in 1990 during the first sound study for the Comet roller coaster due to the proximity and height of that attraction to that neighborhood in relationship to this site. It remains a valid sample location for the same reason and demonstrates the impact of sounds of boats and personal water crafts operating on Glen Lake in the immediate proximity of the sampling site. During Summer of 2000 and in the Fall, additional sites on Glen Lake at shoreline elevation 398 and in direct line of sight of the Great Escape along Ash Pond were also sampled. See Section 4.1, "2000 Sound Studies."

The study found that the Glen Lake Birdsall Road site was representative of the sound environment on Glen Lake. The Leq at Ash Road sites was 41-56 Leq dBA while the prior measurements at Birdsall Road was 45-48 in 1999. Other neighborhoods include Bay Bridge (47-52 Leq dBA), Glen Lake Country Club (51-57 Leq dBA), Indian Hills (43-54 LeqdBA) and Leland Estates (47-49 Leq dBA). Twicwood was sampled at the same time period and sound level was 47-56 LeqdBA which indicates that sound levels in Twicwood area are no significantly greater than many of the other Queensbury neighborhoods such as Indian Hills or Bay Bridge. The fluctuation in sound levels occurs due to changes in activities and the above measurements were made in six separate communities during a single afternoon.

The studies were conducted in a manner consistent with ANSI §1.4 – 1983, and ANSI §1.13. The work provided the data required to make community sound assessments in accordance with NYSDEC Program Policy Assessing and Mitigating Noise Impacts (DEP – 00 – 3 September 29, 2000).

DGEIS Reference: See page 3-38

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 2 **(Mr. Donald Sipp, 60 Courthouse Drive, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 18 and 21):**

Commenter questions the validity of audible noise tests conducted on August 29, 1999 and October 29, 1999, since, as he states, the Alpine Bobsled ride was not operating on that date.

RESPONSE 2

The only August 29 sampling date is August 29, 1990, which is the sound inventory taken prior to construction of the Comet and Bobsled. Based on the technician's notes, the Bobsled was operated for the Frightfest on October 29, 1999.

DGEIS Reference: See page 3-36 and Table 3-7

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 3 **(Mr. Donald Sipp, 60 Courthouse Drive, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 19):**

Commenter questions the DGEIS conclusion that sound levels in residential neighborhoods are within Federal Noise Guidelines claiming there are no such federal guidelines and, if such guidelines exist, "if they choose to use federal guidelines, let's get one more recent than the 1980 one they are using."

RESPONSE 3

The guidelines by the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) remain applicable and the long period of time that they have been in use by federal agencies including the United States Environmental Protection Agency, Federal Highway Administration, and Federal Aviation Administration, indicates that they are effective and fair. The NYSDEC has issued a 10/6/00 Program Policy for Assessing and Mitigating Noise Impact that continues to rely upon the above-referenced documents.

The SEQR record of this proceeding supports a finding that Park's current activities do not constitute a significant noise impact in the three residential study neighborhoods. This conclusion is based on the consistent results of the noise monitoring, done over a period of more than ten years, and the EPA, HUD and DEC noise guidelines which have not substantially changed since they were promulgated in the mid-1970s. The Park proposes to continue annual noise monitoring in each of the three receptor neighborhoods at the established sampling locations, to allow for appropriate data comparisons over time. Additionally, the Applicant proposes that a 5 dBA noise threshold be adopted as a Finding herein to set the threshold levels at which increased noise would be deemed significant and require supplemental studies according to SEQR. Thus, any change in the Park's operation which would not increase noise levels above 5 dBA above the "baseline" determined by monitoring would be deemed non-significant and within the impact thresholds established in this FGEIS. (The existing peak baseline noise level readings attributable to the Park in the 1999 and 2000 seasons were 57 dBA Leq at Courthouse Estates, 56 dBA at Twicwood and 51 dBA at Glen Lake.) The 5 dBA value is suggested since it is the threshold used by the Federal Highway Administration to consider whether mitigation might be required. It is also lower than the 6 decibel threshold at which the NYSDEC recommends investigation of mitigation measures. The Applicant believes that it is an appropriate threshold value because it is only slightly above the 3 dBA level which is the lowest threshold of human hearing to detect any change in sound levels, but has a slight margin to account for the vagaries of humidity, wind and similar environmental factors in noise measurement and perception. Any changes proposed in the Park which would potentially raise noise levels over 5 dBA at any of the monitoring stations would require supplemental environmental review during site plan review; however, the Applicant has indicated that it expects that it will be able to site new attractions without exceeding the 5 dBA noise threshold and thus requiring additional review. As noted in Responses 37, 130 and 311, the Park also expects to reduce noise levels from the existing monitored "baseline" through noise attenuation improvements to the Alpine Bobsled ride.

Lastly, in this discussion of thresholds, it is obvious that if the study neighborhoods are to be protected and stay within the HUD "non impact" category, the Planning Board must endeavor to control other future potential sources of noise from uses other than the Great Escape. The Applicant believes that the use of the 5 dB noise impact threshold would be appropriately applied to all potential land uses which could raise the ambient noise levels in the study neighborhoods. The Planning Board will consider this information in its future deliberations.

The only effects expected by the removal of trees and the addition of the parking lot is a change in the degradation rate of sound since soft ground absorbs slightly more noise than a hard surface would. Studies have shown that sound from a highway close to 'soft' ground produces a decrease in sound of

approximately 4.5 dBA per doubling of distance while 'hard' surfaces produce a decrease in sound of approximately 3 dBA per doubling of distance. The surface quality of the land between I-87 and Courthouse Estates and Twicwood Estates is a combination of both 'hard' and 'soft' surfaces and would continue to be so with the expansion of the parking lot. Since both subdivisions are located more than 1,200 feet from I-87 and the field measurement presented in the DGEIS indicate that noise from I-87 traffic is not dominant at either location is not expected that the conversion of the section of trees adjacent to I-87 to a parking lot will significantly effect the noise levels at the two locations.

In addition to the above information regarding the noise absorption levels, it has been documented in numerous publications by the U.S. Department of Transportation (Highway Traffic Noise Analysis and Abatement, Policy and Guidance, June 1995; Highway Noise, December 1978) that vegetation itself rarely reduces highway noise by significant levels if it is not of sufficient width, height and density. Vegetation has to be dense enough that there is no line of sight through the vegetation, at a height of at least 16 feet above the line of sight, and at least 200-feet in depth to reduce noise levels by two to six decibels. For this reason vegetation is not allowed to be used for noise abatement when conducting noise analysis and mitigation for the DOT. The noise analysis conducted and presented in the DGEIS prepared for the Great Escape include noise data collected at receivers at both the Courthouse Estates and Twicwood Estates developments. The noise levels presented in the report represent the conditions expected regardless of the removal of the trees adjacent to the Northway since it is not expected that the row of trees referenced in the above comment is effectively buffering noise in the project area.

To test whether a barrier would be effective an analysis of the insertion effect was completed as described in Noise Assessment Guidelines. Two analysis were completed. The results of this work is found on worksheets A and B set forth in FGEIS Section 4.1. Location A is the main parking lot while Location B is at the south end of the property at the site of the proposed light blue lot. Due to the distance between barrier and receptors and relation vertically between the Northway and receptors there is not a position where a wall would result in a significant sound reduction.

The distances between barrier and sound sources and receptors all need to be within hundreds of feet of each other rather than the 1,000 + feet distances at the Great Escape. Any variation of the distance between source and barrier does not change the ratios to such an extent that an effective sound barrier position can be discovered. As the barrier moves away from the source, then the ground attenuation and diffraction becomes more important than barrier itself to such extent that the value of the barrier as an attenuation device is severely diminished.

(Noise Assessment Guidelines 1983 PB84-15113. Bolt Beranek and Newman Inc. Cambridge MA. Housing and Urban Development.)

To demonstrate the impact of sound transmission from the Northway the chart below was prepared based on the recognized doubling rule (see above) and use of field data collected at the Great Escape. This data is directly applicable since all evidence indicated that vegetation is an ineffective barrier to sound.

Great Escape Parking Lot 200' east of the Northway 1999 sound levels	61-63 LeqdBA
Double distance 400' (subtract 3 dBA)	58-60 "
Double distance 800' (subtract 3 dBA)	55-57 "
Double distance 1600' (subtract 3 dBA)	52-54 "
Double distance 3200' (subtract 3 dBA)	49-51

Twicwood is 2000 ft from the Northway. The sound levels at Twicwood during the Fall of 1999 was between 41-54 LeqdBA. Comparing that level to the estimate shown above for sound degradation indicated that ground effects account for much of the sound degradation. These ground effects occur

regardless of whether or not there are trees or other dense vegetation. Ground effects of 3dBA for each doubling of distance account for the decreases in sound levels from land adjacent to the Northway to Twicwood and that tree or dense vegetation is not a jmajor factor in the loss in sound intensity.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 4 **(Mr. Donald Sipp, 60 Courthouse Drive, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 20):**

Commenter questions use of HUD guidelines as a method for evaluating audible noise impacts from the Park and the proposed Project. In particular, Commenter questions HUD's goal that exterior noise levels not exceed a day night average of 55 decibels and interior noise levels not exceed a day night average of 45 decibels.

RESPONSE 4

See Response 3. These have been longstanding guidelines which would indicate their general utility and acceptability.

The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) has also just released guidelines cited in Responses 1 and 3. These guidelines reutilize the HUD standards that were also incorporated in the EPA 550/9-79-100 (United States Environmental Protection Agency, Protective Noise Levels, November 1978, the so-called "EPA levels document"). See Response 1.

DGEIS Reference: See page 3-41

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 5 **(Mr. Donald Sipp, 60 Courthouse Drive, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 21):**

Commenter asks, "there was a table showing that on October 6th they determined the day night noise levels, was October 6th a Thursday? Was the Park open and running on that date?"

RESPONSE 5

In order to determine a day/night sound (DNL – level), it was necessary to take sound readings past 10 PM. The Great Escape closes at 10 PM. A DNL has a 10 dB penalty added to the base reading. It is necessary to establish the base reading in the quiet time in order to correctly establish the DNL.

The reference in Table 3 in Appendix 7 to October 6 should have been to September 6, a Monday (the Bobsled was running that day).

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 6 **(Mr. Donald Sipp, 60 Courthouse Drive, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 21 – 22):**

Commenter questions the effect of removing 11.4 acres of trees and 5.6 acres of lawn to create 16.9 additional acres of blacktop on noise emitted from the Northway. In addition, Commenter asks if there is data or a computer model demonstrating how the removal of vegetation will impact noise from the Northway in the Twicwood and Courthouse Estates neighborhoods?

RESPONSE 6

The only effects expected by the removal of trees and the addition of the parking lot is a change in the degradation rate of sound since soft ground absorbs slightly more noise than a hard surface would. Studies have shown that sound from a highway close to 'soft' ground produces a decrease in sound of approximately 4.5 dBA per doubling of distance while 'hard' surfaces produce a decrease in sound of approximately 3 dBA per doubling of distance. The surface quality of the land between I-87 and Courthouse Estates and Twicwood Estates is a combination of both 'hard' and 'soft' surfaces and would continue to be so with the expansion of the parking lot. Since both subdivisions are located more than 1,200 feet from I-87 and the field measurement presented in the DGEIS indicate that noise from I-87 traffic is not dominant at either location is not expected that the conversion of the section of trees adjacent to I-87 to a parking lot will significantly effect the noise levels at the two locations.

In addition to the above information regarding the noise absorption levels, it has been documented in numerous publications by the U.S. Department of Transportation (Highway Traffic Noise Analysis and Abatement, Policy and Guidance, June 1995; Highway Noise, December 1978) that vegetation itself rarely reduces highway noise by significant levels. Vegetation has to be dense enough that there is no line of sight through the vegetation, at a height of at least 16 feet above the line of sight, and at least 200-feet in depth to reduce noise levels by 10 decibels. For this reason vegetation is not allowed to be used for noise abatement when conducting noise analysis and mitigation for the DOT. Vegetation added to projects is merely for psychological benefits and is provided for visual, privacy, or aesthetic treatments to a project. The noise analysis conducted and presented in the DGEIS prepared for the Great Escape include noise data collected at receivers at both the Courthouse Estates and Twicwood Estates developments. The noise levels presented in the report represent the conditions expected regardless of the removal of the tress adjacent to the Northway since it is not expected that the row of trees referenced in the above comment is effectively buffering noise in the project area.

To test whether a barrier would be effective an analysis of the insertion effect was completed as described in Noise Assessment Guidelines. Two analysis were completed. The results of this work is found on worksheets A and B set forth in FGEIS Section 4.1. Location A is the main parking lot while Location B is at the south end of the property at the site of the proposed light blue lot. Due to the distance between barrier and receptors and relation vertically between the Northway and receptors there is not a position where a wall would result in a significant sound reduction.

The distances between barrier and sound sources and receptors all need to be within hundreds of feet of each other rather than the 1,000 + feet distances at the Great Escape. Any variation of the distance between source and barrier does not change the ratios to such an extent that an effective sound barrier position can be discovered. As the barrier moves away from the source, then the ground attenuation and diffraction becomes more important than barrier itself to such extent that the value of the barrier as an attenuation device is severely diminished.

(Noise Assessment Guidelines 1983 PB84-151133. Bolt Beranek and Newman Inc. Cambridge MA. Housing and Urban Development.)

To demonstrate the impact of sound transmission from the Northway the chart below was prepared based on the recognized doubling rule (see above) and use of field data collected at the Great Escape. This data is directly applicable since all evidence indicated that vegetation is an ineffective barrier to sound.

Great Escape Parking Lot 200' east of the Northway 1999 sound levels	61-63 LeqdBA
Double distance 400' (subtract 3 dBA)	58-60 "
Double distance 800' (subtract 3 dBA)	55-57 "
Double distance 1600' (subtract 3 dBA)	52-54 "
Double distance 3200' (subtract 3 dBA)	49-51

Twicwood is 2000 ft from the Northway. The sound levels at Twicwood during the Fall of 1999 was between 41 – 54 LeqdBA. Comparing that level to the estimate shown above for sound degradation indicated that ground effects account for much of the sound degradation. These ground effects occur regardless of whether or not there are trees or other dense vegetation. Ground effects of 3dBA for each doubling of distance account for the decreases in sound levels from land adjacent to the Northway to Twicwood and that tree or dense vegetation is not a major factor in the loss in sound intensity.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 7 **(Mr. Donald Sipp, 60 Courthouse Drive, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 21):**

Commenter asks if sound barriers have been considered to reduce noise levels form the Northway, which Commenter believes will increase owing to tree removal that is part of the Project.

RESPONSE 7

The Applicant has argued that barriers are impractical at this location due to the changes in topography between the existing parking lot labeled as green and purple and the Northway, resulting in an excessive cost to construct an effective barrier. Barriers will not be effective due to distances between the barrier, Northway and the potentially affected study neighborhoods.

See Response 6.

DGEIS Reference: See Cross Sections.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 8 **(Mr. Roger Boor, 83 Sunnyside East, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 24):**

Commenter states that Story Town did not have the degree of negative impacts to the community that the current ride Park now has.

RESPONSE 8

The Lead Agency notes the Commentor's opinion.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 9 **(Mr. Roger Boor, 83 Sunnyside East, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 25):**

Commenter asks whether the applicant studied the impacts on traffic of a mass exodus from Great Escape in which all or most of Park patrons seek to leave the Park at once? Commenter questions the assumption in the DGEIS that patrons leaving the Park will be distributed over several hours and asks "what will occur when 30,000 patrons at the Great Escape experience one of the afternoon thunderstorms or prolonged downpours...?"

RESPONSE 9

A mass exodus from Great Escape does not occur on a regular basis and therefore was not studied in the DGEIS. The statement in the DGEIS that patrons leave the Park over a longer period of time is not an assumption, but rather based on the Applicant's documented experience at the Park. The Lead Agency expects that, on the rare occasions it occurs, levels of service temporarily lower than those calculated and presented in the DGEIS would occur. This would be an unavoidable adverse impact of the project. The Applicant does not expect that there will be 30,000 patrons at the Great Escape at any one time. A straight-line projection indicates that approximately 18,200 people would attend Great Escape on a typical peak day in August when the annual attendance is 1,500,000 patrons. Daily attendance is therefore overstated in this comment. The impacts of traffic exiting Great Escape in the typical afternoon peak hour were analyzed in the DGEIS. One of the benefits of the proposed access road and infrastructure improvements is that they will provide substantial storage areas for vehicles waiting to exit the parking lots. Vehicles exiting the parking lot will be stacked and queued on-site and the proposed traffic signals will meter traffic turning onto Route 9.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section H, Page 25

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 10 **(Mr. Roger Boor, 83 Sunnyside East, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 26):**

Commenter states, "[on] Page 78 of the [Traffic Study], the last bullet states: Approximately 80% of the peak hour traffic entering the Great Escape parking lots approach from the north and approximately 20% approach from the south. The ambiguities of this statement are obvious, of the 80% entering the Park from the north, what percentage in fact is coming from the south existing I-87 at exit 20 and backtracking to the Park? Current stacking problems on northbound 87 would seem to verify that perhaps points south are in fact a larger source of trip generation."

RESPONSE 10

The TIS states that "The 80 percent from the north include those vehicles that travel northbound on I-87 to Exit 20 and travel south on Route 9 to the theme Park." Figure C-1 in Appendix C of the Traffic Impact Study illustrates that 25 percent of the entering traffic is expected to travel from the south on I-87 to Exit 20 to the Park.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section D, Page 19

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 11 **(Mr. Roger Boor, 83 Sunnyside East, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 27):**

Commenter states, "traffic counts for cars exiting from the north onto the bridge and cars using the bridge to go south on I-87 are conspicuously absent from all the traffic counts shown in figures 3.1 to 3.30. They are instead left in appendix A of this manifest and disjoined from their interpretation and enlightening."

RESPONSE 11

The intersections that required detailed analysis were specified in the Scoping Document per the Planning Board's decision to "scope" the GDEIS and SEQR procedures at 6 NYCRR 617.8. Both the lead agency and the NYSDOT reviewed and approved the specific intersections to be included within the DEIS scope of studies. Analysis of the I-87 Exit 20 southbound ramp intersection with Gurney Lane was not required. Both the NYSDOT and the Lead Agency's environmental consultants have reviewed and approved the conclusions of the traffic study.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 1, Page 2

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 12 **(Mr. Roger Boor, 83 Sunnyside East, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 27):**

Commenter claims that the DGEIS analysis of impacts to traffic is flawed because of its treatment of Gurney Lane Bridge, stating, "the cornerstone of this traffic study is that you do not look at the bridge traffic and the opposing left hand turns to access or exit I-87..As you read this document you will see that the name Gurney Lane is conspicuously absent from almost all commentary and analysis...can a professional traffic engineering firm make assertions about traffic in the area without looking at the Gurney Lane bridge, its intersection with Route 9 and its ultimate level of service capabilities?"

RESPONSE 12

The Route 9/Gurney Lane intersection is analyzed in detail in the Traffic Impact Study, including Level of Service (LOS) during the peak hours at 1,500,000 annual visitors at Great Escape. With the improvements recommended in the Traffic Impact Study, the Route 9/Gurney Lane intersection will operate at an overall LOS C and LOS D during the weekday and Saturday peak hours, respectively, at "full build" (See Responses 262 and 267).

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 1, Page 2 and Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section G.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 13 **(Mr. Roger Boor, 83 Sunnyside East, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 28):**

Commenter asks, "is a two lane bridge [on Gurney Lane] going to be able to handle the future demands of our growing community and also provide safe and timely egress and ingress to the Great Escape?"

RESPONSE 13

See Response 12. The two-lane section of Gurney Lane has a maximum capacity of 1,300 vehicles per hour per lane in each direction. At full build (1,500,000 annual visitors at Great Escape) plus an increase in background traffic of 10.4 percent, the highest hourly traffic volume is estimated to be 717 vehicles per lane in one direction (refer to Figure 3.35). Therefore, the two-lane bridge on Gurney Lane will be able to handle the future traffic demands with ample capacity for additional community growth.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section H.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 14 **(Mr. Roger Boor, 83 Sunnyside East, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 28):**

Commenter questions DGEIS' conclusion that there will be no impact to impact to local collector roads, especially Glen Lake Road, West Mountain Road, Round Pond Road, and Sweet Road.

RESPONSE 14

Traffic generated by the Great Escape will be directed by the Park to use highways such as I-87 and Route 9 for access to the Park. The improvements to the State highways will minimize delays for all traffic in the area, so through vehicles (not related to Great Escape) will not be encouraged to travel on alternate routes such as Glen Lake Road, West Mountain Road, Round Pond Road and Sweet Road for general commuting. It is anticipated that the proposed traffic signals on Route 9 at Glen Lake Road and Round Pond Road will have a positive impact on the operation of these collector roads, facilitating access to and from Route 9. There is currently a traffic signal at the Route 9/ Sweet Road intersection to serve traffic turning at this intersection. The Lead Agency agrees that there will be some increase in traffic on surrounding roads such as those cited in this comment. However such increases do not rise to levels that would be considered significant according to standard traffic engineering practices.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section I.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 15 **(Mr. Roger Boor, 83 Sunnyside East, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 29):**

Commenter questions conclusion that local collector roads will not be impacted stating, "isn't Gurney Lane a local collector road?"

RESPONSE 15

See Responses 12 and 13. Gurney Lane is a local collector road and the potential impact of additional traffic generated by Great Escape will be mitigated by the improvements recommended in the Traffic Impact Study.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section G.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 16 **(Mr. Roger Boor, 83 Sunnyside East, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 29):**

Commenter questions DGEIS' conclusion that Park visitors do not know about local collector roads and asks what impact the "2,300 Great Escape employees" going to and from work will have on local collector roads?

RESPONSE 16

See Response 14. The traffic generated by Great Escape employees is included in the increased trip generation of the Park and the impact of these employee trips is implicitly included in the analysis of future traffic conditions. As in the past, future employees at Great Escape will likely come from the Town of Queensbury and the local neighborhoods. It is probable that they will use both the State highways and local roads to travel to and from work. Typically, employees of Great Escape do not travel during the peak hours, but rather when traffic volumes on the adjacent roadways are lower.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section I.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 17 **(Mr. Roger Boor, 83 Sunnyside East, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 29):**

Commenter asks, "how did applicant determine that the increase in traffic on collector roads would be negligible?"

RESPONSE 17

The trip assignment summarized on Figures 3.15 and 3.20 of the Traffic Impact Study illustrates that the increase in traffic on collector roads such as Glen Lake Road and Round Pond Road will be approximately 20 to 30 two-way trips during the peak hours at full build of the Park (1,500,000 annual visitors). The additional trips are approximately 10 percent of the future traffic volumes on these local collector roads. Peak hour traffic volumes could vary by 10 percent on a daily basis regardless of the increase in attendance at Great Escape. Therefore, it was concluded that the increase in traffic on collector roads is negligible. These two-lane roads have ample capacity to accommodate such a small increase in peak hour traffic.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section I.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 18 **(Mr. Roger Boor, 83 Sunnyside East, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 30-31):**

Commenter asks, "how is safe pedestrian and bicycle traffic across [Gurney Lane] bridge going to be ensured?"

RESPONSE 18

The existing shoulders on Gurney Lane will continue to accommodate pedestrian and bicycle traffic across the bridge. The width of the existing shoulders varies from 3 to 4 feet on the bridge and increases to 6 to 7 feet wide on the east end of Gurney Lane near Route 9. The asphalt surface of the shoulders is in excellent condition. The paved shoulders, bicycle-safe drainage grates and existing cross-slope of the shoulders all enhance Gurney Lane's safety and capacity for bicycle and pedestrian traffic. The American Association of State Highways and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) *Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities*, 1999, indicates that "paved shoulders should be at least 4 feet wide to accommodate bicycle travel". Pedestrians and bicyclists are permitted to use the shoulders of most non-Interstate State highways. The NYSDOT *Highway Design Manual* indicates that "Shoulders...should have a minimum width of 4 feet where more than occasional pedestrian traffic occurs". The NYSDOT survey of this area indicates that there is a total of 30 feet of pavement across the Gurney Lane bridge. This provides adequate width for two 4-foot wide shoulders and two 11-foot wide travel lanes. The existing shoulders on Gurney Lane will continue to accommodate pedestrian and bicycle traffic until the bridge is replaced by NYSDOT.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 19 **(Mr. Roger Boor, 83 Sunnyside East, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 31):**

Commenter cites the 22% growth in population for Queensbury over the ten year period from 1990 to 2000 and asks, given this growth, "how can the applicant state that the capabilities of local collector roads are adequate to accommodate the vehicular demands of local circulation?"

RESPONSE 19

See Responses 13, 14, 15, and 17. Information provided by A/GFTC indicates that annual traffic volumes within the study area are generally increasing at the rate of 2 percent per year. The Traffic Impact Study accounted for this growth rate by increasing existing traffic volumes by 10.4 percent (two percent per year for five years).

DGEIS Table 3-4 is corrected in Section 1.0, Errata, of this FGEIS, and shows that from 1980 to 1990, the population of Queensbury increased 12.4%, of Glens Falls decreased 5.5%, and of Warren County increased 7.74%.

Additional information collected from the US Census Bureau indicates that from 1990 to 2000, the population of Queensbury increased 12.4%, of Glens Falls decreased -4.5%, and of Warren County increased 6.9%.

Therefore, the 2% growth factored into the Traffic Impact Study (provided in DGEIS Appendix 4) is appropriate. The NYSDOT and the Lead Agency's environmental consultant haveconcurred on this point.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section A.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 20 **(Mr. Roger Boor, 83 Sunnyside East, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 32):**

Commenter asks what detailed studies of local traffic on collector roads "other than counts" has the applicant made and asks, "have large senior housing facilities and multiple dwelling projects currently underway east of the Great Escape been accounted for with regard to their access to Interstate 87 and the Route 9 corridor, and what about pending development that are likely to receive approval?"

RESPONSE 20

See Response 17. The relative impact of the increased traffic volumes generated by the Great Escape expansion on local collector roads indicates that additional analysis is not warranted. The inclusion of other projects' traffic impacts was incorporated through the use of a regional traffic growth rate, which rate accounts for increased travel associated with local growth. Further, the Great Escape has a different peak hour than typical residential developments.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III; Appendix 1.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 21 **(Mr. Roger Boor, 83 Sunnyside East, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 32):**

Commenter states that the DGEIS should include a study of impacts to traffic from development, such as an increase in population and the addition of new or expansion of existing businesses, that may result from extending sewer lines to parts of town not currently served by municipal sewer.

RESPONSE 21

The Applicant proposes to build an on-site treatment system to improve its wastewater treatment and has indicated its willingness to connect to a public sewer should one become available. However, the Applicant is not proposing to construct a public sewer and the responsibility for studying the impacts from such a proposal, including the additions of new or expansions of existing businesses, would be the responsibility of the agency proposing such a sewer, not the Applicant. The study of cumulative and secondary impacts of extending sewage collection along Route 9 will be the responsibility of the applicant for that municipal project. See Responses 98, 175 and 435.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 22 **(Mr. Roger Boor, 83 Sunnyside East, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 33):**

Commenter acknowledges that the proposed pedestrian bridge will be safer but questions whether facility traffic near the Park will create a bigger bottleneck problem at the Route 9/Exit 20 intersection, in particular, whether travelers on Glen Lake Road will be able to turn right regardless of a green light?

RESPONSE 22

The improvements recommended in the Traffic Impact Study will provide additional capacity to Route 9 through the intersections with the Exit 20 ramps. Based on the analyses provided in the DGEIS, there will not be a bottleneck problem at the Route 9/Exit 20 intersection. Based on the analyses provided in the DGEIS, northbound queues on Route 9 at the Exit 20 intersections will not adversely impact the operation of the Glen Lake Road intersection. Based on the analyses provided in the DGEIS, the proposed traffic signal at the Route 9/Glen Lake Road intersection will reduce the delays for westbound traffic exiting Glen Lake Road.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section G.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 23 **(Mr. Roger Boor, 83 Sunnyside East, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 33-34):**

Commenter suggests that the Warren County Municipal road should have been studied with respect to the traffic study and asserts that impacts to this road may have some negative impact on emergency vehicle access.

RESPONSE 23

The roads that required detailed analysis were specified by the Lead Agency in the Scoping Document. While the Lead Agency acknowledges the use of the Warren County Municipal Center road by some drivers as a form of bypass, the Lead Agency does not expect that there would be significant impacts to emergency vehicle access because, regardless of their location, vehicles are required to pull over when approached by an emergency services vehicle with lights flashing and siren on. The Applicant believes that as improvements are made to Route 9 and the Route 9/Glen Lake Road intersection, fewer vehicles will use the Warren County Municipal Center access road. The Lead Agency's environmental consultant agrees that this is a reasonable expectation.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 1, Page 2

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 24 **(Mr. Roger Boor, 83 Sunnyside East, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 34):**

Commenter asks, "will improvements to the [Route] 149 corridor lessen or cause greater numbers of cars and trucks to enter the study area and well-known bottleneck at exit and entrance ramps that make up the entire exit 20 interchanges?"

RESPONSE 24

The analysis in the Traffic Impact Study is based on traffic count data collected in the summer of 1999. At the time the traffic count data was collected, the NYSDOT Route 9 improvement project was essentially complete and the Route 149 project was not yet under construction. The improvement project on Route 149 is a NYSDOT-sponsored project for resurfacing the highway beginning at Route 9 and continuing east. The first section of the project is currently under construction. The improvements to Route 149 will not change the capacity of the road or the volume of traffic through the study area. The Route 149 resurfacing project will not affect the findings of the Traffic Impact Study.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section G.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 25 **(Mr. Roger Boor, 83 Sunnyside East, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 34-35):**

Commenter suggests that on-site changes will not solve the "massive growth this area of...town is experiencing" and thus such mitigation is inadequate to adequately address the negative impacts that locals who must travel the roads in and around the Great Escape will experience.

RESPONSE 25

The Lead Agency notes the Commentor's opinion. The Traffic Impact Study in the DGEIS recommends off-site improvements on Route 9 that, based on the analyses provided, address the potential impacts of additional traffic generated by the Great Escape and indicate that significant adverse impacts will not occur.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section G.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 26 **(Mr. Roger Boor, 83 Sunnyside East, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 35-36):**

Commenter states that, "the proposed new lane from northbound I-87 through Route 9 Gurney Lane intersection has a high probability of creating a worse situation than already exists. It will reduce the stacking capabilities of Gurney Lane bridge, it will create another lane change for big rigs and automobiles heading south on Route 9 from [Route] 149 and attempting to use the bridge for points south on Interstate 87, and require more time for all vehicles that either turn from or to the bridge from Route 9."

RESPONSE 26

The improvement described for the Route 9/Gurney Lane intersection includes modifying the existing exclusive southbound right turn lane to provide for a shared through/right turn lane. It will not create another lane change for vehicles destined for the I-87 Exit 20 southbound on-ramp. The same lane will be used in the future that is used today for right turns. The stacking capabilities of the eastbound approach of Gurney Lane will be reduced only slightly (approximately 20 feet). Based on the analyses in the DGEIS, there is ample capacity for queues on Gurney Lane such that the proposed extension of the southbound lane through the Route 9/Gurney Lane intersection will not have an adverse impact on Gurney Lane. The increased delay for vehicles that turn right onto the bridge from Route 9 southbound will be minor as a result of the proposed improvements. A comparison was made between the delay for southbound right turns under the No-Build condition and the delay for the Build condition at Attendance Level 3, the level at which the subject improvement is recommended. The average delay for the southbound right-turn movement from Route 9 will increase by approximately 10 seconds per vehicle during the peak hours as a result of changing the exclusive right turn lane to a shared through/right turn lane. (Refer to Response 267 and the Level of Service reports in Attachment 267-1). From the perspective of a driver, this change in average delay during the peak hours is not significant.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section G.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 27 **(Ms. Joanne Bramley, 38 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 37-39):**

Commenter, quoting information she found at discovery.com, states that the trend in amusement Parks is to build rides known as "scream machines" and cites such rides as Six Flags Magic Mountain's Goliath and Superman the Escape.

RESPONSE 27

The term "scream machine" relates to an approach to marketing rather than the characteristics of the particular attraction commonly found in theme parks.

The DGEIS identifies modest improvements that will be made to the Park to improve the mix of attractions and to update attractions. The changes expected over the coming years will be to increase the capacity of the attractions, and certainly the thrill factor attractions will have to meet customer demands. The DGEIS and FGEIS identify specific measures to mitigate significant environmental impacts and describes the process for future review by the Town. The Town has complete a study of sound sources in the neighborhoods around The Great Escape and determined that sound levels in these areas conform to guidelines by Federal Housing and Urban Development and DEC for community noise impacts.

This FGEIS proposes a threshold for cumulative noise impacts as discussed in Response 3.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS

COMMENT 28 **(Ms. Joanne Bramley, 38 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 41):**

Commenter asks how the rides at other Six Flags Parks that may be introduced at Great Escape compare to the Alpine Bobsled in terms of noise generation. In particular, commenter asks that the Planning Board be given decibel readings from the new "scream machine rides" "so the Planning Board is aware of the magnitude of the intended development of these rides at this Park". Furthermore, Commenter asks whether applicant will address the noise emitted by patrons screaming?

RESPONSE 28

Management of sound sources at the Great Escape will require annual monitoring at the long-term sites utilized for sound studies since 1990. The Great Escape will add attractions to the Park and during site plan review prepare analysis of sound impacts. As an operational criteria a new attraction will not be allowed to cause more than a 5dB change in the ambient Leq in the adjacent communities.

It is necessary to have a range of values to account for the seasonal variation and the mix of sound sources that affect the neighborhoods. A range of values is also required since control of new sound by the Planning Board will not be absolute.

As a community objective it is necessary to manage all sound sources to the same level in order to assure that the environment continues to conform to the HUD guidelines.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS

COMMENT 29 **(Ms. Joanne Bramley, 38 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 42):**

Commenter questions the DGEIS' conclusions that a 200 foot structure would have a negligible visual impact and states, "picture the CNA building in Glens Falls. Now imagine two of them stacked on top of each other and add 20 feet."

RESPONSE 29

With respect to visual impact, the Applicant points out that a structure needs to be examined in its existing context or surroundings. The CNA building is isolated and doesn't have any significant vegetation or other tall structures nearby, and so appears to have a significant visual impact. A building also has width and length which gives the structure mass and greater visibility. A tall attraction will be either composed of structural steel elements such as tubing that is 12 to 24 inches in diameter as opposed to a building that is 50 to 100 feet on either its width or length dimension. A tall attraction could be supported by lattice frame work of which the visibility is reduced due to the amount of space in between the structural elements.

In response to comments received on the DGEIS, the Great Escape commissioned additional visual studies to identify areas in the Park where 165 and 200 foot structures would not be substantially visible from Glen Lake and in other areas of the eastern viewshed. For the purpose of this analysis, a structure is substantially invisible when the form of the structure is partially hidden from view due to vegetation or interferring structures that reduce visibility. A substantially invisible structure will not be readily apparent to the casual observer. This information and study is included in this FGEIS and can be found in Section 4.3.

As a result, three zones are proposed in the Park that can accommodate structures up to 200 feet tall that will not significantly impact Glen Lake, the Glens Falls Country Club or the Bike Trail. It is within these zones that such proposed new structures will be located. See FGEIS Section 4.3 for a detailed analysis. The NYSDEC has issued a Program Policy Statement for Assessing and Mitigating Visual Impacts (July 31, 2000), provided in Section 4.11 of this FGEIS This policy statement includes definition and criteria for aesthetic impacts. "Aesthetic impacts occur when there is a detrimental effect on the perceived beauty of a place or structure. Mere visibility, even startling visibility of a project proposal should not be a threshold for decision making." Instead, a project by virtue of its visibility must clearly interfere with or reduce the public enjoyment and/or appreciation of the appearance of an inventoried resource. The viewshed of the Project does not include an inventoried resource such as a state or municipal park or historic structure or place. The Town of Queensbury has numerous areas designated as historic features and scenic corridors. Among the inventoried scenic resources which could potentially be affected by the Park is the Rush Pond wetland. This low lying area is owned by the Applicant, difficult to access, and has restricted views into adjacent areas due to elevation changes between the wetland and the Great Escape in part due to the fill slopes of the Northway. Glen Lake Road is designated as scenic and Mud Pond is an historic scenic road in the 1989 master plan. The scenic views on both roads include the Great Escape as part of the visual fabric of the local vistas. Improvements at the Great Escape (which is zoned for use as an amusement park) will not significantly change the scenic views of the vista since the property will continue to be an amusement park. This reduces the importance of the visibility factor. The structure visibility must be considered within the context of the overall view. A tall attraction in the background with other smaller amusements both on the Great Escape and in adjacent properties build a context that includes amusement rides as a part of the expected view and increases the compatibility of the elements.

Visibility from scenic areas such as Glen Lake must be considered in accordance with the aesthetic impact definition. Mere visibility of a tall structure is not necessarily an impact. Other tall structures can be seen from Glen Lake. Tall structures that are proposed, as described, can have reduced visibility by use of design and siting. The visibility of a structure will not be equal at all locations. A lattice structure that is triangular in form viewed from the apex of the triangle is an entirely different view than the view of one of three flat sides of the triangle. The amount of visibility of a tall structure will be highly variable which reduces the overall impact by limiting the numbers of individuals able to readily see the structure. Tall rides at the Park are proposed to be sited within an area of the Park already developed with rides and attractions, and containing significant mature vegetation. Refer to FGEIS Section 4.3, "Visual Analysis 2000-2001" wherein other Park locations were examined for placement of tall rides, and a development area defined for tall rides. Note that the amusement Park is located in the Town designated Recreational/Commercial zoning district, which is designed to "isolate, protect, and encourage the expansion of the recreation industry." As a guideline, the NYSDEC document suggests that when a use is allowed as of right, the need for extensive visual analysis is diminished, since the elements are already considered to be compatible.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS

COMMENT 30 **(Ms. Joanne Bramley, 38 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 43):**

Commenter asks that, with respect to the visual impact of a 200' structure, the applicant quantify the number of affected persons for each receptor area, citing Glen Lake, the Glens Falls Country Club, the bike path, and the north and southbound lanes of the Route 9 and I-87.

RESPONSE 30

Refer to FGEIS Section 4.3, "Visual Analysis 2000-2001," for a report providing additional field analysis. The proposed area volunteered by the Park for development of tall rides will not be substantially visible from Glen Lake, the Glens Falls Country Club, or the bike path. **See Response 29 for a definition of insubstantial visibility.** The Applicant has argued that, given the context of the aesthetics of the existing Park rides and attractions, and given that the Park is located in the Recreation/Commercial zone which is designed "to isolate, protect, and encourage the expansion of the recreation industry," the consolidation of visual effects such a ride represents from those traveling the Northway and the Route 9 business/commercial/amusement corridor is believed to be insignificant. The visual analysis in Section 4.3 of this FGEIS supports this assertion.

See Response 29.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS

COMMENT 31 **(Ms. Joanne Bramley, 38 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 43):**

Commenter asks, "why was data not included regarding the construction of noise barriers as possible mitigation?"

RESPONSE 31

See Responses 6, 7.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS

COMMENT 32 **(Ms. Joanne Bramley, 38 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 43-44):**

Commenter questions extension of hours at the Park over the past ten years and asks why operating hours were not included in the DGEIS.

RESPONSE 32

The Applicant reports that the hours of operation were reviewed in 1990 and 1996. The overall hours of operation are not expected to change from those that have occurred during recent years. The Applicant reports that the Park will continue to operate until 10 PM except during special events when the Park has stayed open to 11 PM. Most special events take place in enclosed spaces such as the Bavarian Palace and picnic pavilions which are enclosed or surrounded by intervening land forms that reduce sound transmission.

Hours of operation are set by the needs of Great Escape guests to provide value for their entertainment dollar and vary in response to competitive conditions, among other factors. Hours in recent years have been as follows.

Prior to 1997 – 9:30 a.m. – 6:00 p.m. daily, Memorial Day through Labor Day and 12:00 p.m. – 11:00 p.m. during the Octoberfest. 1997 Season – changed to 9:30 a.m. – 6:00 p.m. Sunday through Thursday and 9:30 a.m. – 8:00 p.m. Fridays and Saturdays in June; 9:30 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. Sunday through Thursday and 9:30 a.m. – 10:00 p.m. Fridays and Saturdays in July and August and 12:00 p.m. – 11:00 p.m. during the Octoberfest. 1998, 1999, 2000 Seasons – 9:30 a.m. – 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and 9:30 a.m. - 8:00 p.m. Saturday and Sunday in June; 9:30 a.m. – 8:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and 9:30 a.m. – 10:00 p.m. Saturday and Sunday in July and August and 12:00 p.m. – 11:00 p.m. for the Octoberfest. Waterpark hours – 11:00 a.m. 6:00 p.m. in 1997 and has remained the same. 1999 & 2000 Frightfest – 5:00 p.m. – 10:00 p.m. on Fridays; 12:00 p.m. – 10:00 p.m. on Saturdays and 12:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. on Sundays during October. 2001 Season – opening time changed to 10:00 a.m., all other hours remain the same.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS

COMMENT 33 **(Ms. Joanne Bramley, 38 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 44):**

Commenter states that, "other Six Flag Park properties operate until midnight and on some occasions until one a.m." and asks that the Planning Board, "be specific about restricting the hours of operation to not exceed current hours."

RESPONSE 33

The majority of the Six Flag parks close between 10-11 p.m. The recent noise studies by the Town of Queensbury demonstrate that the sound environment in the adjacent neighborhoods is compatible with the HUD Noise Guidelines. Based on this level of compatibility there is not a recognizable impact on the community sound environment. In order to require a mitigative measure there must be a specific demonstrated significant impact. The lack of impact on the sound environment does not provide the basis for requiring a mitigative measure that is as pervasive as restricting the park hours of operation.

Specific measures have been implement to mitigate instantaneous sound emitted by the Bobsled. To date $125,000 has been spent on studies, insulation application and experimentation with various wheels. This type of mitigation is appropriate for the level of impacts that occur at the site.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS

COMMENT 34 **(Ms. Joanne Bramley, 38 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 45):**

Commenter quotes page 2 of the DGEIS Executive Summary, "As documented in this Impact Statement, the support facilities which the Park proposes in this project, are intended to support and accommodate growth in patronage while providing for improved levels of environmental quality for potential impacts on traffic congestion, water quality, wetlands protection, storm water management, cultural resources and visual impacts, community character, and audible noise," and questions that conclusion.

RESPONSE 34

The Lead Agency notes the Commentor's opinion. The purpose of this GEIS process is to provide the Lead Agency with specific studies and facts on which to base its conclusions on the project.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS

COMMENT 35 **(Ms. Joanne Bramley, 38 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 46):**

Commenter questions whether the development of a parking garage would be cost prohibitive and suggests that such an alternative should have been addressed because of its claimed lesser impact on topography, especially the removal of trees from Animal Land to the Samoset property?

RESPONSE 35

A parking structure over the existing lots (green, purple, brown, beige) would be very expensive due to the weak subsoils in this area. Cost of a parking space within a garage facility runs from $5,000 to $10,000 per space while a surface lot costs only $1,000 per space. Based on these figures, the Applicant has indicated that construction of a parking garage would be cost prohibitive. Placing a garage or deck elsewhere will diminish its benefits since patrons would have a long distance to travel to the entry area.

A large multiple level structure will not contribute to resolving the local traffic issues. A multiple level parking structure will have four to eight entry points which limits access. This limited number of access locations will reduce the speed at which cars can be parked. A level parking field will allow multiple rows of cars to be parked simultaneously while a garage only allows single rows of cars to be parked at a time. A parking garage reduces the speed at which cars can leave a site during peak periods, again due to the limited number of exits provided, restricted lanes for movement, tight turning radius and narrow parking bays. This increases the period during which cars idle while in an exit or entry queue which creates a source of air pollution. At some point in the future if year-around use warrants it, a single level deck could be a positive attribute at the hotel to increase parking proximity and guest convenience.

See also Response 6 regarding why existing vegetation does not significantly reduce noise transmission.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS

COMMENT 36 **(Ms. Karen C. Angleson, 1 Greenwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 48):**

Commenter asks if noise barriers were considered and, if not, why not, stating that "these could be attractive and very effective."

RESPONSE 36

See Responses 6 and 7.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS

COMMENT 37 **(Ms. Karen C. Angleson, 1 Greenwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 49):**

Commenter asks whether there will be further mitigation to reduce the audible noise generated by the Alpine Bobsled?

RESPONSE 37

The Applicant has indicated that over $125,000 has been spent on reducing the amount of sound from the Alpine Bobsled. This past summer, a medium density acoustic foam was applied to the track to reduce vibration and sound transmission. This has reduced the sound from the Bobsled by four to seven dB in the nearby residential neighborhoods. In July, new soft wheels were installed on the Bobsled to further reduce sounds from the attraction. These wheels work well to reduce sound but caused the Bobsled to ride high in the track which potentially created structural issues and caused unusual wear on the braking mechanism. These consequences also cause the ride's passengers to be jostled and changed the ride from a family group ride to one that may have required height or weight restrictions. The Park management continued to study the use of various soft wheel combinations, structural improvements in braking systems and other means to control noise from the ride. The use of the Bobsled was also curtailed during the past summer while the various repairs were being made. During the coming season, additional sound mitigative measures will continue to be worked on with a goal of minimizing the sound from this attraction. The Applicant has indicated that it appears feasible to reduce sound from this attraction by 12 dB if a soft composite wheel can be utilized.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS

COMMENT 38 **(Ms. Karen C. Angleson, 1 Greenwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 49):**

Commenter cites a comment on page 4-21 of the DGEIS that states that the hill within the US Route 9 corridor will not be eliminated but notes that figures 4-10, 4-11, and 4-12 show the removal of land and trees within that area, and asks whether the DGEIS' conclusion that any change in landscaping for the project will have no effect on noise propagation from the Northway has been substantiated.

RESPONSE 38

The statement on page 4-21 is correct, as are the cross section Figures 4-10, 4-11, and 4-12. The trees within the NYSDOT ROW will not be disturbed nor will the land in the NYSDOT row be disturbed. This will maintain an effective visual barrier to the extent that it exists today. Further additional cross sections have been prepared to show the relationship of the Northway, parking lots and Route 9. The Route 9 corridor right of way extends to the top of the hill on the west side of Route 9. This hill as it faces Route 9 will not be changed by the project.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS

COMMENT 39 **(Ms. Karen C. Angleson, 1 Greenwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 50):**

Commenter cites a statement in the DGEIS stating that vegetation must be 20 to 100 feet wide with shrub growth and a height of 15 feet or more to be effective to a two to six decibel sound change, and questions, "how will removing lands and trees and replacing them with plantings, landscape clusters and blacktop accomplish this?"

RESPONSE 39

The existing wood lots do not meet the recognized criteria to be an effective sound barrier, therefore it is not necessary to mitigate for the loss of that ineffective barrier. (FGEIS Section 4.1 contains four photographs that show the condition of the existing vegetation along the Northway.) See Response 6.

According to Harris R.A. and L.F. Cohn (1985) in a research paper, Use of Vegetation for Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise, in order for vegetation to be an effective sound barrier, it must have a dense undergrowth of shrubs. The vegetation barrier must also be 30 to 100 feet wide. A 30 foot vegetation buffer may reduce sound by 2 to 3dB immediately adjacent to the buffer. The sound reduction beyond this barrier was not found to be significant due to the high variability of sound transmission as one moves from source to receiver. Conversely the Federal Highway Administration states that a vegetation barrier of 200 feet is necessary to reduce sound by 2-3 dBA. The Applicant's proposal to use vegetation at the perimeter of the parking lot is for aesethic improvement and will not be an effective sound barrier. (See Response 6.) Given the elevational changes between the Northway and adjacent communities, and the great distance, the vegetation along the Northway never provided an effective barrier to sound transmission. Ground effects are the major means of sound reduction. Typically ground effects are 3 to 4.5dB reduction in sound for each doubling in distance and 3dB or less reduction in sound over a hard surface. The net impact of a dense vegetation barrier may only be 0 to 3dB when compared to the changes caused by the same distances associated with normal ground effects (Bolt, Baranek and Newman, 1976
The planting plan proposed for the parking lot is designed to add visual interest at the parking lot level and add diversity in the parking lot visual environment.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS

COMMENT 40 **(Ms. Karen C. Angleson, 1 Greenwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 50):**

Commenter cites page 2-10 of the DGEIS, which states that a variety of plantings will be used and that the parking lot will not be the typical layout but a festival style, and states, "this festival style would have to be approved yet the document considers it a fact and proceeds to describe the planting."

RESPONSE 40

In the DGEIS the Applicant proposes festival style parking as a appropriate mitigative measure subject to the approval of the lead agency and potentially other Town boards.

The Applicant has indicated it will request the Town Board to add festival parking to the Zoning Ordinance as an alternative parking scheme for use by seasonal/recreation oriented businesses. Festival parking limits the amount of impervious area, aids in the speed at which cars are accommodated, provides for better use of vegetation as a visual screen and requires that attendants be at the parking lot. It is the Applicant's contention that Queensbury Code §176-66 Off-street Parking and Loading, is written specifically "off-street parking spaces shall be required for all buildings constructed, extended and enlarged in use after the effective date of this chapter," and that the ordinance applies to buildings and not to facilities such as the Great Escape which does not necessarily involve buildings. The code does not provide a specific parking standard for amusement facilities and lists the following: dwelling, home occupation, rooming house or motel, church, temple, elementary school, high school, theater or place of assembly, retail business or bank, club or restaurant, tavern, bar, wholesale, storage, freight terminal, industrial, manufacturing, office building, drive-in restaurant, retail, marina, boat storage, and enclosed shopping. The Applicant argues that none of the above categories are applicable to the Great Escape as a general means of calculating parking, and further, that the code in §179-66B(1), (2), describes the method to assign parking for a facility that relies on having a building as a focal point for the project. Based on the above, it is the Applicant's belief that the parking code does not apply to the proposed Park expansion.

The Town's Development Director does not agree with the Applicant's interpretation of the Zoning Ordinance. The Development Director's position is that the design requirements of the Zoning Ordinance apply to all commercial uses and that the Great Escape is clearly a commercial use. The ordinance does not address the number of parking spaces for an amusement facility, and in such cases provides that the Planning Board determine the number of spaces to be required. However, the number of spaces is clearly separate from the design requirements for commercial uses, which apply to the Great Escape.

The Applicant believes the proposed festival parking reduces the amount of impervious surfaces, increases the number of parking spaces, increases the speed at which cars can be accommodated and allows for enhanced screening. The Applicant believes the screening can be enhanced due to the ability to install planting closer to the public Route 9 right of way, and that screening is more effective when it is placed in front of or closer to the viewer than when it is in the distance and part of the overall landscape view. The Lead Agency's environmental consultant does not believe that screening is enhanced by festival parking, since screening is an external requirement that can be applied regardless of the internal layout of the parking lot. For example, draft revisions to the Town's zoning ordinance require both external screening and internal landscaping for commercial parking lots. With respect to the Applicant's other arguments in favor of festival parking, the Lead Agency will consider and weigh these arguments against other considerations in making its Findings on the project.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS

COMMENT 41 **(Ms. Karen C. Angleson, 1 Greenwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 51):**

Commenter questions the DGEIS' conclusion that there is "no causal relationship between growth and visitor attendance and the increase in audible noise."

RESPONSE 41

The Lead Agency notes the Commentor's opinion, however the data in DGEIS Appendix 7, "Audible Sound Studies" supports the conclusion.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS

COMMENT 42 **(Ms. Karen C. Angleson, 1 Greenwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 52):**

Commenter questions whether the DGEIS includes discussion of how the project will strengthen the local tourist industry and how the benefits thereof will grow and expand the area visitors.

RESPONSE 42

The DGEIS identifies the positive secondary economic impacts of Park expansion to the regional tourism industry generally. See DGEIS pages 1-7 through 1-8. Many DGEIS commentors within the tourism industry submitted comments to the effect that the Park plays a significant role as a primary tourist attraction and agreeing that Park expansion would benefit the regional tourism industry.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS

COMMENT 43 **(Ms. Karen C. Angleson, 1 Greenwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 54):**

Commenter states that audible noise has a "clear adverse health effect" based on her research taken from "Conscious Choice," a www web site.

RESPONSE 43

The HUD Noise Guidelines and EPA noise level documents have been utilized since the mid 1970s and are set at a level that is below the threshold of human health effects. The NYSDEC Program Policy Assessing and Mitigating Noise Impacts states 55 dBA L_{DN} is sufficient to protect public health and welfare and in most cases, did not create any annoyance complaints. Sound levels found in the community and those expected at project build out are at or below 55 dBA, therefore, health impacts will not occur nor will normal sleep cycles be interrupted. Currently, in the neighborhoods daytime ambient noise levels varies from the high 30 dBA range to the high 50 dBA, depending on the neighborhood and sampling conditions, as documents by the long standing monitoring data gathered by the Park and presented in the DGEIS and FGEIS. Sleep interference should not be at issue, since the Park does not operate during nighttime hours. According to EPA and DEC guidances, based on many scientific studies, there is no evidence that low-level community noise in the 30-70 dBA range (Leq) has any health impacts similar to OSHA-regulated standards for worker hearing protection (where ambient levels may be 80-100 dBA or above), such as in some factories, airports, and similar noisy environments where hearing protection is required.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS

COMMENT 44 **(Ms. Karen C. Angleson, 1 Greenwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 55-56:**

Commenter has supplied the names of other Six Flags Parks and suggests some review of how these parks compare to the Great Escape with respect to issues such as "environment, noise, water quality,...traffic,...[their proximity to] neighborhoods, scenic views, and other areas of concern."

RESPONSE 44

While such a comparison might be interesting from an academic point of view, the Lead Agency believes that it is empowered to consider and only has jurisdiction over the specific environment of the Town of Queensbury. Hence, it does not believe that it may reach decisions based on the size or nature of parks and impacts in other communities. Rather, it must consider the specific impacts of this park on and in the Town of Queensbury.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 45 **(Ms. Linda S. McNulty, 14 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 57):**

Commenter states, "I can't possibly understand how expanding this Park they are talking about increasing the 1.5 million people attending and the traffic study indicated that they are averaging about thee people per vehicle that's coming to the Park. In my math I gather it is 500,000 vehicles that they are predicting per day. I can't visualize Route 9 being able to handle that..."

RESPONSE 45

The proposal is to increase annual attendance from 900,000 to 1,500,000 +/- patrons.

The *annual* attendance will be 1,500,000 people, not the daily attendance. On a peak day in August, the daily attendance will be approximately 18,200 people. The increase in vehicles on Route 9 as a result of increased attendance was estimated to be 490 trips in the weekday AM peak hour and 546 trips in the Saturday AM peak hour. Based on the analyses in the DGEIS, with the improvements recommended in the Traffic Impact Study, Route 9 will be able to handle this increase in traffic.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section C.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 46 (Ms. Linda S. McNulty, 14 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 58):

Commenter cites what she considers to be a dangerous condition at the left-hand turn from I-87 onto Gurney Lane and implies that the Project may worsen this condition.

RESPONSE 46

The safety of the left turn from the I-87 Exit 20 southbound off ramp onto Gurney Lane is related to the available sight distance looking to the east over the bridge. The available sight distance was measured and compared to the NYSDOT standard. The existing sight distance is approximately 250 feet looking left compared to the NYSDOT standard of 360 feet. The bridge rail along the north side of Gurney Lane restricts sight distance. The Applicant has proposed to post an intersection warning sign on Gurney Lane westbound approaching the ramp intersection, and the NYSDOT has agreed that this improvement will mitigate this condition.

NYSDOT Region 1 provided verbal accident description reports for the I-87 southbound ramps/Gurney Lane intersection for the period January 1, 1996 to September 15, 1999. There was only one accident that occurred at this intersection that involved a southbound vehicle from the off-ramp turning left onto Gurney Lane. The accident occurred between a southbound left turn vehicle and a vehicle approaching from the west. Therefore, the recent accident history at this intersection indicates that the sight distance looking left (east) from the southbound off-ramp is not critically limited. The sight distance looking left has not been a contributing factor in accidents at this location.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 47 **(Mr. Chuck McNulty, 14 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 60):**

Commenter claims that DGEIS is dishonest and its authors incompetent, offering several examples of such incompetence, one of which is the DGEIS' authors' belief that changes in traffic signal timing can mitigate potential impacts to traffic flow of the Project.

RESPONSE 47

The Traffic Impact Study includes off-site improvements on Route 9 that, based on the analyses in the DGEIS, will adequately address the potential impacts of additional traffic generated by the Great Escape. These improvements include widening Route 9 and the installation of new traffic signals. The Lead Agency has consulted with the New York State Department of Transportation, which has concurred that these improvements are adequate to mitigate impacts from the project.

The Commenter is referred to DGEIS Sections 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.4, 2.1.6, 2.1.15, 4.7.1, 4.7.2 and 4.7.3, and to DGEIS Appendix 4, "Traffic Impact Study," for complete description of the proposed improvements and traffic mitigation measures.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section G.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 48 **(Mr. Chuck McNulty, 14 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 61):**

Commenter states, "I can't understand how obliterating the left turn option on [the northbound light on Route 9 at I-87 exit 20] and doubling the amount of traffic that is headed for the Great Escape is going to make everything okay."

RESPONSE 48

See Responses 46 and 47.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section G.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 49 **(Mr. Chuck McNulty, 14 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 62):**

Commenter states that, "the traffic study also fails to adequately discuss the impact of doubling of the traffic in I-87 and Route 9 on other roads in that area," citing Montray Road, Country Club Road, Glenwood, Bay Road, Wincrest, Oak Road, Sweet Road, and Haviland.

RESPONSE 49

The traffic on I-87 and Route 9 will not be doubled as a result of the proposed Great Escape expansion. The roads that required detailed analysis were specified in the Scoping Document. Analysis of Montray Road, Country Club Road, Glenwood, Bay, Wincrest, Oakwood, Sweet and Haviland was not required because these Roads, located further away from the Great Escape site, will experience a smaller increase in traffic than those roads located proximate to the site, such as Glen Lake Road and Round Pond Road (See Response 17). Improvements to the Route 9 corridor will encourage traffic to utilize the State highways. While there will be some minor increase in traffic on local roads such as those listed, such increases do not rise to levels that would be considered significant according to standard engineering practice.. Area roads such as West Mountain Road, Gurney Lane, Round Pond Road, Country Club Road, Bay Road, and Haviland Road are all County roads that are designed to handle higher volumes of traffic than they accommodate today.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 1, Page 2; Appendix 4, Chapter III, Sections F and I.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 50 **(Mr. Chuck McNulty, 14 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 62):**

Commenter asks, "how much more traffic will be forced into residential areas and non-residential streets and other roads of the town when the Great Escape attendance doubles?"

RESPONSE 50

The increase in traffic on area roads is described in the Traffic Impact Study and summarized on Figures 3.11 through 3.20 in Chapter III of the DGEIS and in Appendix 4. Based on the analyses in the DGEIS, significant amounts of Park bound traffic are not expected to use local collector roads rather than arterial roads such as I-87 and Route 9 to access the Park.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section E.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 51 **(Mr. Chuck McNulty, 14 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 62-63):**

Commenter states that the engineering studies regarding sound in the DGEIS "totally dismiss the human aspect of the problem...residents of formerly quiet neighborhoods should not have to listen to rock bands, ride noises, people screaming, PA announcements from car salesmen, PA announcements for go-cart tracks, trucks roaring up the interstate a half mile away, or deep base boom both from roller-skating rinks. And, yes, all of these should be part of the Great Escapes' GEIS...Great Escape attracts similar businesses and the patrons that go to these businesses and therefore are a contributor to some of the noise that these businesses create."

RESPONSE 51

The DGEIS and FGEIS contained analyses of sound levels from the Great Escape. Response 1 reports results and Response 3 presents the Applicants proposed noise thresholds and monitoring program. The Lead Agency is aware that current levels of noise emanating from the Great Escape, although falling within levels considered by federal agency standards to be acceptable for residential receptors, are not acceptable to some neighbors. The Lead Agency is also aware that the major source of noise complaints to date has been the Alpine Bobsled, and that the Park is involved in ongoing efforts to reduce noise from this ride.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 52 **(Mr. Chuck McNulty, 14 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 63):**

Commenter states, "I don't care how loud or how soft a ride or PA system or a band is, I shouldn't have to listen to it in my home."

RESPONSE 52

The Lead Agency notes the Commentor's opinion. The Lead Agency will be required to balance such opinions, data from sound studies, published noise standards, the applicants proposed noise thresholds and monitoring program and the history of operation of the Great Escape and the character of the surrounding neighborhoods in making its Findings on this issue. See Response 51.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 53 **(Mr. Chuck McNulty, 14 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 64-65):**

Commenter states that the Project and attendance increases associated therewith will transform the town and "destroy at least three residential neighborhoods." Commenter asks whether the Town of Queensbury "is going to become a gaudy commercial area or whether it's going to protect its year-round residents and strive to be ...a nice place to live."

RESPONSE 53

The Lead Agency notes the Commentor's opinion, but does not agree that it will necessarily "destroy at least three residential neighborhoods". The Town Zoning Ordinance in Section 179.21.B states that housing is compatible with the Recreation/Commercial (RC) zone. The Queensbury Zoning Ordinance provides for a diverse mix of land uses to meet the needs of its residents. Queensbury, unlike many areas with suburban-style detached single family residential subdivisions, is not merely a "bedroom community". In many master plans since the Town was first zoned, residents have sought to have commercial and institutional land uses in proximity to residential uses. A Study by a local realtor demonstrated that home sale prices in Twicwood have generally increased. Eleven property transactions were reviewed and in only one instance was the resale price lower than the market trend would have predicted. Therefore, this demonstrates that values are not depressed at Twicwood. Based on the foregoing, the Lead Agency sees its task as determining the level of expansion and associated improvements that are compatible with other land uses, including the surrounding neighborhoods, among other considerations.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 54 **(Mr. Donald Milne, 25 Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 67):**

Commenter, speaking on behalf of the Glen Lake Association, states that the "DGEIS is notable not only for its size, it's notable for numerous omissions, errors and misstatements and contraindications," and asks the Planning Board, "if we are to believe that the addition of a 200 foot high roller coaster in front of our view of West Mountain improves the visual quality of the sight?"

RESPONSE 54

FGEIS Section 4.3 contains the results of an additional visual study which identifies an area of the Park in which a 200 foot tall ride can be placed without significant visual impact. The analysis additionally identifies areas where 165-175 foot and 115 foot tall rides can be placed without significant visual impact. Tall rides constructed in the defined areas will not be substantially visible from Glen Lake, the Bike Trail, or the Glens Falls Country Club.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 55 **(Mr. Donald Milne, 25 Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 67):**

Commenter states, "I respectfully ask the [Planning] board if removal of every tree from the area of the Samoset Motel south to The Coach House Restaurant will result in improved levels of storm water management in that area?"

RESPONSE 55

The stormwater plan presented in the DGEIS evaluated pre and post development water quality conditions. Based on the analyses in the DGEIS, due to the comprehensive stormwater system, the discharge water quality will not change significantly. The amount of phosphorus discharged will be slightly lower than under current conditions. The two year storm phosphorus loading under "existing condition" is project to be 1.19 lbs. and only 1.06 lbs. under the post-development conditions Phosphorus is the limiting nutrient at Glen Lake per the Glen Lake Watershed Plan (1993), therefore reducing the amount of phosphorus will protect the water quality of the lake.

It is the Lead Agency's intent to further adopt Findings requiring the implementation of measures in addition to those presented in the DGEIS to mitigate adverse impacts due to stormwater runoff quality. These include the use of some form of permeable parking, the use of swirl concentrators separators and the requirement for a maintenance plan. Additionally, the Planning Board intends to require a stormwater monitoring plan, and will require additional mitigation measures should adverse water quality impacts be found to occur as a result of stormwater runoff.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 56 **(Mr. Donald Milne, 25 Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 67-68):**

Commenter states, "I respectfully ask the [Planning] board if the collection of runoff from parking lots on which 4,500 cars have been leaking oil, gasoline and antifreeze will improve our water quality?"

RESPONSE 56

See Response 55 with respect to the Planning Board's intended Findings concerning stormwater management. The majority of the parking lot will be paved with porous asphalt to aid in the recharge of stormwater and reduce the velocity of stormwater. Attached is the EPA (See FGEIS Section 4.9) fact sheet on porous pavement. At the parking lots that will not have porous pavement (green and blue) additional stormwater management facilities will be utilized. These lots will be utilized on a year round basis and will be paved with conventional hot mix asphalt. Discharges from these lots will be treated by a stormwater manage filter device. These devices control floatables, total suspended solids, and oil.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 57 **(Mr. Donald Milne, 25 Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 68):**

Commenter cites the Scoping Document's instruction that the DGEIS model noise levels within the DGEIS adjacent area and consider the effect upon property across Glen Lake that may be affected by noise carrying over water. Commenter states that the DGEIS does not include such modeling or studies of noise levels on adjacent properties other than six houses adjacent to the monitoring station on Birdsall Road.

RESPONSE 57

The DGEIS provides data on sound levels at a variety of distances from the Park. Ground effects or the degradation of sound intensity with distance is one of the factors that causes sound to decrease between a source and receptor. The site at Glen Lake is representative of a receptor at 3,500 feet from the source at one of the Glen Lake points closest to the Park. This site also demonstrates the impact of boating and use of personal watercraft on the sound environment at the Lake. Further additional sound analysis was completed in August. (See FGEIS Section 4.1, "2000 Sound Studies"). The August sampling included the additional sites at Glen Lake West, Glen Lake Northwest, Bay Bridge, Glens Falls Country Club, Indian Ridge and Leland Estates along with the Courthouse Estates and Twicwood sites. These new sites were added to refine the conclusions drawn from the prior studies. Local sound sources are the dominant influence in the local environment. At Glen Lake West the Bobsled sound was 2-4 dBA over ambient conditions. For comparitive purposesbased on the data sheet and field notes (see FGEIS Section 4.1) the following observations were made which demonstrate the typical mix of instaneous sounds that occur in the neighborhoods, a dog barking nearby was 3-6 dBA over ambient levels. At this site vehicles passing caused a 16-29 dBA increase over baseline, while a bicycle caused a 8-13 dBA increase over baseline. At Glen Lake Northwest a watercraft caused a 17-22 dBA increase over baseline, a grasshopper caused a 24 dBA and the Bobsled 3-4 dBA over baseline. The prior study on September 6, 1999, occurred on Labor Day weekend with the Bobsled operating. The Leq at Birdsall Road was 39.5, while the Leq at Glen Lake West was 42 and at Glen Lake Northwest was 39. This demonstrates that the Birdsall Road site was not unusually quiet and the prior work was representative of the overall sound environment.

Ground effect is the degradation of sound as it moves over a surface. Ground effect is greater over soft ground covers of grass and shrubs or other vegetation than it is over hard surfaces such as gravel or paved areas. These terms and concepts are explained in the NYSDEC Policy Guide on sound titled Assessing and Mitigating Noise Impacts DEP-00-3 September 29, 2000 and included in Section 4-12. Sound traveling over soft surfaces degrades at a rate of 3-4.5 dB for each doubling of distance while over hard surfaces the sound reduces by 0-3 dB (Bolt, Beranek and Newman, 1976). The marsh area is a soft surface while water is a hard surface. Water cannot amplify sound since that would involve a transfer of energy, which is not a mechanism that can occur over water. Based on the above, if the sound level at Ash Road is 48.7 Leq, then at Osprey Point it will be 45.7-48.7, due to the small to no loss of energy as the sound moves over water. This low level of change would not be perceivable by most individuals, therefore, it makes sense that the personal observations of sound on the Lake are unchanged even when one crosses the entire water body **(See Responses 6 and 7 for discussion of highway sounds).**

These data indicate that although noise from the Bobsled is audible from Glen lake, such noise is significantly less than other common lake noises such as passing watercraft. Nevertheless, the lead Agency is aware that noise from the Bobsled is considered intrusive by some residents. The Lead Agency is also cognizant of the Park's ongoing, and to date partially successful efforts to reduce noise from the Bobsled. See Response 3 for the Applicant's proposals with respect to the adoption of noise thresholds and a proposed monitoring program.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 58 **(Mr. Donald Milne, 25 Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 69):**

Commenter asks whether additional noise monitoring stations will be requested by the Planning Board to measure the effects of noise from the Park traveling over water, such as Glen Lake? Moreover, Commenter mentions the rationale of using the same noise monitoring stations as used in 1990 but questions why additional stations were added at the Park but not to Glen Lake neighborhoods?

RESPONSE 58

See Response 3 for the proposed noise monitoring program and thresholds.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 59 **(Mr. Donald Milne, 25 Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 71):**

Commenter states that stormwater analysis was omitted from Park Area A and notes, "since area A is adjacent to the sensitive wetland, this is important."

RESPONSE 59

Park Area A includes the already developed amusement Park and consists of 47.2 acres of pervious area, 34.5 acres of impervious area and 155.9 acres of wetland. As the Park area develops, the amount of impervious surface may increase slightly. It is impossible to predict the amount of new paved area, however, the entire upland area available to the Project sponsor could be improved and still conform to the green space requirement of the Town Zoning Law. In most locations in the amusement area, stormwater is recharged into deep natural sands. The combination of recharge and large adjacent wetlands minimizes impacts on Glen Lake. The DGEIS does not present specific plans for improvement in Park Area A and therefore does not present a plan for stormwater improvements. The Applicant and the Lead Agency anticipate that improvements in stormwater management will be made as attractions and the wastewater system are upgraded. The on-site septic systems will be abandoned and removed, which will provide new space for stormwater management systems.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 60 **(Mr. Donald Milne, 25 Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 71):**

Commenter states that the DGEIS "provides reference to plantings [in the areas of new construction] but no specifications on the size of trees or whether those plantings will be trees or whether those plantings will be trees, shrubs or ground cover," and asks, "will the [Planning] board require such analysis and specification?"

RESPONSE 60

The requested information is typical of design details developed in detailed project engineering to be reviewed during site plan review. The Lead Agency anticipates requiring such information at that time.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 61 **(Mr. Donald Milne, 25 Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 71):**

Commenter states that, "large trees absorb large quantities of nutrient which do not reach groundwater" and asks, "will the [Planning] board require analysis of the effects on groundwater from this removal [within Park Area C]?"

RESPONSE 61

Sampling upstream of the wetland located on Great Escape property and at the discharge indicates the volumes of nutrients are reduced by the wetland. Available sampling data of Glen Lake indicates a lake in balance with the nutrient load. Total phosphorus and nitrogen sampling of Glen Lake resembles that of a potable water supply. It is hard to quantify the total pounds of nutrient assimilated by trees, but the amounts assimilated are assumed to be naturally occurring in the soil, and the stormwater runoff plan addresses the prevention of nutrient laden runoff. See Response 55 for the Lead Agency's intentions with respect to stormwater quality and monitoring.

DGEIS Reference: See Section 4.10.2, pages 28 to 33.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 62 **(Mr. Donald Milne, 25 Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 72):**

Commenter believes that the sewage effluent figures in Section 2.1.10 of the DGEIS are in error in that they indicate that the current volume of sewage from the Park is 45,636 GPD but will only rise to 60,000 GPD after the expansion.

RESPONSE 62

The estimated amount of wastewater is based on past regulatory requirements for the Great Escape; the existing SPDES permit is based on 45,600 gallons per day. The Applicant assumed and the available data support the assumptionthat the existing systems have been more than adequate because of the water quality data in the surrounding area indicates a very healthy ecosystem both in the wetland and in Glen Lake. There has never been a known incident involving the existing septic systems where they were unable to handle the flow. The estimated increase is 25% or 11,400 gpd, bringing the total discharge to 57,000 gpd. Excess capacity has been included in the system to provide a prudent "safety net" as well. The additional 30,000 gpd is included to serve the areas west of Route 9. In addition, there are existing flows on the west side of Route 9. The Adirondack Coach House has a daily flow of approximately 12,500 gpd and Martha's Ice Cream and Grill requires 3,500 gpd. The total estimated daily load is therefore106,000 gpd.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 63 **(Mr. Donald Milne, 25 Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 72-73):**

Commenter states that effluent quality from the proposed sewage treatment plant will not be better than DEC standards, citing that, "the proposed level for phosphorous discharge only just meets DEC potential effluent standards. Glen Lake cannot biologically afford any additional phosphorous loading."

RESPONSE 63

The most stringent SPDES permits in New York State for phosphorous are located in the NYC Watershed where the receiving waters are phosphorous-restricted basins. A phosphorous-restricted basin is one that has been proven through scientific investigation to have a residual amount of phosphorous that is so high that the water body cannot naturally assimilate it. This results in algae blooms, euthrophication and a general deterioration of the water quality. All of the available data indicates that the Glen Lake watershed is quite healthy. The levels of nutrients are below the recommended standards, the turbidity (clarity) of the lake has been improving, there has never been a long-term recurring algae bloom, and the wetland upstream of the lake consistently lowers the level of nutrients passing through. The available data indicates the ecosystem is in balance. The Great Escape will be treating its wastewater with a state of the art phosphorous filter that will reduce phosphorous to non-detectable levels for most certified labs in New York State. The treated effluent will then be discharged to the soil allowing additional natural filtration to occur. If it is assumed that a typical septic tank effluent has 1.0 mg/l(ppm) of phosphorus, the current daily loading to soils based on 20,000 gpd is 76 gm of phosphorus. Once the park is redeveloped and the sewage is being treated in a sewage treatment plant, the effluent phosphorus levels will be 0.02 mg/l. The daily wastewater disposal will be 105,000 gpd. This results in a loading of 8.0 gm of phosphorus per day. The impact of phosphorous will not be an issue from this facility as the total pounds discharged will be reduced by 90% from the existing treatment systems which currently have no impact on Glen Lake. The Lead Agency's environmental consultant has reviewed this design and agree that, properly operated, it will not result in adverse impacts to Glen Lake.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 64 **(Mr. Donald Milne, 25 Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 73):**

Commenter asks, "will measures of current phosphorous [concentration in Glen Lake] be taken and analysis of future phosphorous in Glen Lake and the watershed be determined based on additional loading [from the expanded Park]?"

RESPONSE 64

There will be required sampling under the SPDES permit for the Park and those results will be available to the public. Although no additional phosphorous loading is anticipated from the wastewater facility into the waters of Glen Lake, should adverse results be found, it can be anticipated that the DEC would require modifications in the operation of the wastewater treatment system. Additionally, the Lead Agency anticipates requiring the Applicant to conduct a water quality monitoring program. Should impacts to water quality be found, the Planning Board anticipates reserving the right to require modifications to the project.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 65 **(Mr. Donald Milne, 25 Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 73):**

Commenter questions whether phosphorous discharged to a lake will accumulate and result in considerable degradation of the lake over time, and whether such degradation may be prevented by connecting to a municipal sewer line rather than utilize the proposed sewage treatment plant?

RESPONSE 65

See Responses 63 and 64. The Applicant has indicated its intent to connect with a municipal sewer if and when on be becomes available to it.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 66 **(Mr. Donald Milne, 25 Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 73):**

Commenter asks, "will the comparison study of the effects of ammonia, phosphorous and biological oxygen demand on the watershed and waters of Glen Lake be done which compares the alternative of local sewage treatment versus transfer of sewage to the Glens Falls treatment plant?"

RESPONSE 66

Because of the design of the facility, the effluent from the WWTP will be comparable to potable water, and will then be discharged into the ground, not into the waters of Glen Lake or its tributaries. The wastewater treatment facility is to be equipped with processes that currently are designed in potable water filtration facilities. The filter design has 7 ft. of 1.4 mm silica sand, a chemical coagulant is added prior to the filtration process and the treated effluent is disinfected with chlorine, it then passes into a second filter with 5 ft of 0.9 mm silica sand. The resulting effluent will possess in excess of log – 3 removal of the protozoan giardia and cryptosporidium as well as 100% kill of coliform bacteria, the turbidity will be less than 0.1. These are the standards for surface drinking water, it is after the water is treated to such high standards that it will be discharged into infiltration galleys for additional treatment in the soil. The Lead Agency's environmental consultant has concurred that this system is unlikely to result in adverse impacts t o Glen lake unless the system fails in some manner.

Presently the Great Escape is permitted to discharge in excess of 45,000+ gallons per day of septic tank effluent into the soil, this load currently being treated with subsurface fields and, based on available data, there is no negative impact occurring to the wetland or Glen Lake. The Lead Agency believes it is reasonable to conclude that with the discharge improvements that include a 95+% reduction in BOD5, total suspended solids, coliform, NH3, PO4, giardia, cryptosporidium the subsurface treatment will have considerably less concerns than what is currently in operation. Based on the foregoing, the Applicant is not proposing transfer of sewage to the Glens Falls plant because of the cost of this option and because the proposed treatment plant appears capable of avoiding adverse impacts to Glen Lake. The Applicant has indicated its willingness to connect to a municipal sewer should one become available in the future.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 67 **(Mr. Donald Milne, 25 Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 74):**

Commenter questions a statement on page 4-9 of the DGEIS to the effect that groundwater will not be impacted because no grading will occur at or below the water table level and the water table is more than 6 feet below grade, and challenged that assessment because the existing parking lot in Area C was built on filled land and therefore generalizations regarding the water table do not apply to that area.

RESPONSE 67

The grades at the purple, brown, beige and green lots will be filled approximately 3-5 feet above the present grade. The water table along the Rush Pond outlet stream is 1-2 feet below grade based on test bores for the pedestrian bridge. During periods of seasonal high water, there will be 1–3 feet of separation between the subsurface stormwater recharge system and the elevated water table. The pond bottom elevations are found in the stormwater report as the start elevation.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 68 **(Mr. Donald Milne, 25 Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 75):**

Commenter states that existing Park parking lots were completely flooded during stormwater events this Spring, which flooding would not occur if the water table were truly more than six feet below grade as Commenter states is stated in the DGEIS, and asks if the Planning Board will require test borings to verify the water table depth?

RESPONSE 68

See Response 67. The Commenter is describing a short-term surface water situation. Based on the stormwater analysis in the DGEIS, the filling of the parking lots which were previously subject to short term flooding is anticipated to prevent inundation of the area during the spring and following unusually severe rain showers.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 69 **(Mr. Donald Milne, 25 Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 75):**

Commenter refers to potential water quality impacts of anti-freeze and hydrocarbons in stormwater runoff from parking lots, and asks if traps or filters will be employed to prevent hydrocarbons from entering groundwater?

RESPONSE 69

See Response 55.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 70 **(Mr. Donald Milne, 25 Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 75-76):**

Commenter asks if the Planning Board will require applicant to conduct additional analysis of additional hydrocarbons that may contaminate stormwater from Route 9 due to the increased number of traffic generators?

RESPONSE 70

The Lead Agency intends to require both a monitoring plan and the incorporation of swirl concentrators/separators and/or filters in the project for those areas with conventional pavement, and other areas if warranted. These devices will aid in the control of sediments, debris oil and nutrients runoff from the developed areas. The proposed monitoring plan will focus on nutrient, turbidity, and dissolved ions. Past monitoring of hydrocarbons has demonstrated that wetland absorbs these types of contaminates. Further, the DGEIS concludes that the stormwater management system will contain these contaminates to existing condition levels.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 71 **(Mr. Donald Milne, 25 Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 76):**

Commenter states, "the author [of the DGEIS] claims the project will only slightly increase or produce no increase in nutrient loading due to stormwater runoff. This is not acceptable at the present time because we are attempting to reduce nutrient loading to Glen Lake."

RESPONSE 71

Available water quality data of the influent and effluent of the wetland indicates a wetland that is doing its job of assimilating nutrients, buffering storm surge and providing habitat. Water quality data for Glen Lake indicates very low nutrient levels. Nutrients entering the wetland will continue to be assimilated by the wetland.

Based on the analyses in the DGEIS the post-development loading of phosphorus will be controlled to less than the predevelopment condition. For example, the existing condition total phosphorus load for a two year event is 1.19 lbs., while under post-development conditions, the loading will be 1.06 lbs. Further, the higher level of sewage treatment and the elimination of septic tank loadings will reduce overall phosphorus loading to Glen Lake. In addition, the Lead Agency intends to require a monitoring plan as well as measures to mitigate adverse stormwater quality impacts. See Response 55.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 72 **(Mr. Donald Milne, 25 Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 76):**

Commenter states that the DGEIS does not include figures on the current phosphorous levels in the Glen Lake Brook in project Area C and states that, "we need data on levels in Park Area C and the fen immediately after the Park. Will these studies be added to the DGEIS?"

RESPONSE 72

The Citizen Lake Assessment Program has been conducting water quality analysis for Glen Lake Watershed for the past 13 years and will continue to do this sampling. The available data indicates no phosphorous issues. Additionally, the Lead Agency intends to require the Great Escape to conduct water quality sampling. See Response 56.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 73 **(Mr. Donald Milne, 25 Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 77):**

Commenter disagrees with the overall conclusions presented in the DGEIS based on what he believes to be a "common sense" approach. Commenter states, "common sense dictates that a 200 foot high roller coaster has an enormous impact."

RESPONSE 73

FGEIS Section 4.3, "Visual Analysis Fall 2000-2001," contains additional data regarding the potential visual impact of tall rides.This analysis defines ana rea for the development of tall rides which will not be substantially visible from surroinding residential receptors.

See Response 29.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 74 **(Mr. Donald Milne, 25 Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 77):**

Commenter states, "common sense dictates 90,000 gallons per day of effluent going into the soils 100 feet from the fen has an enormous impact."

RESPONSE 74

The discharge of 90,000 GPD as per USEPA standards for rapid infiltration take into account the soil conditions, the size of the infiltration area, the depth to ground water, the distance from a body of water, the waste assimilative capacity of the area, the quality of the discharge. With respect to discharge water quality, the effluent from the proposed WWTP will be treated to near drinking water quality, thus a discharge of 90,000 gallons of substantially clean water will have no detrimental impact on potential receiving water. All of these standards are considered and the design is done to insure no detrimental impact. Further, treated effluent will be discharged to soils and not to the fen. Finally, the DEC will review the design and require monitoring of discharge from the plant.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 75 **(Mr. Donald Milne, 25 Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 77):**

Commenter states, "common sense dictates that we must not allow hydrocarbons to be released from 4,500 cars."

RESPONSE 75

See Response 56.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 76 **(Mr. Donald Milne, 25 Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 77):**

Commenter questions applicant's record of environmental compliance and asks, "given past code violations are we willing to trust this corporation with the well-being of our valuable watershed? Will this [Planning] board take into account past violation patters?"

RESPONSE 76

The Planning Board will consider all relevant factors with respect to its review of the project, currently there are no outstanding violations according to the Zoning Department. Past violations have involved parking at the sand pit and conversion of the re-use of Animal Land for parking. Application for the Animal Land temporary parking lots were submitted and approvals are pending this SEQRA process.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 77 **(Mr. George Stark, 1545 State Route 9, Lake George; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 78):**

Commenter supports the Project. Commenter is a motel owner who remarked on the beneficial economic impacts of the Project. Commenter noted that the Park is popular with local residents and that over 4,000 season tickets to the Park were sold to the 22,000 residents of the Town of Queensbury.

RESPONSE 77

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 78 **(Ms. Barbara Bartwitz and Mr. Dave Harrington, 26 Fayon Street, Glens Falls; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 80):**

Commenters, speaking on behalf of Adirondack Runners, remarked that they had heard a lot of negativism but that they support the Project because of the Park's positive impacts to the community such as its support of Adirondack Runners' events.

RESPONSE 78

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 79 **(Ms. Anna Fowler, 96 Ash Drive, Lake George; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 83-84):**

Commenter, secretary of the Glen Lake Protective Association, takes issue with the DGEIS conclusion that the paved parking lots that are part of the Project will not have an adverse effect on stormwater management because she believes that an increase of 2,000 parking spaces and, thus, 2,000 cars, will cause an increase in chemicals and hydrocarbons entering the groundwater which she feels was not adequately addressed in the DGEIS stormwater management plan.

RESPONSE 79

See Response 56.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 80 **(Ms. Anna Fowler, 96 Ash Drive, Lake George; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 84):**

Commenter asks whether, if the Alpine Bobsled "cannot be properly mitigated," it could be removed?

RESPONSE 80

The Applicant reports that the Alpine Boblsed is a family ride that is very popular with Park guests, and that the Park must balance the needs of its guests with the desire to be a good neighbor. Response 37 details the Applicants efforts and future commitments with respect to mitigating noise impacts from the Bobsled.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 81 **(Ms. Anna Fowler, 96 Ash Drive, Lake George; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 84-85):**

Commenter expressed general concerns with removing trees and the effect thereof on noise, nutrient, and water runoff absorption.

RESPONSE 81

Refer to Responses 6, 56, 87, 107, and 586.

DGEIS Reference: See DGEIS Sections 4.10.2, and 4.8.2.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 82 **(Ms. Anna Fowler, 96 Ash Drive, Lake George; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 85):**

Commenter suggests that the visual impact of a 200 foot ride on Glen Lake and the Bike Trail will be significant.

RESPONSE 82

The analysis in FGEIS Section 4.3, "Visual Analysis 2000-2001," indicates that tall rides placed as volunteered by Park management within a defined area of the Park already developed with rides and attractions will not be substanitally visible from Glen Lake or the Bike Trail.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 83 **(Ms. Anna Fowler, 96 Ash Drive, Lake George; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 86):**

Commenter questions whether there will be a visual impact to the bike trail from the proposed upgrades to electrical lines and, if so, Commenter asks that applicant provide photographs depicting the impact.

RESPONSE 83

The existing utility poles on Ash Road will not be modified as a result of the proposed electrical upgrade. A tap structure will need to be installed on Ash Road where the 34.5 kV service is accessed. The tap structure, an additional utility pole, will be several hundred feet west of the Bike Trail/Ash Road intersection and will not be visible from the Bike Trail. A photograph of such a tap structure is provided in FGEIS Section 4.4, "Tap Structure."

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 84 **(Ms. Anna Fowler, 96 Ash Drive, Lake George; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 86-87):**

Commenter, a trained ornithologist, claims that there are a number of omissions in the DGEIS' inventory of bird species in Project Area C. Commenter states that the DGEIS fails to mention the bald eagle, the great horned owl, the barred owl, the hooded merganser, and the common loon. Commenter notes that the source used in the DGEIS for bird life in the Project area was from 1988 and suggests there might be more up to date sources.

RESPONSE 84

The DGEIS relied upon the Breeding Bird Atlas for New York State. The Commenter points out that some additional birds such as bald eagle and common loon may visit the site. Neither of these birds breed at this location. None of the other birds listed by the Commenter are rare, threatened or endangered.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 85 **(Ms. Anna Fowler, 96 Ash Drive, Lake George; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 87):**

Commenter states that her "main thought is that the project is on a wetland. It is a very environmentally sensitive area and the vast scale proposed is just not acceptable as far as environmental impact."

RESPONSE 85

Based on available data, the over 250 acres of wetland at the Great Escape surrounding the 90 acres of developed upland portions of Park Area A are extremely healthy. Protection of the wetland is of paramount concern to the Planning Board in its review of the project. The wastewater is being treated to nearly potable standards and is being discharged into the ground. The storm water runoff plan is designed to meet NYSDEC regulations for storm water. The Planning Board intends to ensure that each aspect of this project will meet all regulatory standards to insure the continued health of the wetland.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 86 **(Mr. James Underwood, 99 Mannis Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 88-89):**

Commenter, who has been involved with the Glen Lake Protective Association, states that although he has "no doubt that probably some blacktopping is going to be necessary maybe around the immediate area where they are approaching the bridge over the Northway, I mean, over the Route 9," he questions what effect "the massive amount of parking lots that are proposed over on the other side of Route 9" will have on Glen Lake "if they are done in the present form that they propose."

RESPONSE 86

The Planning Board intends to ensure that the storm water runoff plan will meet all regulatory requirements insuring the protection of downstream waters. See Responses 540, 576 and 626 concerning Glen Lake watershed protections.

DGEIS Reference: See Section 4.10.2 of the DGEIS.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 87 **(Mr. James Underwood, 99 Mannis Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 89-90):**

Commenter suggests that the applicant keep many of the outside parking lots that are proposed in back of Martha's and some of those that are proposed for up the hill from the Park in their natural state rather than blacktopping them to facilitate water percolation. Commenter states that "blacktop there is really unnecessary" since patrons of the Park will not return to their cars after parking them for many hours.

RESPONSE 87

The Applicant has proposed to use porous pavement in the upland parking areas which will not be used year-round. Porous pavement facilitates water percolation. The Applicant believes that porous paved or paved lots in conjunction with festival style parking and the ring road will allow park patrons to get off US Route 9 quickly and efficiently.

See Responses 107 and 223.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 88 **(Mr. James Underwood, 99 Mannis Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 90):**

Commenter referred to previous speakers who expressed concerns with automobile fluids that "drip out of cars on a regular basis."

RESPONSE 88

See Response 56.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 89 **(Mr. Kevin Dineen, 149 Birdsall Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 90-93):**

Commenter, an 18 year resident of Queensbury and a professional athlete by trade, refers to changes taken place at the park in the last ten years that have produced increased traffic, noise, and other adverse effects.

RESPONSE 89

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference: See DGEIS pages 4-14-18, 4-20-23, and 4-1-41.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 90 **(Mr. Kevin Dineen, 149 Birdsall Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 93):**

Commenter states that the water quality of Glen Lake is worse than it has ever been and questions whether the applicant is responsible.

RESPONSE 90

NYSDEC data for the past 13 years indicates that Glen Lake is actually improving in water quality. The turbidity in the past 3 years has gotten better, the nutrient levels meet the levels recommended for potable surface supplies. See FGEIS Section 4.5, "Water Quality Data Charts."

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 91 **(Mr. Kevin Dineen, 149 Birdsall Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 93-94):**

Commenter claims that noise from the Park is excessive and that "your ears certainly don't lie."

RESPONSE 91

See Response 3.

DGEIS Reference: See pages 3-34-45, 4-20-24.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 92 **(Mr. Kevin Dineen, 149 Birdsall Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 94):**

Commenter, a professional hockey player, attempts to compare emptying out a parking lot of 17,000 after a hockey event with the addition of "600,000 people in the neighborhood" as a result of increased attendance at the Park.

RESPONSE 92

The applicant's goal is to increase annual attendance from 900,000 to 1,500,000 visitors. Meeting this attendance goal will not require a daily attendance of 600,000. The DGEIS has a complete Traffic Impact Study (TIS) contained in Appendix 4 of the DGEIS which is summarized on DGEIS Section 2, pages pages 1 to 4 and 6 to 7 and Section 4, pages 14 to 18.

The 600,000 people referenced in the comment is the increase in *annual* attendance between the existing 900,000 and the future 1,500,000 annual attendees. The increase in vehicles on Route 9 as a result of increased attendance was estimated to be 490 trips in the weekday AM peak hour and 546 trips in the Saturday AM peak hour. With the improvements recommended in the Traffic Impact Study, Route 9 will be able to handle this increase in traffic with only a small increase in traffic on the local roads. There will never be an increase of 600,000 people in the neighborhood at any one time as a result of the expansion of Great Escape.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section C.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 93 **(Mr. Kevin Dineen, 149 Birdsall Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 95-96):**

Commenter claims that the improvements associated with the Project will not improve the theme Park experience but that the Project simply reflects the wishes of "big business" and "big money."

RESPONSE 93

Improved guest experience is the primary reason for adding new attractions or upgrading services.

See Response 94.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 94 (Mr. Ed Lewi, Saratoga Springs; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 97-98):

Commenter is a public relations professional and has been involved with the marketing of the Great Escape and other Adirondack attractions. Commenter stated that, in his experience, Charles Wood (former owner of the Park) and others who have invested in attractions have reaped an economic return from that investment, "I represented all the Adirondack attractions from the North Pole to [The] Land of Make Believe...The people who spent the money continued in business. The people who didn't spend the money are now out of business."

RESPONSE 94

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 95 (Mr. Ed Lewi, Saratoga Springs; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 98-99):

Commenter states that he represents the Saratoga Race Track, which, "this year spent $8.5 million in improvements." Commenter credits improvements made to the race track for bringing up attendance levels despite the rain.

Commenter noted that since 1996, when Premier Parks purchased the Park, "there has been a growth of 45% in tourism in Warren County," and then referred briefly to the economic benefits of that growth. Commenter also noted with approval Great Escape's attempt to extend the tourism season and the positive economic benefits thereof.

RESPONSE 95

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 96 **(Mr. George J. Stec, 245 Butler Pond Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 102-103):**

Commenter, representing Citizens For Queensbury, is a retired state forest ranger. Commenter lists a number of concerns such as encroachment and destruction of wetlands, pollution of Glen Lake, stormwater runoff, lighting, buffers, and parking. His home is two miles away, and he claims that that he "can see some of the rides protruding above the trees" and "used to hear the people screaming two miles away." Commenter is concerned about sewage disposal stating that, "life as we know on this planet is dependent on the sun, the green plants and the water. When you alter, change any of these three things, the planet is headed for big problems."

RESPONSE 96

The effluent from the WWTP will exceed the most stringent requirements set forth by the regulatory agencies. The discharge will be to the subsurface and monitoring will be a requirement of the DEC permit.

Refer to Response 63 regarding the wastewater treatment facility.

Refer to Response 343 regarding visual effects.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 97 **(Mr. George J. Stec, 245 Butler Pond Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 104):**

Commenter states that when Premier Parks first acquired the Park, it invested $7.5 million which was supposed to address parking and traffic issues implying that Great Escape did not "do its homework". Commenter states that, "this area is not suited for expansion. I see it as the developers are trying to put ten pounds of sugar in a five pound bag."

RESPONSE 97

The Applicant does not believe that acreage is the best measure of Park capacity. The Applicant believes that Park capacity is more strongly related to capacity of the attractions and capability to circulate patrons around the Park. Adequate space is available to accommodate circulation areas around the Park. The Applicant proposes that higher capacity attractions will be added to the Park as well as making the necessary improvements in circulation on site.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 98 **(Mr. George J. Stec, 245 Butler Pond Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 105):**

Commenter suggests that the "only solution [to the question of sewage disposal] is municipal sewer" and believes that the Great Escape can pay for installation of that sewer because the sales tax rate on admission tickets is lower than it should be. Commenter suggests that increasing the sales tax on tickets to the Park can fund extension of the sewer lines to the Park.

RESPONSE 98

The wastewater issue is addressed in Responses 63 through 66 and 74. While recent discussions with the City, Town and County regarding a sewer main extension are promising, it can still take several years for required environmental review and required planning procedures incident to district formation under the Town Law before actual construction and operation of a sewer could commence. The Park has proposed to have an improved method of wastewater as part of the mitigation for the proposed "expansion" project. The Park has indicated its willingness to connect to a municipal sewer if and when one should become available.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 99 **(Mr. David McGowan, 48 Birch Road, Lake George; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 108):**

Commenter, who moved to Queensbury from Kalamazoo, Michigan five years ago, states that he and his wife "are not opposed to amusement parks by any stretch of the imagination" and that his family frequents the Park having purchased passes for the last three years. Commenter states, however, that he is "strongly opposed to any additional expansion proposed by the Great Escape."

RESPONSE 99

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 100 **(Mr. David McGowan, 48 Birch Road, Lake George; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 108):**

Commenter is concerned about pollution generated by cars in the proposed parking lots.

RESPONSE 100

See Response 56.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 101 **(Mr. David McGowan, 48 Birch Road, Lake George; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 108-109):**

Commenter, a chemical engineer, states that, "in industrial plants where you have pollution issues that equipment requires continuous monitoring and continuous maintenance to assure that the treatment methods are functioning properly" and asks, "how are we going to monitor that storm water runoff and assure that it does not affect the actual quality of Glen Lake?"

RESPONSE 101

Like industrial plants the Great Escape will have daily monitoring by a NYS Certified Wastewater treatment plant operator. There will also be alarm systems with telemetry to automatically call the operator if an issue develops at the facility.

Neither the parking lots or the site itself are subject to specific discharge requirements set under the State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (SPDES). However, it is the Planning Board's intent to require monitoring of water quality to ensure against adverse impacts.

The Applicant has agreed to monitor the quality of the surface water at three points: the Rush Pond outlet on the east side of the Northway (west of the parking lots), Rush Pond outlet on the east side of US Route 9 and within the park in the Rush Pond outlet upgradient of the Glen Lake Fen. The Applicant's environmental consultant has overseen a five+ year long stormwater quality monitoring program at a large recreational site where parking lots are used seasonally. The program monitored conductivity, pH, total suspended solids (TSS), ammonia, total phosphorus (TP), temperature turbidity and dissolved oxygen (DO). At the end of the five year period laboratory test results were compiled and examined, with the result being that there were essentially no difference in measured parameter levels over the five year period. The construction improvements at the study site had no impact on surface water quality trends. The date indicated that more frequent monitoring of fewer parameters would be more beneficial in terms of monitoring long-term water quality. It is proposed that the surface water / stormwater monitoring program at the Great Escape include collection of five sample sets (two baseflow and three events) over the operational season, and that parameters to be tested should include conductivity, TSS and TP. Testing for these parameters would provide the data necessary to evaluate any effects from construction of the proposed improvements at the Park. The Planning Board intends to review the results of the monitoring to assure that the system is operating as designed to maintain stormwater runoff quality and require additional mitigation measures if warranted by the results.

DGEIS Reference: See pages 2-15, 4-27-34.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 102 **(Mr. David McGowan, 48 Birch Road, Lake George; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 109):**

Commenter asks what the Planning Board will do to protect property values and keep residents' investments from eroding?

RESPONSE 102

See Response 168.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 103 **(Mr. David McGowan, 48 Birch Road, Lake George; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 110):**

Commenter states that traffic on Route 9 has already begun to lower the quality of life of Queensbury residents and questions the effect of removing trees on Route 9 on noise levels in his backyard, as well as Great Escape's commitment to solving environmental problems because Great Escape has not corrected the Alpine Bobsled in the three years he and his wife have been complaining about the noise produced by the Bobsled.

RESPONSE 103

See Responses 6, 37, 57, 104 and 132.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 104 **(Mr. David McGowan, 48 Birch Road, Lake George; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 111):**

Commenter states that the Town should consider a noise ordinance and should not grant applicant any variances from the Building Code.

RESPONSE 104

The Town is considering a noise ordinance similar in form to a local law recently adopted in Lake George. It is worth noting that such an ordinance regulates sources of night-time (10 p.m. – 7 a.m.) noise which are deemed particularly injurious to the public welfare, and that the Great Escape would comply with such an ordinance currently, as it does not operate in the night-time hours regulated by the noise ordinance. The Applicant has requested no variances from the zoning or building codes relevant to the Project.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 105 **(Ms. Kathleen A. Gowen, 14 Elm Drive, Lake George; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 111-112):**

Commenter, a member of the Glen Lake Protective Association, is a career forester and notes that she has personally witnessed the devastation caused by nature and the havoc forest fires wreak on neighboring communities. Referring to the proposed removal of trees between the Samoset Motel and the Coach House Restaurant, Commenter asks why "we should purposely encourage and direct such destruction when we have the power to control it?" Commenter believes that the removal of trees would adversely affect the watershed and water quality, and noise stating that trees acting as a "beautiful natural sound barrier."

RESPONSE 105

Water quality impacts of the runoff are addressed in the storm water management plan.

The wood lots along the Northway do not provide a significant sound barrier due to their lack of understory, as described in Response 39. The Stormwater Management System will reduce the loading of phosphorus to the Lake which should contribute to overall water quality stability due to control of the nutrient that limits the growth of plant life in the Lake.

DGEIS Reference: Pages 2-15, 4-27-34 and Appendix 3. See Responses 39 and 56.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 106 **(Mr. Paul Derby, 86 Ash Drive, Lake George; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 114-115):**

Commenter, a member of the Glen Lake Protective Association, states with respect to stormwater protection, that, "the Park should have included Park Area A along with its proposed new development to Park Area C in its analysis" and suggests that the applicant could include this information with "retrofitted storm water Park Area A with minimal analysis."

RESPONSE 106

At most locations in Park Area A, the stormwater is recharged at the edge of the pavement into the deep natural sands where stormwater is biologically treated by both natural and physical processes. The Applicant has indicated that this type of system will be maintained where feasible and will be supplemented by detention and retention basins where required. As Park Area A redevelops, more stormwater facilities will be added, as has been done in the past. This will further improve the stormwater treatment in this area.

DGEIS Reference: Page 2-15-16, 4-27-34 and Appendix 3.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 107 **(Mr. Paul Derby, 86 Ash Drive, Lake George; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 115):**

Commenter states that the Park Area C parking lot should not be paved but agrees that paving the ring roads is "probably a good idea to get traffic in." However, Commenter suggests a technology called "Gravel Pave Two," a permeable block, as an alternative to asphalt for the ring roads.

RESPONSE 107

TheApplicant believes that the use of Grasscrete™, concrete waffle block or other similar devices is prohibitively expensive becausea block concrete pavement system will cost approximately 5-10 times more than paving. The Applicant further argues that the use of Gravel Pave Two™ is 10-20% more costly than conventional pavement and can not be easily marked with stripes. As an alternative means to reduce stormwater flow, porous pavement can be utilized since it can be striped to aid the parking operation. Porous pavement is also more expensive by a factor of 5-10% cost premium however the parking isles can be striped. The porous pavement will reduce overall stormwater flow and increase recharge of rain water throughout the entire parking lot. Porous pavement is conventional asphalt that has been modified by leaving out the fine particles that prevent transmission of water. In Section 4.9 is a brief description of porous pavement prepared by the US EPA. This type of recharge is more natural since it is over a wider area and percolate in place rather than being collected and discharged at a point and will reduce the potential for overloading of stormwater basin. The number and size of basins would be reduced as a result of the use porous pavement. The Applicant has proposed to use porous pavement in area that are used seasonally and not subject to use by heavy vehicles, winter maintenance, and heavy vehicle traffic, whcih leads to premature failure of porous pavement. Conceptually, the Applicant proposes to use porous pavement at the purple, beige, brown, red, yellow pink, orange, black light green, maroon and lavender parking lots. The Planning Board will consider the Applicant's proposal to use porous paving systems along with other paving systems in making its Findings on the project. Also, see Response 87.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 108 **(Mr. Paul Derby, 86 Ash Drive, Lake George; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 117):**

Commenter believes that the DGEIS should have referred to the Glen Lake Watershed Management Plan and included a type of modeling of development called "intermodal" **[utramod?]** that is suggested in the Plan.

RESPONSE 108

The data used in the Glen Lake Management Plan was used in the design considerations for the wastewater treatment facility.

FGEIS Section 4.5 Water Quality Data charts contains the information on Glen Lake Water Quality considered as part of the overall assessment of potential impacts. Since 1986, the Secchi depth an overall measurement of water clarity has increased from 4m to 5-6m and occasionally as much as 8m. This indicates that microscopic plant life in the lake has decreased, which is related to Zebra Mussels and lower levels of phosphorus. The phosphorus levels have fluctuated during the period however the levels have stabilized to between 6-10ppb since 1990. Overall, the lake water quality has improved.

The Glen Lake Watershed Management Plan (December 1998) has five general goals. The proposed project at the Great Escape conforms to each of these goals and are identified below.

Goal 1 Protect and improved the water quality of Glen Lake and its tributaries.

The project provides a comprehensive stormwater management system that controls nutrient runoff from the new development to levels that match the existing conditions. Additionally the implementation of comprehensive sewage treatment on site with use of advance wastewater system will reduce phosphorus loading by at least 90%. This 90% reduction will take place prior to recharge to regional groundwater. As Park improvements are made in the attraction area further upgrades to stormwater control will also be made. All these runoff management and nutrient reduction will benefit Glen Lake.

Goal 2 Ensure that Glen Lake fisheries and habitat areas are maintained and improved and that contact recreational uses of the lake are not diminished.

The project will preserve and improve water quality which will allow the fisheries and existing contact recreational uses to continue. The Rush Pond area will not be developed which will continue to protect the headwater areas.

Goal 3 Control growth and spread of noxious aquatic vegetation in the Glen Lake watershed.

The project will not directly cause the introduction of nuisance aquatic species. The project will reduce nutrient loadings in the watershed which will slow the eutrophication process aiding in the control of certain aquatic species.

Goal 4 Maintain the use of Glen Lake as a recreational resource.

Both the visual and acoustic setting of Glen Lake is being protected by the proposed mitigation for each of those areas. The visual setting will be preserved by allowing Park redevelopment to include tall structures within specific zones in the Park. Tall structures will be substantially invisible from Glen Lake in that the structural elements visibility will be reduced by intervening topography and vegetation. A

structural element may be somewhat visible but its entire form will be hidden by topography or vegetation.

The sound environment will be protected by minimizing the changes to less than 5 decibel above existing ambient conditions in 1999 and 2000.

Goal 5 Ensure that future development in the greater Glen Lake watershed is appropriate and sustainable. The project conforms to existing zoning and the master plan. The proposed expansion minimizes nutrient loading and actually reduces levels of phosphorus loading into the lake watershed. The Great Escape is committed to cooperating with a proposed Route 9 sewer project including making land available for a necessary pump station which will benefit the western portions of the Glen Lake watershed and enhancing sustainability of the existing community. Also the Great Escape intends on preserving the Rush Pond property under it control as undeveloped land.

Based on the above review and the substantive analysis in the environmental impact state it is concluded that the project conforms to Glen Lake master plan goals.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 109 **(Mr. Paul Derby, 86 Ash Drive, Lake George; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 117-118):**

Commenter states that, unlike the Birdsall Road sound monitoring location used for the DGEIS assessment of noise in the Glen Lake neighborhood, residents on Ash, Canterbury, Birch and Chestnut Drives have a relatively clear line of sight to the Park and hear noises, especially the Bobsled. Commenter requests that the DGEIS be amended to include additional sound monitoring locations in Glen Lake that are currently affected by Park noises.

RESPONSE 109

Additional sound monitoring locations were sampled in August 2000. The results of that effort is found in Section 4.1, "2000 Sound Studies."

See also Response 57.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 110 **(Mr. Paul Derby, 86 Ash Drive, Lake George; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 121):**

Commenter states that the Scoping Document requires the GEIS to include noise modeling that considers sound propagation over the open water of Glen Lake.

RESPONSE 110

See Response 57.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 111 **(Mr. Paul Derby, 86 Ash Drive, Lake George; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 122):**

Commenter questions whether the proposed electric upgrades along Ash Drive will change the current visual character of the area. Commenter suggests a closer look at the proposed tree and branch trimming requirements for the proposed electric line to determine whether there will be an impact and urges the Planning Board to view the area.

RESPONSE 111

As documented by the visual impact simulations in the DGEIS, upgrades of the Ash Road power line will cause only a minor change in the visual character of the road corridors. The height of the poles will be the primary change. The horizontal clearing limits may be increased depending on the arrangement of the conductors on the poles. Horizontal clearing limits can be minimized by arranging the conductors in a delta or vertical arrangement rather than on a horizontal cross bar.

Overall, the clearing limits will change only by 5 to 15 feet horizontally along Ash Road. These clearing limits prevent power disruption during major wind storms and limit damage due to trees falling across the power line. The clearing limits are not unusual or atypical of the necessary clearing for protection of the utility's sub-transmission system required by national and utility system standards (e.g., National Electrical Safety Code and Niagara Mohawk Power Corp. Electric System Bulletins).

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 112 **(Mr. Paul Derby, 86 Ash Drive, Lake George; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 122):**

Commenter questions whether the proposed electric upgrades along Ash Drive will change the current visual character of the area. Commenter suggests a closer look at the proposed tree and branch trimming requirements for the proposed electric line to determine whether there will be an impact and urges the Planning Board to view the area.

RESPONSE 112

Comment 111 has been inadvertently duplicated. See Response 111.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 113 **(Mr. Paul Derby, 86 Ash Drive, Lake George; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 123):**

Commenter asks the applicant and the Planning Board to consider placing the proposed upgraded electric lines along Ash Drive underground to avoid any visual impact.

RESPONSE 113

Construction of an underground 34.5 kV corridor will in most cases require a larger disturbance and ultimate visual impact than the proposed overhead lines. An under conduit duct will require 10-15 feet of clearing and grubbing of trees and stumps at the outside edge of the road right of way. This will cause the tree line character of the road to be changed to a road inside of an unusually wide right of way.

Construction of an underground duct system would also be very expensive since at least four conductors and one empty duct will be required.

The Planning Board will weigh these considerations against the visual improvement to be gained by requiring an underground line when making its Findings.

DGEIS Reference: See page 2-16.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 114 **(Ms. Lorraine Stein, 86 Ash Drive, Lake George; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 124):**

Commenter asks that the Planning Board consider the fact that "all these impacts caused by the expansion project will be irreversible."

RESPONSE 114

Per SEQR's requirements, the DGEIS provides a systematic method of disclosing and considering irreversible and irretrievable impacts as are set out at DGEIS Section 6. The Applicant has argued that the SEQR record as a whole documents that the benefits of the action far outweigh any significant adverse environmental impacts, which, are further mitigated to at or below current levels of impact by the proposed traffic, stormwater and wastewater mitigation proposals. The Planning Board will take the irretrievable and irreversible aspects of the project into account when making its Findings.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 115 **(Mr. Bernard Ace Watkins, 3 Chestnut Road, Lake George; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 125):**

Commenter, a 30 year summer resident of Glen Lake, states that "that little postage stamp of land" that constitutes the Park's holdings has insufficient carrying capacity for the thousands of people it attracts and that impacts from those visitors spill over onto area residents.

RESPONSE 115

The Commentor's opinion is noted. The area that makes up the attraction area is 81.4 acres of which only 34.5 acres is currently developed. This developed area is contained within a 237.6 acre parcel. See Response 97.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 116 **(Mr. Bernard Ace Watkins, 3 Chestnut Road, Lake George; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 126):**

Commenter questions what kind of incremental controls the Planning Board would have if it were to approve the expansion on the condition that the proposed mitigation measures are implemented. Commenter also notes that he opposes blanket approval.

RESPONSE 116

Phased mitigation has been proposed for traffic impacts in order to match traffic growth with the needed improvements to maintain "levels of service" within the Route 9 corridor. Furthermore, the Planning Board intends to require ongoing monitoring of noise and water quality impacts and to require mitigation if adverse impacts are found to exist.

See Appendix 4 and DGEIS page 4-19 and FGEIS Response 101.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 117 **(Mr. Bernard Ace Watkins, 3 Chestnut Road, Lake George; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 127):**

Commenter believes that a 200 foot ride would be inconsistent with the natural beauty of the mountains, and he notes that he favors some expansion but not to the scale he perceives being requested.

RESPONSE 117

The applicant believes that there is an area within the developed portion of the Park for placement of such a ride that would be compatible with the context of the Great Escape, and with the scenic context of the region of the Park. Refer to FGEIS Section 4.3, "Visual Analysis 2000-2001," which augments the March 2000 visual study and defines an area within the portion of the Park already occupied by rides and attractions for development of tall rides which will not be substantially visible from surrounding areas.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 118 **(Ms. Dale Nemer, 15 Greenwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 128):**

Commenter states that noise is her primary concern. In particular, she finds the Alpine Bobsled "deafening and disturbing" and states she hears it from her yard, in her home, and on the golf course at the local country club. Commenter states she perceives no reduction in noise levels since the Alpine Bobsled was modified and asks whether the Town has considered a noise ordinance to restrict the volume of noise at certain hours.

RESPONSE 118

See Responses 57 and 104, concerning the potential Town Noise Ordinance.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 119 **(Ms. Dale Nemer, 15 Greenwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 129):**

With respect to alternative rides and attractions that Commenter believes should be considered in the DGEIS that would not produce audible noise, Commenter wonders whether the Applicant "has considered moving toward virtual reality rides that are being added at other theme parks and indoor thrill experiences?"

RESPONSE 119

The Applicant has indicated that it has considered such rides. The Park assess many types of new attractions at trade shows and similar opportunities. Potential new attractions are reviewed for guest appeal and how they add to the overall guest experience. In recent years, the Park has installed several rides, such as the Nightmare and Black Cobra, which operate entirely within enclosed structures. However, because of visitor preferences and need for variety in amusement experiences, the Applicant does not believe it is feasible to design an amusement Park where all the rides and attractions would be within buildings.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 120 **(Ms. Dale Nemer, 15 Greenwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 129):**

Commenter asks, "has the Town examined the proposed new ride slated to be built near the perimeter of the Park?"

RESPONSE 120

Refer to FGEIS Section 4.3, "Visual Analysis 2000-2001," which reports on the additional visual analysis completed in order to reposition the study points. This study defines an area within the Park in which to site tall rides which will not create a significant adverse visual impact. The study concludes that tall rides situated south of the Nightmare ride and east of the Condor ride within the area of the Park developed for attractions would meet this criteria. No ride is currently proposed.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 121 **(Ms. Dale Nemer, 15 Greenwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 129):**

According to Commenter, other theme parks such as Busch Gardens, Universal Studios and Knox Berry Farm have implemented noise control berms to mitigate audible noise and asks if the Town has considered requiring cement or concrete barrier walls?

RESPONSE 121

Barriers are an ineffective means of mitigating sound from tall attractions because of the difficulty in building a structure that will interrupt the line of sight between the attraction and receptor. The applicant has proposed both a height limit, and location limits, for future tall structures. These areas to host tall structures are not readily visible from the residential neighborhood receptors in the study areas, and therefore sound transmission will be also restricted because of intervening vegetation and/or topography in the line of sight between the ride and the neighborhoods.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 122 **(Ms. Dale Nemer, 15 Greenwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 129-130):**

Commenter is concerned about the potential impact of traffic noise from clearing and grading areas in Park Area C and questions the need for additional parking as "it appears that there is sufficient parking available now as many spots seem to go unused each day."

RESPONSE 122

The Applicant does not believe that planning the parking needs of the Great Escape based on the 2000 season when weather was cool and wet would be prudent management. The year 2000 attendance was well below the 1999 season when over 900,000 visitors were hosted. The improvements proposed are for long term growth and are part of a comprehensive plan of improvements necessary for continued prosperity of the Park. The Planning Board's role is to ensure that such impacts do not result in undue significant adverse impacts to the community.

The parking plan is based on the projected increase in Park visitors. Not all operating days are or will be at peak parking capacity.

The applicant's proposal is to provide necessary improvements in order to grow Park attendance to approximately 1,500,000 visitors. Phased traffic improvements will mitigate the traffic delays that occasionally occur at this time.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 123 **(Ms. Dale Nemer, 15 Greenwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 130):**

Commenter questions whether the impact of clearing and grading in Park Area C is consistent with protection of a "heavily wooded buffer" as discussed in the Town Master Plan Revision (Neighborhood 7, page 8)?

RESPONSE 123

Neighborhood 7, as described in the Town Master Plan Revision, extends to the north only as far as Round Pond Road. The plans to develop parking and access improvements in this area to serve the Park have been formed in response to comments of the Town and the community regarding traffic and parking issues. It is believed that the proposed improvements to parking and access/circulation will alleviate the Route 9 traffic issues.

The 1998 Comprehensive Land Use Plan identifies the Great Escape as being located within Neighborhood 4. The recommendations include methods for improving traffic flows at the shopping outlet center, including access management, parking areas and enhanced pedestrian use. The Plan recommends that the topography on the west side of Birdsall Road should be maintained as it creates a buffer between the Great Escape and the Round Pond/Country Club area. The Plan recommends that stormwater runoff and erosion control measures should be encouraged. Applicant believes that the Project is consistent with both the general and specific recommendations of the Plan. With respect to the recommendation to preserve topography on the property between the Park and Glen Lake Applicant would expect that any proposed development on the neighboring parcel that could affect the topography of the intervening, hillside would require SEQR review by the Planning Board.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 124 **(Ms. Dale Nemer, 15 Greenwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 130):**

Commenter asks whether noise impacts could be reduced by an alternative plan that provides for less clear cutting and development in Park Area C through the use of a parking garage structure?

RESPONSE 124

Refer to Responses 6 and 35.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 125 **(Ms. Dale Nemer, 15 Greenwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 130-131):**

With respect to the visual impact of the proposed parking lot development in Park Area C, Commenter states, "no doubt the character of the area both in terms of driving on Route 9 and from a variety of visual vantage points, i.e., Prospect Mountain, the bike path, will be negatively affected."

RESPONSE 125

The commentors opinion is noted. The Commenter is referred to FGEIS Section 4.3, "Visual Analysis 2000-2001," for a study that augments the March 2000 study.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 126 **(Ms. Dale Nemer, 15 Greenwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 131):**

Commenter states that, "cement parking lot[s] cause heat problems and storm water runoff," and asks whether these issues have been addressed by the Planning Board?

RESPONSE 126

The stormwater management system uses subsurface recharge systems and dry detention ponds to moderate stormwater flows on the sites. These measures lead to the lowest possible thermal loads to surface waters. The subsurface recharge system will not change the temperature of surface water since the stormwater will be shaded and not exposed to sunlight heating.

The dry infiltration detention ponds are the stormwater management device with the least thermal loading (Galli J, 1990 Thermal Impacts Associated with Urbanization and Stormwater Management Best Management Practicing Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments).

The thermal loading associated with stormwater management is expected to be less than the thermal loading that naturally occurs in the Rush Pond Fen which is fully exposed to sunlight. Nevertheless, the Planning Board may choose to require temperature monitoring as part of its overall water quality monitoring program.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 127 **(Ms. Dale Nemer, 15 Greenwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 131):**

Commenter asks, "where is the spoil from the clear-cut going," stating that it is not clear from the DGEIS.

RESPONSE 127

The trees will be sold on the market for pulp or as firewood.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 128 **(Ms. Dale Nemer, 15 Greenwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 131):**

Commenter states that, "traffic is a big concern...it is virtually impossible to make a left-hand turn out of Montray, Round Pond and Kendrick Roads between four and six-thirty p.m. Hence people are driving circuitous routes to avoid the snarl. Commenter asks, "has the Town Planning Board considered the secondary impact and ripple effect of traffic and secondary roads, including the aforementioned roads as well as Haviland Road, the Orchard Park area, Route 149 and Bay Road?"

RESPONSE 128

The Lead Agency acknowledges the commentors concerns. The intersections of Route 9/Round Pond Road and Route 9/Route 149 were studied in great detail in the Traffic Impact Study. The proposed traffic signal at Round Pond Road will facilitate turning movements out of Round Pond Road during the peak hours. Analysis of Montray Road, Kendrick Road, and the roads in the Orchard Park area was not required by the Lead Agency because there will be little increase in traffic on these local roads as a result of the Great Escape expansion. The lower speed limits and lower design standards on these roads would create a less attractive travel route for Great Escape patrons and employees than Route 9. Roads located further away from the Great Escape site such as Bay Road and Haviland Road will experience a smaller increase in traffic than those roads located proximate to the site, such as Glen Lake Road and Round Pond Road. Improvements to the Route 9 corridor will encourage traffic to utilize the State highways. The minor increase in traffic on local roads such as those listed will not have a significant impact on the operation of these roads or the character of the area.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 1, Page 2; Appendix 4, Chapter III, Sections G and I.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 129 **(Ms. Dale Nemer, 15 Greenwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 132):**

With respect to the impact on community services, Commenter asks how "local fire, rescue, police and ambulance services responded to the [DGEIS]?"

RESPONSE 129

The Commenter is referred to DGEIS Sections 3.5.3 and 4.12.2 regarding emergency service providers. The DGEIS details the nature and number of emergency calls currently experienced in the Park, and provides details on the Emergency Services Plan that Park management and the emergency service providers have created cooperatively and for which practice drills are periodically run. This information is based on in-person interviews and meetings with Fire Chief Richard A. Jones on February 16, 2000, and with EMS providers and the Sheriff's Department on February 11, 2000. The Sheriff's Department interview was conducted by telephone and confirmed the continued adequate capacity of local police coverage as was originally evaluated in the 1990 DEIS concerning the Comet.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 130 **(Ms. Dale Nemer, 15 Greenwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 132-133):**

Commenter refers to the natural resources and charm of the Adirondack area and acknowledges that it is an area frequented by tourists. However, Commenter notes that Great Escape's expansion plans should not "affect what was here first" and should not impact other area resources. In particular, Commenter suggests that future rides at the Park not be "as loud as the Bobsled."

RESPONSE 130

The goal of the applicant and the Town is to reduce the sound level from the Bobsled. The applicant has spent $90,000 on placing insulation over the track surface to reduce sound. This was preceded by spending $35,000 for various sound and engineering studies and $6,000 for monitoring of the performance of the mitigative measures in 2000. The Great Escape is committed to reducing the sound from the Bobsled.

Refer to Responses 3, 37 and 132.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 131 **(Ms. May Ann McNeil, 316 Glen lake, Lake George; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 135):**

Commenter, who lives on Glen Lake, claims she cannot open her windows during the day because the Alpine Bobsled, which she equates to the "roar of a jet," drowns out bird and other ambient sounds. Commenter states that she cannot use her screen porch or dock while the Bobsled is operating.

RESPONSE 131

See Response 57.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 132 **(Ms. May Ann McNeil, 316 Glen lake, Lake George; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 136):**

Commenter asks whether there are other Alpine Bobsled rides elsewhere designed to operate more quietly?

RESPONSE 132

The other ride that is similar to the Bobsled is the LaVibora at Six Flags Over Texas. This ride was studied to understand the sound characteristics of this particular attraction. By measuring sound at each ride it was determined that the ride has a characteristic sound with noticeable peaks at the 125-500 Hz range.

This past summer, measures to reduce the sound from the Bobsled were implemented. Installation of a medium density foam has reduced sound levels at the Bobsled. In 1999 the Bobsled sound ranged from 49-53 dBA while in 2000 the range was 41-49 dBA which indicates a reduction of 4-7 dBA at Twicwood. Additional sound reduction will hopefully be obtainable when a soft wheel sled will track the ride in consistency with the ride preferred operation. The soft wheels were used on a test basis this past summer and did reduce sound levels by an additional 6 dBA but caused the sled to move erratically in the track. The Great Escape and the Town are committed to reducing the sound level at the Bobsled.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 133 **(Ms. May Ann McNeil, 316 Glen Lake, Lake George; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 136):**

Commenter states that extra loud noises such as those created by the Alpine Bobsled can damage hearing over long periods of time, especially the hearing of children.

RESPONSE 133

The sound levels in the neighborhoods are well below any established threshold of potential hearing damage. The NYS DEC Program Policy Assessing and Mitigating Noise Impacts guidance states that 55dBA is sufficient to protect public health and welfare. The short term exposure in the Park will not result in hearing impairment of the Park patrons. The Great Escape and all Six Flags Parks have a hearing protection or conservation plan which complies with OSHA standards. There are no rides at the Park which exceed OSHA noise thresholds which would require ride operators to wear hearing protection.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 134 **(Ms. May Ann McNeil, 316 Glen lake, Lake George; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 136):**

Commenter states that she can hear traffic on the Northway while on her porch during nighttime hours and surmises that removal of trees and grading in Park Area C will increase noise propagation from the Northway.

RESPONSE 134

See Responses 6 and 39.

DGEIS Reference: See Section 4.1, "2000 Sound Studies."

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 135 **(Ms. May Ann McNeil, 316 Glen lake, Lake George; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 136-137):**

Commenter states that even under existing traffic conditions, it is impossible to make a left hand turn onto Route 9 from Glen Lake so that her "whole family has been forced to go over Glen Lake Road, out to Bay Road," which she calls the "back way." Commenter further states that if existing deficiencies cannot be mediated, the Park should not be allowed to expand.

RESPONSE 135

The Planning Board shares these concerns. The Route 9/Glen Lake Road intersection was studied in great detail in the Traffic Impact Study. The proposed traffic signal at Glen Lake Road will facilitate turning movements out of Glen Lake Road and therefore are anticipated to mitigate the impacts of traffic generated by the Great Escape expansion.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section G.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 136 **(Ms. May Ann McNeil, 316 Glen lake, Lake George; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 137):**

Commenter states that "Six Flags now is in the red; they are not making money; they have been losing money," and is concerned that the applicant may request public funds for construction of the wastewater treatment plant or other mitigation measures and is against the taxpayers paying for the Park's expansion.

RESPONSE 136

According to the Applicant, the Commentor's statement with respect to Six Flag's financial condition and profitability is incorrect, as documented by that company's publicly filed and available financial statements. The Applicant anticipates funding the improvements outlines in the DGEIS itself, except that it may seek State assistance for certain off-site roadway improvements which generally benefit the highway system, such as Exit 20 ramp improvements.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 137 **(Ms. Linda Clark Whitty, 3 Benmost Bur Lane, Lake George; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 138):**

Commenter states that the water quality of Glen Lake has deteriorated due to the clear cutting of trees and filling along the wetland, especially between the Great Escape and the Trading Post Restaurant. In particular, Commenter states that water turbidity has increased as Commenter has herself observed by the fact that she can no longer enjoy snorkeling in the lake. Commenter believes that sewage will increase the frequency of algae blooms on the lake.

Commenter also states that noise has increased with the addition of a 200 foot ride "designed to make people scream" and increased clear cutting of "what is left of the trees around this Park" and both actions will significantly affect the visual environment of the area. Commenter states that, unlike other Six Flags Parks which are supposedly better buffered from residential neighborhoods, Great Escape "does not comfortably fit into this neighborhood."

RESPONSE 137

As discussed in Responses 63 and 64, NYSDEC data indicates that the quality of Glen Lake is that of a healthy lake in balance with low levels of nutrients and improving turbidity over the past 13 years. The concern of turbidity may be explained by increased boat traffic on the lake which will cause turbidity levels to deteriorate as boat traffic increases on any given day. Once the boat traffic subsides for a period of time turbidity may improve. In any event, this is not an impact attributable to the Great Escape.

With regard to the water quality comments refer to Response 150. With regard to the comments on visibility, refer to Responses 144 and 255.

See Response 39 for a discussion of sound issues.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 138 **(Mr. Andrew Patenaude, 3 Best Ave., Mechanicville; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 141):**

Commenter, a contractor who "does a lot of work for Great Escape" and approves of the Park's expansion as it will provide more work opportunities for his company, reminds the Planning Board that the region is constantly trying to retain and expand employment and that tourism is an important component of the area economy. Commenter notes that tourism and, thus, the local economy, will be strengthened by the Park's investment, which provide visitors with a reason to travel to the region, as well as encourage local residents to visit the Park and surrounding businesses.

RESPONSE 138

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 139 **(Mr. Andrew Patenaude, 3 Best Ave., Mechanicville; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 142):**

Commenter asks the Planning Board to consider that employment provided by the Great Escape is not just for kids but includes full-time and construction work. Commenter notes that many of the proposed mitigation measures, in addition to the expansion plans themselves, represent opportunities for construction trades given that many are "built features." Commenter further notes that construction employment is often off-season and that his company has "20 to 25 people working at the Great Escape for three months. All high paying jobs," which Commenter observes are, "hard to find...in the northeast."

RESPONSE 139

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 140 **(Mr. Herb Levin, Birch Road, Glen Lake; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 144-145):**

Commenter is a Glen Lake resident who lives on Birch Road on Glen Lake Shore. Commenter questions applicant's commitment to environmental protection based on what he considers poor management practices involving contaminants from parking lots running into critical wetlands. Commenter also assumes that the Park uses and discharges chemically treated water in its water park that drains into the soils of the wetland. Commenter further states that the filling and encroachment of wetlands conducted by previous Park owners should be removed so that the original extent of the wetland is restored before further development is allowed. Commenter suggests that the Planning Board "require greater and increase buffers between the watershed and all aspects of the [proposed] development, especially parking."

RESPONSE 140

Data indicates that the wetland is healthy, performing as any healthy wetland performs: buffering run off, reducing nutrients and organic loads etc... The pool water discharge is dechlorinated and discharged through a series of holding tanks and NYSDEC approved leach fields. The Planning Board intends to implement a monitoring program to ensure that stormwater runoff does not adversely affect the wetlands.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 141 **(Mr. Herb Levin, Birch Road, Glen Lake; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 145-146):**

Commenter suggests that an alternative parking lot design be considered, which he asserts is employed at the Bronx Zoo, in which areas are not cleared or paved and patrons Park between the trees.

RESPONSE 141

The Applicant favors the proposed parking arrangement because it provides the quickest means of moving vehicles into spaces that will provide the greatest level of traffic mitigation. The Applicant believes the placement of planting islands or dividers will interfere with vehicle movements and that such improvements are meant to regulate traffic flow in a parking lot that is not supervised by an attendant. The Great Escape is proposing to plant more trees and plantings than required by the existing Town zoning ordinance.

The Bronx Zoo is served by a well-developed system of mass transit and has always been primarily served by mass transit. This creates a situation that attendees are accustomed to, and many prefer to access the Park by mass transit. The number of parking spaces at the Bronx Zoo reflects the reliance on mass transit and site conditions that includes numerous rock outcropping.

The Lead Agency will balance the Applicant's needs and environmental considerations with respect to the design and layout of the parking lots when making its Findings.

DGEIS Reference: See Section 2 page 3, and Section 4 page 7.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 142 (Mr. Herb Levin, Birch Road, Glen Lake; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 146):

Commenter states that that the Planning Board should require the applicant to remove the recycled asphalt layer dumped in the sand pit north of the Park, which slopes and drains into the wetland.

RESPONSE 142

The Applicant does not believe the recycled asphalt is an environmental threat in its current location. The DEC has reviewed and approved the placement of the asphalt as part of the Park's mined land permit's reclamation plan. Absent data indicating the asphalt is adversely affecting water quality, the Planning Board does not believe it is necessary to require removal of the asphalt.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 143 (Mr. Herb Levin, Birch Road, Glen Lake; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 146):

Commenter requests that the Planning Board place limits on the height of and sounds emitting from Park rides. Commenter states that the outdoor evening noises in the Glen Lake area would be impacted by "the scream of the roller coaster ride" as it projects above the tree line.

RESPONSE 143

The Great Escape is located in the Town-designated "Recreation/Commercial" zoning district, which is intended to "isolate, protect and encourage expansion of the recreation industry." The Applicant believes that in order to keep the public's interest in the Park, it is necessary to change or add rides and attractions occasionally. Most parks have large roller coaster rides as a main attraction. In order to stay current with the industry and provide the rides the public demands, it is anticipated that at some time Park management will add new roller coasters or similar tall rides. FGEIS Section 4.3, Visual Analysis, 2000-2001, defines areas within the portion of the Park already developed with rides and attractions in which tall rides could be constructed without causing a significant adverse visual impact.

Refer to Responses 27 and 28.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 144 **(Ms. Lorrie Graves, 82 Ash Drive, Glen Lake; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 147):**

Commenter resides on Ash Drive on Glen Lake and claims she hears noise from the Park and will hear noise from a 200 foot roller coaster, which she further claims would impair the view from her dock. Commenter states that clear-cutting of "all the trees" would be detrimental to Glen Lake and observes that current congestion at the Glen Lake/Route 9 intersection requires residents to use municipal center as a turn around, which is "not fair."

RESPONSE 144

The Park has no intention of clear-cutting all the trees at the Park. The Commenter is referred to FGEIS Section 4.3, "Visual Analysis 2000-2001," for the visual study conducted to augment the March 2000 study. The study concludes that tall rides constructed in the defined area would not be substantially visible from the bike path, Glen Lake or its shoreline or the golf course. It is believed that the traffic improvements proposed as part of the project will mitigate the existing traffic issues including the need to use the municipal center to make a turn at the Glen Lake/Route 9 intersection.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 145 **(Ms. Lorrie Graves, 82 Ash Drive, Glen Lake; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 148-149):**

Commenter has visited and enjoyed Great Escape both as an adult and as a child and understands the Park's need to expand. Therefore, Commenter states she is not against the Park's expansion, but, "it has to be scrutinized and controlled."

RESPONSE 145

The lengthy environmental and site plan review processes offer substantial public scrutiny and control over the potential impacts arising from the Park's expansion plan.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 146 (Ms. Diane Hayes, Glen lake Area; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 149-150):

Commenter, who is a member of the Glen Lake Protective Association, states that there used to be a large pool of water near the east side of Route 9 that could be used for swimming but which was filled for use as a parking lot. Commenter claims that this filling was the cause of the currently increased turbidity in Glen Lake.

RESPONSE 146

NYSDEC data indicates that turbidity has been improving over the past three years. The increase in turbidity mentioned may be a day to day event based on boat traffic on any given day. Speeding boats and water craft will have the effect of a mixer, stirring up the sediment on the bottom

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 147 (Ms. Diane Hayes, Glen lake Area; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 150):

Commenter believes that the Planning Board should require that all rides be below the tree line.

RESPONSE 147

The Great Escape amusement park is located in the Town-designated "Recreation/Commercial" zoning district which is intended to "isolate, protect and encourage expansion of the recreation industry." The 200 foot ride is allowed since the zoning ordinance regulates building height, and the ride does not meet the definition of building stated in the ordinance. At the same time, the purpose of this SEQRA process is to ensure that such tall rides do not result in significant adverse impacts. It is believed that a suitable area for development of tall rides can be established which will not have a significant adverse impact, as defined in FGEIS Section 4.3, "Visual Analysis 2000-2001."

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 148 (Ms. Diane Hayes, Glen lake Area; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 150):

Commenter states that power line upgrades requiring "taller and larger poles along the Glen Lake Road" and alongside the bike path, would significantly impact the visual quality of the bike path and the view presumably near the wetland bridge where bike path users "looking across toward West Mountain and would see nothing but a ride sticking up."

RESPONSE 148

There is no ride proposed that would substantially impact the view from people using the bike trail. FGEIS Section 4.3, "Visual Analysis 2000-2001," describes the study conducted to augment the March 2000 study. The Fall 2000 study defines an area within the Park where tall rides could be placed so that it would not create a significant adverse visual impact. The electrical utility poles along the bike trail would not need to be modified.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 149 (Ms. Diane Hayes, Glen Lake Area; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 150):

Commenter states that the removal of trees from Animal Land and the Samoset Motel area "is just plain wrong," and further cites the impact thereof on noise, erosion, and nutrient runoff.

RESPONSE 149

See DGEIS Section 4.1 which concludes, based on accepted environmental impact assessment methodology, that selective removal of trees will not have a significant adverse environmental impact on noise, erosion or stormwater borne nutrient runoff to receiving surface water
Also see Responses 6, 39, and 101, and DEIS Section 4, pages 28 to 34.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 150 **(Mr. Robert Hughes, 383 Bay Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 152):**

Commenter, a lifelong summer resident of Glen Lake, states that the lake has changed a lot and that the does not think that the change has been for the better.

RESPONSE 150

The data from NYSDEC indicates that Glen Lake is a healthy, balanced lake. See Response 63; and FGEIS Section 4.5, "Water Quality Data Charts."

Glen Lake is a natural kettle lake that is typically found in areas of the United States that have been subjected to glacial activity. As a kettle lake, this category of waterbody is very well understood and the science of lake study is firmly based on the observation made on kettle lakes over the last 80-90 years. Glen Lake has been sampled on numerous occasions and was included in the Citizen Statewide Lake Assessment Program (CSLAP). The CSLAP data was included as a basis for the Glen Lake Watershed Management Plan enacted by the Town of Queensbury. The CSLAP data clearly shows that the lake has a low level of nutrients, and a corresponding low concentration of chlorophylla. The level of phosphorus is under 10 ppb which indicates the lake is oligotrophic (nutrient poor). The chlorophylla concentration is 2.9 ppb which is over the oligotrophic range of under 2 ppb and is at the low end of mesotrophic scale of 2-8 ppb. The water clarity as measured by Seechi disk is 5.3m which is at the low end of mesotrophic scale. The nutrient phosphorus drives the ecology of the lake and the levels of the other parameters. Kettle lake water enters by both ground water due to the sandy till soils and by the surface. The phosphorus is derived from both the watershed and internally from lake sediments. Therefore low levels of phosphorus indicate that eventually the lake may continue or become more like an olisotrophic lake, with low nutrients and high water clarity rather than a mesotrophic lake with medium levels of nutrients and medium water clarity.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 151 **(Mr. Robert Hughes, 383 Bay Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 152):**

Commenter states that the Project constitutes "exploitation" and "big business," which ends up "becoming a large drain on the community [that]...really does not bring money into the community. It takes it out. That money no longer re-circulates in the community and therefore becomes a major drain. That is just basic economics."

RESPONSE 151

The economic and fiscal impact assessments set forth in the DGEIS establish that the project will have significant net positive economic and fiscal impacts. The applicant believes it has demonstrated that not only does its projected growth in payroll, full-time management and craft positions and tax revenue growth far exceed any additional incremental burden on public services, but the project is a significant source of business for other regional suppliers.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 152 **(Mr. Robert Hughes, 383 Bay Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 152-153):**

Commenter states that the Bobsled noise issues show a "total lack of sensitivity and lack of concern for the neighbors and the neighborhood and this community as a whole. That ride does sound like thunder on Glen Lake."

RESPONSE 152

The Park management has indicated that it is concerned about noise complaints and is committed to reducing noise as much as practicable. Commenter's perceptions of the Bobsled from Glen Lake are not supported by the EISs quantitative noise studies, which show the Bobsled noise as a non-dominant component at a generally noisy location, at a level lower than car and boat traffic and of more sporadic occurrence. Nevertheless, the Planning Board is aware that noise from the Bobsled is a source of annoyance and impact to some, and it is working with the Applicant to employ measures to mitigate this problem.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 153 **(Mr. Robert Hughes, 383 Bay Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 153):**

Commenter states that the applicant's "not being willing to tie in or contribute to the sewer system proves [a] lack of community orientation."

RESPONSE 153

As noted in the DGEIS and Response 175, the Park is willing to tie into a public sewer if and when such facility is available. It may take up to five years, however, to establish a sewer district extension, engineer the line and construct it. It is also possible that such a sewer might not be provided at all.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 154 **(Mr. Robert Hughes, 383 Bay Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 153):**

Commenter states that auditory pollution can be vastly more damaging than visual pollution.

RESPONSE 154

The Comment is noted. Studies discussed in DGEIS Section 3.6.1 indicate that while government agencies set levels for industrial exposure to very loud noises (e.g. OSHA regulations requiring worker hearing protection) for health-based reasons, no such regulation of lower-level sources of community noises are warranted for health-based reasons. See DGEIS page 3-42.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 155 **(Mr. Robert Hughes, 383 Bay Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 153):**

Commenter states that the Planning Board must continue to enforce, "visual, height and sound restrictions," and further notes, "I really don't think we need this kind of growth here."

RESPONSE 155

Comment noted. The analysis in FGEIS Section 4.3 supports the creation of restrictions with respect to the height of rides. See Response 3 with respect to the adoptions of restrictions on noise.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 156 **(Mr. Michael J. O'Connor, Fitzgerald Road, Glen Lake, and 546 Glen Street, Glens Falls; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 153-154):**

Commenter is a resident of Glens Falls with a year-round home on Glen Lake where he has resided at least on a part-time basis since 1953. Commenter states that he agrees with the Planning Board's approach to review the expansion program on a generic basis as opposed to on a "piecemeal basis [as] applications come in." However, Commenter professes confusion as to what approval of the FGEIS will mean since there is not an "actual application before the board at this time," for any part of the expansion program. Commenter wonders "what level of review will be required in the future when [applicant] get[s] more specific as to what [it] propose[s]." Commenter states that any resolution or acceptance and SEQR-related documents should define what has been approved so that the matter does not have to be reconsidered in the future.

RESPONSE 156

As SEQR authorizes and, indeed encourages, a generic or programmatic assessment can be undertaken, even though no specific project applications, which would require more detailed engineering, have been filed. 6 NYCRR §617.10. See also, 6 NYCRR 617.3(g).

As contemplated by the SEQR Part 617 regulations, this Generic EIS process develops thresholds for future review. 6 NYCRR §617.(c).

The Planning Board and the Applicant agree with commenter that this EIS process should resolve the overall issues with respect to the proposed development and set forth thresholds and review mechanics to streamline site plan review for project elements which are consistent with this DGEIS.

As documented elsewhere in this FGEIS, thresholds are proposed for visual impacts of tall structures, audible noise, traffic mitigation, stormwater monitoring and other direct and cumulative impacts.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 157 **(Mr. Michael J. O'Connor, Fitzgerald Road, Glen Lake, and 546 Glen Street, Glens Falls; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 155):**

Commenter thanks the applicant for its effort to date and states that he does not oppose applicant's plans. Commenter states that the applicant has rights and that it is matter of balancing applicant's and the rights of those that will be affected by the expansion, which Commenter believes can be done. Commenter further states that he believes applicant has had a "very positive impact on the community, particularly economically," and thinks that "a partnership can be worked out so that everybody can co-exist."

RESPONSE 157

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 158 **(Mr. Michael J. O'Connor, Fitzgerald Road, Glen Lake, and 546 Glen Street, Glens Falls; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 156):**

Commenter is concerned about the proposed package plant and mentioned several package plants around the area in Lake George, Bolton, and a local housing development that were installed which were said to be state of the art but then failed.

RESPONSE 158

The wastewater facility will not be a "package plant" as that term is commonly used within the wastewater treatment industry.

The proposed treatment plant is a "one off" facility designed for the specific raw wastewater to come into the plant, and for a desired effluent quality to be produced by the plant. Every component is selected individually and sized for the plant. The components come from a variety of manufacturers and not a single vendor. A package plant is sized for specific total flow range and components are all delivered preassembled by a single vendor.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 159 **(Mr. Michael J. O'Connor, Fitzgerald Road, Glen Lake, and 546 Glen Street, Glens Falls; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 157-158):**

Commenter states that the proposed package plant is an improvement over existing septic system but asserts it is a "band aid" approach. Commenter believes that the Great Escape should be required to hook up to the Glens Falls Sewer System. Commenter refers to the WalMart sewer line extension, which apparently did not include in the expansion district all abutting property owners but paid for easements allowing all such owners to connect in the future, and suggests a similar approach be applied to this Project. Commenter suggests that there is no rush to upgrade to the package plant and that sufficient time should be allowed for the municipalities and the applicant to explore a municipal sewer main extension alternative. Commenter states that connecting Great Escape to the Glens Falls sewer line would offer great advantages to residents of Glen Lake since it would avoid the issue of "what will happen when the present septic systems aren't working as well [as] now."

RESPONSE 159

Refer to DGEIS Section 7.4, Alternative 5. See also Response 153.

The proposal by Great Escape will be a long-term solution that will effectively operate for 25-50 years with only minor equipment upgrades and routine maintenance. The site is not served by a sewer and is not adjacent to a sewer district, therefore extension of sewer requires district formation. The process to form a district requires a map, plan and report and compliance with the State Environmental Quality Review Act. Even though recent initiatives of municipalities to expand the public sewer systems are promising, the required environmental, engineering and cost reviews and associated "lead time" for district formation require the Park to prudently plan to have its own permitted wastewater capacity on-site for the next five year planning horizon.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 160 **(Mr. Michael J. O'Connor, Fitzgerald Road, Glen Lake, and 546 Glen Street, Glens Falls; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 159-160):**

Commenter criticizes the proposed location of the Project's sewage treatment plant as being too close to the wetlands and asks why the applicant does not locate it on the west side of Route 9 either on the north or south end of the property in order to get it as far away as possible from the wetlands. Commenter also states that a location near Animal Land would be more likely to be connected to the municipal sewer line and also would avoid the risk of some outflow into the wetland.

RESPONSE 160

The wastewater facility is proposed and the location will ultimately be decided after consulting with NYSDEC. Portion of the facility may be located within the 100 foot buffer (adjacent area) to a state-regulated wetland and will thus require a permit from DEC pursuant to ECL Art. 24 and 6 NYCRR Part 663. Because of the redundant design, the alarm monitoring, and the technology involved, the risks to nearby land and water from a plant malfunction or upset associated with the facility are negligible. As for its location on the west side, the ultimate siting must also take into account the collection system and the topography, making the best location the one which has the least amount of pumping, as pumping systems are not as inexpensive or fault tolerant as gravity systems. Finally, the system will be subject to regular monitoring.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 161 **(Mr. Michael J. O'Connor, Fitzgerald Road, Glen Lake, and 546 Glen Street, Glens Falls; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 161-162):**

Commenter is concerned about the visual impacts of the Project. Commenter, an attorney who represents clients in land use matters, states that it appears inconsistent to propose a high ride when Glen Lake height restrictions for single-family homes is 28 feet. Commenter also criticizes the DGEIS' visual impact study, which depicts balloons without structures underneath, stating that he does not know how such photos will allow for an "intelligent decision."

RESPONSE 161

The amusement park is located in the Town-designated Recreation/Commercial zoning district, which is intended "to isolate, protect and encourage the expansion of the recreation industry." The proposal to construct tall rides complies with the Town Zoning Ordinance. The Town Zoning Ordinance height limits are specific to buildings, and the rides at the Park do not meet the definition of building which is defined in the Town Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, allowing tall structures in a Recreation/Commercial district is not incompatible with limiting structure height in a nearby residential zoning district to building heights typical of residential structures. The use of balloons to indicate the highest point of a supposed structure is standard practice in the field of visual impact analysis and allows examination of the effects of the most critical component of a tall structure, namely identification of the highest point of a structure so that comparison to the existing visual environment can be made. Park management has voluntarily offered to place such tall rides within a defined and limited area of Park which is already developed with rides and attractions in order to minimize the potential visual impact of such a ride. Refer to FGEIS Section 4.3, "Visual Analysis 2000-2001."

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 162 **(Mr. Michael J. O'Connor, Fitzgerald Road, Glen Lake, and 546 Glen Street, Glens Falls; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 162):**

Commenter states that the DGEIS' visual simulation photographs do not take into account the proposed removal of vegetation and omit receptors from view points that he finds important, two such views are that from the patio or the first tee of the Glens Falls Country Club and out in the lake or down by the island.

RESPONSE 162

Refer to FGEIS Section 4.3, "Visual Analysis 2000-2001," for a visual study conducted to augment the March 2000 study. The proposed area voluntarily defined by the applicant for development of tall rides is believed to be an area that will not create significant adverse visual impacts. Development of tall rides in the defined threshold area would not be substantially visible from the Glens Falls Country Club or the associated golf course, Glen Lake, or the bike path.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 163 **(Mr. Michael J. O'Connor, Fitzgerald Road, Glen Lake, and 546 Glen Street, Glens Falls; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 163):**

Commenter is concerned about sheet drainage and asks what final grading is proposed in parking lots south of the Coach House Restaurant. Commenter states that he is concerned that the engineering has not been performed and wonders if the conceptual lack of detail is appropriate for the document currently under review by the Planning Board.

RESPONSE 163

See DGEIS figure 2-21, 22, 23 pages 4-28, 29, 30, 31, 32, and 33. The analysis shows that stormwater quality will not be significantly changed as a result of the project. The Planning Board intends to require monitoring of water quality. Finally, the Planning Board will review detailed grading plans at the Site Plan Review stage.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 164 **(Ms. Karen Sabo, 12 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 163-164):**

Commenter, a resident of Twicwood, is "very concerned over the increase in noise coming from the Great Escape over the past two years," and states that she has been, "involuntarily bombarded with noise," mentioning the Comet, the Alpine Bobsled, special events, and the daily Elvis impersonator. Commenter states that she is concerned about audible impacts from future rides and suggests that sound berms be considered to mitigate noise.

RESPONSE 164

See Responses 6, 7 and 39

DGEIS Reference: See Section 3 pages 34-45, and Section 4 pages 20-23.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 165 **(Ms. Karen Sabo, 12 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 1653):**

Commenter criticizes the DGEIS for not mentioning impacts to audible noise from special events and states that the Christian rock concert last year and the Elvis impersonator are a problem.

RESPONSE 165

Prior to the Christian music concert, numerous musical performances had occurred without community complaints during prior seasons. To avoid similar problems, the Applicant has indicated that future concerts will be held only in the center of the Park with music directed towards the west. The Park has reiterated its commitment that, as has been the practice when complaints are directed to the management, the issue will be immediately addressed, to the extent that it can be readily controlled.

DGEIS Reference: See page 4-23.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 166 **(Ms. Karen Sabo, 12 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 165-166):**

Commenter states that the extensive removal of trees on the west side of Route 9 is a "really, really, really big concern" and conflicts with the Town of Queensbury Master Plan, which recommends that the west side of Route 9, "maintain existing heavily wooded buffer between the properties and the Northway," Commenter states that the residents in the neighborhood on the east side of Route 9 can hear the Northway since the Great Escape moved some mature trees on the former Animal Land property. Therefore, Commenter states that, "it should be obvious that the clear-cutting of large areas of dense woods would cause a very serious Northway problem to nearby neighbors. However, this potential negative impact was also not addressed in the DGEIS or even identified as a concern..."

Commenter also states that the alternatives of a parking garage, sound walls on the Northway, and "rearranging the connecting road and parking lots or decreasing the number of parking spaces needed in order to preserve some of the wooded buffer on the west side of the property" were not mentioned in the DGEIS.

RESPONSE 166

The interior of the Animal Land property had existing large fenced grazing fields for the animals. No more than twelve trees were removed from the property subsequently. Vegetation removal at the Animal Land property therefore does not appear to have been significant.

See DGEIS Section 7.3, "Alternative Parking Lot Layouts, Lot Surfacing and Parking Garage Alternative. Also see Responses 6, 7, and 39.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 167 **(Mr. Raymond Erb, 19 Fitzgerald Road, Glen Lake; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 169):**

Commenter, a resident of Glen Lake, states that the proposed 200 foot ride over a 50 foot tree line would definitely accelerate sound across Glen Lake and notes that he can hear fishermen 200 feet off shore on their boats and believes that the ride and its passengers would be very loud and keep lake residents awake at night.

RESPONSE 167

See Responses 144 and 361.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 168 **(Mr. Raymond Erb, 19 Fitzgerald Road, Glen Lake; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 171):**

Commenter is concerned about property values around the Park. He states that if the value of his property goes down it will hurt him in the long run but he does not expect to see a corresponding decrease in property taxes.

RESPONSE 168

There has been no evidence of property value diminution in any of the neighborhoods in the EIS study area, based on real estate sales data, and no reason to believe that these current price trends will not continue. Refer to Section 4.7 in the FGEIS.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 169 **(Ms. Karen Howe, 1 Mohawk Trail, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 172-175):**

Commenter, Director of Human Resources for Great Escape and a resident of Queensbury, grew up in the Twicwood neighborhood. Commenter states, "I think it's important to remind everyone that the Park supports over 50 full-time positions, year-round, and that our seasonal jobs are counted on by hundreds of local residents to support their families, as well as, provide a learning environment for our first time employees," noting that the Park offers first time workers opportunities to work with seasoned staff in mentoring relationships. Commenter further notes that the Park provides vital permanent craft and management jobs that allow people like herself to pursue satisfying careers while raising their families in the greater Glens Falls area.

RESPONSE 169

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 170 **(Ms. Karen Howe, 1 Mohawk Trail, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 174):**

Commenter asks, "where would we be today without the financial support and growth the Park brings to this community?" Commenter mentions the positive economic impacts of the Park cited in the DGEIS and also comments on the positive effects of local purchases of goods and services by the Great Escape on local businesses, such as the installation, maintenance and purchase of fire and security systems, construction, carpentry, skilled craftsmen, paving materials, and painting, among other goods and services purchased regularly by the Park.

RESPONSE 170

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 171 **(Mr. Warren Rosenthal, 40 Sunnywest Lane, Lake George; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 176-177):**

Commenter, President of the Warren County Economic Development Corporation ("WCEDC"), states that WCEDC has "unanimously agreed to endorse the expansion plans of the Park subject to the company adequately addressing the concerns of traffic, noise, wastewater, stormwater, visual impact, and so forth." Commenter observes that, "tourism is the primary industry of our county and of our region" and notes that expanding the tourist season "as much as possible...will have a positive economic impact on the community and...create better quality jobs for all the people..."

Commenter also mentions that Great Escape is currently paying $1 million in sales taxes, which will grow to $2 million if the Project is approved and the "$30 to $100 per day" spent by visitors to the Great Escape "in turn will generate additional jobs and taxes in the community."

Commenter remark that, "the Great Escape has continuously demonstrated good corporate citizenship in the community donating over $100,000 in charities in the year 2000 [and]...is a significant economic engine for the town, county, and the region."

RESPONSE 171

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 172 **(Ms. Kathi DiMartino, 97 Birdsall Road, Glen Lake; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 180-182):**

Commenter, a summertime resident of Glen Lake for 10 years, states that she is concerned with wastewater, the quality of the water of Glen Lake, the removal of trees, and maintaining property values of areas around the Park. In addition, Commenter's states that, based on her experience with sound berms, they do not work citing her experience living next to the Sunrise Highway where property was taken and an 18 foot sound berm installed.

RESPONSE 172

The water quality of Glen Lake is being protected by the installation of advanced wastewater treatment (DGEIS 2-12, pages 4-8-4-10) and comprehensive stormwater management (DGEIS 4-27-4-34) and a monitoring plan. The trees along the Northway are not an effective sound barrier due to the low density of shrubs and the height of the adjacent roadways. As noted by the Commenter, roadside sound barriers at times are ineffective. See Response 7. Given the height of the Northway along the existing main parking lots, it is impractical to build sound barriers at this location. See Response 6.

All of the data provided by NYSDEC indicates that in fact the Glen Lake watershed is quite healthy. The levels of nutrients are below the recommended standards, the turbidity (clarity) of the lake has been improving. The wetland upstream of the lake consistently lowers the level of nutrients passing through. The ecosystem appears to be in balance. The Great Escape will be treating its wastewater with a state of the art wastewater facility which incorporates a phosphorous filter that will reduce phosphorous to non-detectable levels for most certified labs in New York State. The treated effluent will then be discharged sub-surface allowing additional natural filtration to occur.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 173 **(Ms. Kathi DiMartino, 97 Birdsall Road, Glen Lake; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 182):**

Commenter states that tax revenues from the Great Escape go to Lake George and insufficient revenues go to Queensbury.

RESPONSE 173

Most of the tax revenues from the Project benefit the Town of Queensbury. Only the school tax component directly benefits Lake George and such benefit is required by the fact the Great Escape is within the Lake George Central School District.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 174 **(Mr. Robert Schulz, 2458 Ridge Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 184):**

Commenter states that he hopes that, "the stenography transcript would be available soon but on computer readable material at reproduction cost for everyone, made available to everyone."

RESPONSE 174

The stenographic transcript of the August 29th public hearing may be downloaded free of charge from the Lemery MacKrell Greisler website at www.lmglaw.com/GreatEscape. The verbatim transcript will also be included within the FGEIS, per SEQR regulations at 6 NYCRR 617.9(b)(8).

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 175 **(Mr. Robert Schulz, 2458 Ridge Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 184):**

Commenter refers to the Warren County Sewer District and Sewer Project and notes that Great Escape is included within the Sewer District.

RESPONSE 175

The Park property is in the Warren County Sewer District but is not within that part of the district serving the Lake George Basin which is being studied for a possible sewer system. If the Great Escape is to be served by a public sewer, it is much more likely that will be achieved by an extension of the Queensbury Central – Quaker Road District lines which currently terminate near Sweet Road, rather than by an extension of the Warren County District project lines. In any event, such a project, if someday proposed by a municipal agency or other entity, would be subject to its own SEQRA review.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 176 **(Mr. Robert Schulz, 2458 Ridge Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 184-187):**

Commenter criticizes the DGEIS for failing to include the feasible alternative of dismantling the Park and moving it to an area that is not near a "critical environmental area."

RESPONSE 176

This alternative was not developed in the DGEIS because dismantling the Park and moving it to an entirely different location is not viewed as a "reasonable alternative that would achieve the Park's objective. Not all potential alternatives must be discussed in a DEIS, but only "... the range of reasonable alternatives that are feasible, considering the objectives and capabilities of the project sponsor". 6 NYCRR 617.9(b)(5)(v). Also, a "critical environmental area" under SEQR is only a mechanism to encourage preparation of EISs like this when CEAs may potentially be affected.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 177 **(Mr. Robert Schulz, 2458 Ridge Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 186-187):**

Commenter states that SEQR also requires the applicant to study "no action alternatives," which the Commenter finds lacking in the DGEIS.

RESPONSE 177

The "no action" alternative is discussed in the DGEIS as required by SEQR. "No action" equals not expanding and operating the existing Park more or less "as is". "No action" does not equal dismantling the existing Park and moving it as suggested by Commenter in Comment 176.

DGEIS Reference: Refer to DGEIS Section 7.7. "No Action Alternative."

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 178 **(Mr. Robert Schulz, 2458 Ridge Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 188):**

Commenter disagrees with those Commenters who recommend extending the municipal sewer line to the Park along the Route 9 corridor, stating that sewering an area removes constraints to development and induces further, more intensive development, which must be studied in greater depth before it is encouraged in an area. Commenter states that such study, in addition to studying the direct and indirect effects of providing sewer services to inhabitants on Route 9, must also consider the impacts to the "rest of the Lake George or Warren County Sewer District" in the context of all sewers over that area and to not do so would constitute "impermissible segmentation" under SEQR.

RESPONSE 178

The Commenter is correct that under both SEQR and Town Law Arts. 12 and 12-A, environmental, engineering and cost studies of a sewer system extension must take place before the lines may be built. However, this project does not contemplate the construction of a municipal sewer. The Applicant has simply stated its willingness to connect with a municipal sewer, should one ever become available.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 179 **(Ms. Marie Miller, 14 Elm Drive, Lake George; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 191-192):**

Commenter has been a resident of Glen Lake for 45 years and states that her grandchildren and dogs are affected "very badly" by the noise from the Alpine Bobsled. Commenter also implies that if a sewer system is not installed, the waters of Glen Lake will become contaminated and will cease to be appropriate for swimming, fishing, or drinking.

RESPONSE 179

The wastewater and stormwater improvements will greatly reduce the Park's discharges of nutrients and pollutants into groundwater and surface waters. The Planning Board intends to require a monitoring plan for water quality. Sewage effluent will be subject to monitoring by the NYSDEC.

The sound levels in the community are below the threshold associated with human health impacts according to the NYS DEC Program Policy Assessing and Mitigating Noise Impact (DIEP-00-3 September 29, 2000) and the EPA Protection Noise Level (November 1978).

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 180 (Ms. June Talley, 13 Pinewood Avenue, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 193):

Commenter lives on Pinewood Avenue on the west side of I-87 and states that she can hear the Northway and noise from Great Escape at her home. Commenter is concerned that the removal of land and trees as contemplated by the Project will cause the degree of noise from the Great Escape reaching her home to increase.

RESPONSE 180

See Responses 6, 39 and 57.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 181 **(Ms. June Talley, 13 Pinewood Avenue, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 193):**

Commenter is concerned that the proposed locations of new parking lots will cause polluted water to run off into Rush Pond.

RESPONSE 181

Stormwater runoff is addressed by the stormwater management plan which has been designed to infiltrate water on-site beneath lots and is not anticipated to adversely affect water quality in Rush Pond or other surface waters.

The parking lots will have a comprehensive stormwater management system that includes both subsurface recharge of stormwater and detention ponds in order to improve the quality of the stormwater discharges. Nutrient loading from stormwater will be nearly the same as currently takes place under the existing level of development.

Rush Pond is upstream of the stormwater discharges therefore it will not be impacted by stormwater. The Planning Board will require a monitoring plan to mitigate the potential adverse impacts from stormwater discharge.

DGEIS Reference: See Section 4 pages 27-34.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 182 **(Ms. June Talley, 13 Pinewood Avenue, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 194-195):**

Commenter is concerned about sites in Park Area C that may contain cultural resources. Commenter has been involved in local area archaeological projects and is concerned "about the artifacts and things that will be destroyed there if that project, if the hotel is put there too quickly without a complete survey done..and done right." Commenter explains that she means that, "it should be...done properly and the artifacts should be saved." Commenter states that any artifacts found may have commercial and educational value and may be of interest to tourists.

RESPONSE 182

All of the archeological field work previously, and scheduled to be conducted in connection with The Great Escape project is performed to professional standards established by **the New York Archaeological Council.** Hartgen Archeological Associates, Inc. has over 27 years of experience conducting archeological investigations across the state. Its highly trained staff is committed to quality archeology. All of the excavations conducted by Hartgen and its staff meet and exceed the standards established for the profession In addition, the archeological field work at The Great Escape has been completed in close consultation with the New York State Office of Historic Preservation. All of the artifacts recovered from the site have been carefully cleaned, catalogued, analyzed, and conserved. Currently, the artifacts are still retained by Hartgen for additional analysis. In the future, the artifacts will be donated to a museum, local institution, and/or retained by The Great Escape as part of an educational program.

Development near sites which are potentially eligible for inclusion in the state or federal registers of historic places must be reviewed by the State Office of Historic Preservation under Section 14.09 of the State Parks & Historic Preservation Law (where, as here, state permits may be involved). Two potentially eligible prehistoric and historic sites have been identified in the course of SHPO review concurrent with these SEQR studies, and mitigation plans including artifact recovery have been approved. The archeological site will be recovered prior to the start of construction in that area. The historic resources consist of the various cabin colonies that include a portion of Samoset, and Kay's Motel. Two alternatives are being explored to mitigate loss of these historic collection of structures. A possible reuse or development of tourist cabins around the hotel site is a potential mitigation measure. This measure will allow visitors to understand historic tourism based on detached cabins and auto travel. Alternatively the sites could be comprehensively mapped and inventoried as a record of past development.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 183 **(Dr. Mark Hoffman, 32 Fox Hollow, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 196-197):**

Commenter has concerns about the independent review to be done by the Town and believes that, "data and interpretations that are presented by the sponsor of a project are clearly biased in favor of the project and it's really critical that qualified independent technical review be available to review this project."

RESPONSE 183

SEQR permits, but does not require, independent third-party engineering review of a DEIS. In this instance, the Town Planning Board has elected to retain an independent third-party firm, The Chazen Companies, to review the DGEIS. See, SEQR regulations at 6 NYCRR 617.13(a). Such independent third-party technical review provides the Planning Board and public with an effective safeguard against a potential "pro-project" bias mentioned by the Commenter. The DEIS was also reviewed by independent "involved agencies" such as NYS DOT, NYS DEC and the County Planning Board.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 184 (Dr. Mark Hoffman, 32 Fox Hollow, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 197):

Commenter, referring to the purported economic benefits of the project, says that there is no unemployment problem in the area but rather an under-employment problem and that, "bringing in 900 part-time jobs, seasonal part-time jobs with no benefits, no pension and no health insurance is not going to do anything to improve that situation."

RESPONSE 184

Commenter ignores the more than 50 permanent, full-time jobs which will be created by the Project, most of which are relatively high-paying, skilled and managerial positions with full benefits. Additional seasonal, part-time jobs also fill an important component of the area labor market, particularly with students and retirees who are looking for part-time or seasonal positions rather than full-time, career jobs.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 185 **(Dr. Mark Hoffman, 32 Fox Hollow, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 198):**

Commenter claims that the 50 full-time jobs that the Project will create at Great Escape are not significant stating that, in contrast to the Great Escape, his small medical practice has 10 full-time employees with no adverse environmental impacts associated with their employment.

RESPONSE 185

In terms of "significance" to the local economy, employers with over one hundred permanent employees are among the top regional employers (see, e.g., annual compilations by such publications as the Capital District Business Review). In that context, adding 25 executive positions and 25 skilled craft positions to the existing 50 full-time Park employees in the $30,000 - $55,000 salary range could be considered significant. While Commenter did not provide data on the salaries of the 10 office staff cited, it is likely that the projected salaries of all the new Great Escape positions is considerably higher than the prevailing area salaries for non-professional clerical staff.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 186 **(Dr. Mark Hoffman, 32 Fox Hollow, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 198-199):**

Commenter refers to local efforts by the Glens Falls Transportation Council, the Town of Queensbury, the Glens Falls Hospital Healthy Heart Program, and the New York State Department of Health to encourage pedestrian and bicycle transportation. In particular, Commenter refers to efforts to facilitate mobility of pedestrians and cyclists crossing the Northway to the Warren County bicycle trail at Gurney Lane. Commenter questions how the safety of pedestrians and cyclists will be protected at the Gurney Lane crossing if project development proceeds.

RESPONSE 186

See Response 18. The design for improvements at the Route 9/Gurney Lane intersection will also include provisions for pedestrians and bicyclists including crosswalks and pedestrian push buttons on the traffic signal.

The Regional Bike Plan, which was adopted by A/GFTC last year, included a recommendation to provide a connection from the bike path from West Mountain Road to Gurney Lane with the Warren County bike path on the east side of Route 9. There was no proposed route for the extension of the bike path. One alternative that the Town may consider is through the Courthouse Estates subdivision.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 187 (Dr. Mark Hoffman, 32 Fox Hollow, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 199-200):

Commenter notes that the Town is in the process of updating its zoning code with an emphasis on the improving aesthetics on major travel corridors and the overall visual impact of those corridors. Commenter is concerned about the visual impact of adding more blacktopped parking lots along Route 9.

RESPONSE 187

Comment noted. For several years, the Town Planning Board had requested that the Park obtain additional land for parking and the Park management has complied with this request. The Applicant believes that paving the lots makes parking more efficient and utilizes less parking area than if the lots were not paved because it allows for higher vehicle density. Refer to Responses 40, 87 and 141.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 188 **(Mr. Jack Fox, 15 Kettles Way, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 200-203):**

Commenter is a resident of Queensbury and an employee of the Great Escape. Commenter notes that several of his co-workers began their Great Escape careers as seasonal employees and that employment opportunities at the Great Escape bring people to the area from outside of the region.

RESPONSE 188

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 189 (Mr. Hal Halliday, 2599 Ridge Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 203-204):

Commenter has resided in the Town of Queensbury for 28 years and is a full-time seasonal manager at the Great Escape and soon hopes to become a member of the full-time yearly staff. He notes that the Great Escape is a "solid employer...committed to safety and our local environment."

Commenter believes that the Town has good schools and libraries because it has a good balance of businesses and residences. Commenter notes that, "tourism dollars generated in our area turn over many times before leaving," and cites studies that say a dollar is turned over seven times in the community before it leaves.

RESPONSE 189

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 190 (Mr. Hal Halliday, 2599 Ridge Road, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 203-204):

Commenter notes that he lives on the east side of Lake George and hears noise from the boats on Lake George and other tourist attractions in the area, such as the Mini Ha Ha whistle and the occasional plane. Commenter states that, "it still amazes me that people move onto the shore of Lake George and the next thing they are at the town meeting complaining about the boats on the lake, or move near the airport and complain about the noise flying. Or some live near the amusement Park and complaint about the noise of the amusement near their house." Commenter states that, "we all have choices about our daily life. Let's not make other people change to suit our own personal needs." Commenter further states, "People who moved here five years ago, tell them that they should not have assumed that the Great Escape would never expand."

RESPONSE 190

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 191 **(Ms. Dayrene Patten, 7 Jackson Road, South Glens Falls; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 207-210):**

Commenter resides in South Glens Falls and has been a full time employee of the Great Escape for the last 14 seasons. Commenter cites the Park's former ownership under International Broadcasting Corporation, which during its 2 year period of ownership Commenter says "drained the Park" and "did not put anything new into the Park," as a demonstration of a fact "generally accepted in the amusement industry" that if improvements are not made, the business will suffer and die. According to Commenter, when International Broadcasting Corporation failed to make capital investments in the Park, the Park "began to die." Again, referring to the Park's history, Commenter cites former Park owner Charles Woods' experience when he re-purchased the Park from International Broadcasting Corporation and immediately began to invest in new rides and other capital improvements. Commenter states that Mr. Woods' investment was responsible for the recovery in attendance levels at the Park.

RESPONSE 191

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 192 (Mr. Eric Gilbert, 42 E. Hunterbrook Lane, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 210-211):

Commenter is the manager of operations at the Great Escape. He states that he considers himself lucky to have had the opportunity to begin a career in the amusement industry and learn about responsibility and finance. Commenter notes that the Great Escape, "employ[s] senior citizens who…use that as an opportunity to do things…beyond their career goals as well as they mentor …young people."

RESPONSE 192

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 193 (Mr. Scott Malpin, 18 Bronk Drive, Queensbury; 8/29/00 public hearing, Tr. 212-213):

Commenter is the Director of Operations at the Great Escape and has worked with Six Flags for about ten years in four different parks, "I have seen parks firsthand that have had to work around stringent environmental guidelines, and I know that it can happen, I have been there, I have done it. We are committed to that."

RESPONSE 193

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 194 **(Ms. Deborah Roberts, Roberts Environmental Consulting, Inc., written comments dated August 25, 2000):**

Commenter states, "a major visual impact (and potential environmental impact) of the proposed expansion will be the construction of the large parking facilities in Area C, increasing the parking from 2,600 spaces to 4,000 spaces. The need for this parking is unclear from a total Park use perspective. Currently, the existing parking allows for crowds in the Park that frequently result in lines of more than 1 hour at most of the popular rides/shows. Consequently, the Park under existing build-out seems near capacity. If the number of activities within the Park is not expanded by 2-fold, then it seems unnecessary to nearly double the parking capacity. It does not seem reasonable to assume that without considerable increase in facilities within the Park, crowds warranting the extensive parking proposed are going to turn out to wait in two-hour-long-lines."

RESPONSE 194

It is the intention of the Park to gradually add higher capacity rides to its current offerings. There are currently some days when parking capacity is exceeded, and in response to the direction of the Town Planning Board expressed over several years, Park management purchased additional land specifically to be used for parking and traffic access/circulation improvements as proposed by the Project under review in the DGEIS.

Generally speaking, at most times, the Park is not near capacity. The Park works to spread its attendance over its operating days. Ride lines are often dependent on the capacity of the ride versus the number of rides. It is important to add new rides that will increase ride capacity in place of older, lower-capacity rides.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 195 **(Ms. Deborah Roberts, Roberts Environmental Consulting, Inc., written comments dated August 25, 2000):**

Commenter states, "Section 5, page 5-1 states that the proposed loss of vegetation is unavoidable. Some of the loss of the proposed 11.5 acres of forest could be reasonably avoided and more thoroughly mitigated. Figure 4-1? Shows that all of the mature trees/shrubs will be removed along the Northway right-of-way to accommodate the expanded parking. The proposed plantings in figure 2-4 appear to be insufficient to provide a visual barrier from the Northway or from Route 9. Since the amount of parking is in excess of what seems to be reasonably needed for the Park facilities..., the width of the buffer along the Northway should be increased and some of the large mature trees left in place. In addition, the planting scheme should be sufficient to ensure the view of the massive paved parking area is fully mitigated form both major roadways. This should include a monitoring plan for the plantings, and a commitment to ensure survival or replanting of trees and shrubs for 3 years after planting."

RESPONSE 195

DGEIS Figure 4-1 illustrates that some of the mature trees/shrubs along the Northway will be removed. The two large existing parking lots currently have little or no planting adjacent to the Northway. DGEIS Figures 2-11, 2-17 and 2-13, "Buffer Analysis Plans," illustrate the locations of 1,057 +/- plants (trees and shrubs) the Park is proposing to buffer the parking and ring road improvements. The Applicant believes that placing the trees at locations immediately in front of the viewer reduces visibility to a greater extent than trees dispersed throughout the parking lots in islands that are hundreds of feet away, and cites the example that if one stands immediately behind a utility pole it blocks the view while a utility pole 10 feet away has a limited ability to interrupt a view. A pine tree and/or shrub hedges along Route 9 and I-87 will reduce visibility into the parking lots from that travel corridor. Specific planting plans and any attendant monitoring or other conditions would be the subject of a site-specific site plan review application. The Planning Board will weigh the Applicant's goals with respect to plantings against other considerations, including visual impact, when making its Findings.

The plan proposal to develop compact and efficient parking lots requires land to be cleared of trees and regarded is an unavoidable impact associated with the proposed improvements. It is infeasible to significantly reduce the visibility from the Northway since the road is elevated approximately 20 feet above the parking lots. Mitigation for the impacts has been provided by the proposed planting plan at the perimeter of the parking lots. The perimeter planting will reduce the visibility of parking for the driving public along Route 9. The view duration along Route 9 is longer than it is on the Northway due to lower speeds on Route 9.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 196 **(Ms. Deborah Roberts, Roberts Environmental Consulting, Inc., written comments dated August 25, 2000):**

Commenter states that, "the DGEIS concludes that there will be no significant long-term cumulative effects on aquatic ecology. The information provided is insufficient to support this statement. Potential contributions to surface water degradation included stormwater run-off, wastewater discharge and to a lesser extent, waterfowl use...The stormwater plan provides detailed information on how the quantity of stormwater will be treated in order to remain at or below existing conditions. However, the DGEIS does not address stormwater quality. The discharge of the stormwater goes to sensitive aquatic systems and data to support the contention that there will not be long-term degradation of surface water quality resulting from the significant increase in impervious surfaces proposed by the project."

RESPONSE 196

NYSDEC data for the tributaries to the wetland, including those currently receiving runoff from the Northway, indicate the amount of nutrients to be low. The water quality of the wetland effluent indicates an ecosystem in balance and water quality data from Glen Lake indicates a healthy balanced ecosystem as well.

The level of phosphorus is the limiting nutrient that exerts control on many water quality parameters. Clarity and chlorophylla will be lower or equal to the amounts discharged with the current level of development. The level of nitrogen will be slightly higher. The improved waste water treatment system will reduce phosphorus loading by 99% due to the use of advanced waste water treatment. The project will therefore decrease current and not significant nutrient loadings to Glen Lake.

The Planning Board intends to require a monitoring plan to ensure against adverse impacts from stormwater runoff.

DGEIS Reference: See Section 4 pages 27-34.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 197 (Ms. Deborah Roberts, Roberts Environmental Consulting, Inc., written comments dated August 25, 2000):

Commenter states that, "An existing condition within the Park that adds to the degradation of water quality is the presence of waterfowl within the main stream. Populations of waterfowl may also utilize the proposed stormwater ponds. As mitigation for potential water quality impacts, the Great Escape should implement low-cost measure to manage the water fowl populations. Allowing vegetation to grow along the bank of the stream, fencing and, in particular, signage discourage the guests form feeding the ducks, should be used to discourage the large resident population from over-use of this section of the stream. Waterfowl are notorious for increasing nutrient and coliform contamination in surface water and a proper management program should be implemented. An education program with simple signs requesting the guests not to feed the ducks would be beneficial along the existing restaurant facilities near Subway and Itza Pizzeria."

RESPONSE 197

Water quality data indicates no impact from the current waterfowl population.

The Great Escape has indicated its willingness to review a program of public outreach to visitors to discourage waterfowl feeding.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 198 **(Ms. Deborah Roberts, Roberts Environmental Consulting, Inc., written comments dated August 25, 2000):**

Commenter states that, "Page 3-4 [of the DGEIS] states that no activities will involve or intercept with groundwater resources. However, the document also states that the high groundwater table is within 6 feet of the surface during parts of the year. In addition, page 2-14 indicates that the effluent from the preferred wastewater treatment alternative will be discharged to a deep sandy soil, which will further reduce nutrient pollution to the regional groundwater system. The design flows for the wastewater treatment system are up to 95,000 GPD (gallons per day). The treated effluent limit for total phosphorous (the nutrient with the greatest potential for contamination of surface water) is 0.5 mg/L. The surface water concentrations of total phosphorous in the surrounding wetlands and the final receiving waters of Glen Lake are 1 to 2 orders of magnitude less than this effluent concentration. The surface water concentrations of total phosphorous (TP) in tributaries to Glen Lake range from 0.009 to 0.040 mg/L TP. Unless the separation from the groundwater and ultimate discharge to surface water is capable of continuously removing a substantial load of TP from the effluent, indefinitely, during all flow conditions, a potential for significant impact to water quality exists. The DGEIS does not provide sufficient information regarding the groundwater or soil condition, or the proposed wastewater disposal system in section 2.1.10 or Appendix 6 to support the statement that ground water or surface water will not be impacted by the proposed discharge."

RESPONSE 198

The NYS SPDES permit program is based on the requirement that the permitted discharge be of better quality than the receiving waters, this is to insure the improvement of the waters throughout the state of New York. This program is a statewide success as the waters across the state have improved considerably over the past two plus decades that the program has been in effect. The proposed effluent quality of the wastewater facility exceeds many of the requirements for potable water and will be of higher quality than any of the surrounding waters. Subsurface discharge is an additional design element not required by the SPDES program but put forth to insure an additional level of protection. The design of the treatment process incorporates the technology that is used in drinking water facilities to insure the integrity of the water quality. The soil conditions will be tested and the design done according to regulatory requirements for the soils. Currently all of the waste is being treated with septic tanks and the effluent is discharged to the ground with absolutely no negative impact to Glen Lake as proven by the total phosphorous level in the Lake as mentioned in this comment. The Great Escape proposal is to improve the treatment of this waste with biological treatment, physical/chemical treatment and finally filtration equal to the standards established for microfiltration and then disinfection, an improvement of four additional levels of treatment than is currently being done. So if the current level with no treatment except for primary septic tanks and leach fields is having no significant impact on Glen Lake, an improvement of tertiary treatment of effluent to near drinking water quality will certainly continue the no impact scenario. As stated, the soils will be tested and approved before the final design is completed.

DGEIS Reference:
Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 199 **(Mr. Stephen L. Johnson, Queensbury and Glens Falls; written comments dated August 29, 2000):**

With respect to the proposed traffic impact and the mitigation measures such as paving, internal roads and landscaping included in the Project, Commenter states that, "Mitigation design provides only for smaller traffic volumes than Great Escape predicts."

RESPONSE 199

The DEIS' Traffic Impact Study provides for three graduated levels at which additional traffic would trigger mitigation designed to preserve levels of service. The traffic impact study indicates that existing roads can handle current and projected traffic volumes with installation of mitigation at the designated thresholds.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section G.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 200 **(Mr. Stephen L. Johnson, Queensbury and Glens Falls; written comments dated August 29, 2000):**

With respect to the proposed traffic impact and the mitigation measures such as paving, internal roads and landscaping included in the Project, Commenter states that, "with those additions proposed by the Park, traffic within the Park will likely flow easily while traffic entering or exiting on public roadways will likely be slowed because existing roads were designed for, and previously carried, only easily accommodated local traffic."

RESPONSE 200

See Response 47. The Applicant believes, and the data supports, that the on and off site mitigation measures proposed will reduce delays to through-traffic on Routes 9 and I-87 due to Park-related traffic. Traffic impact computer modeling of projected traffic as required and reviewed by NY DOT appears to confirm that levels of service on existing roads will remain the same or improve as a result of the proposed traffic mitigation.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section G.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 201 (Mr. Stephen L. Johnson, Queensbury and Glens Falls; written comments dated August 29, 2000):

With respect to the proposed traffic impact and the mitigation measures such as paving, internal roads and landscaping included in the Project, Commenter states that, "Direct access from I87 would reduce local income, yet increase local traffic safety. Have these factors been considered?"

RESPONSE 201

Direct access from I-87 was considered and evaluated in the Alternatives section of the Traffic Impact Study. For reasons described in the study, in particular, that the addition of a new interchange between I-87 Exits 19 and 20 does not conform to Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) interchange separation standards and therefore is unlikely to receive the required FHWA-US DOT approval, this alternative was deemed not feasible and unworthy of further consideration.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter IV, Section A.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 202 **(Mr. Stephen L. Johnson, Queensbury and Glens Falls; written comments dated August 29, 2000):**

With respect to the DGEIS' conclusion that the proposed tertiary sewage treatment plant will meet the State's most stringent standards, Commenter states that, "Park plans seem to effectively mitigate potential problems associated with sewage treatment. Additionally, the Glen Lake fen, or natural wetlands surrounding the Park and upland from Glen Lake, provides an historically effective natural Stabilization Basin. This approximately 10 million square foot basin between the Park and Glen Lake extends across Route 9 and Interstate 87 to include over 4 million more square feet. Discharging treated waste as far as possible from the Great Escape and Glen Lake would seemingly ensure that water entering Glen Lake becomes, first pathogen free and sterile through Great Escape's proposed excellent treatment facility, and then reconstituted while percolating through up to 14 million square feet of wetland before entering Glen Lake."

RESPONSE 202

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 203 **(Mr. Stephen L. Johnson, Queensbury and Glens Falls; written comments dated August 29, 2000):**

Commenter states that, "I heard little mention of tie into existing municipal sewer system. Could this be done with flow meters to assess proportional costs?"

RESPONSE 203

Refer to DGEIS Section 7.4, Alternative 5. See also, Responses 98, 175 and 435. Any public sewer system would almost certainly seek to assess user charges (such as to recover operation and maintenance costs) on the basis of the users' flow, at least to some extent, such as is done by the Queensbury – Quaker Road district where water meter readings are used as the proxy for estimating sewer flows used in assessing one component of sewer charges.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 204 **(Mr. Stephen L. Johnson, Queensbury and Glens Falls; written comments dated August 29, 2000):**

With respect to the DGEIS' conclusion that there will be no significant visual impact, Commenter states that, "Rides with elevations above existing hills appear to allow clear sight of those rides from most of Glen Lake surface and those shoreline sections directly across the lake. Were sight line contour maps prepared?"

RESPONSE 204

FGEIS Section 4.3, "Visual Analysis 2000-2001," describes the methodology utilized in the visual impact analysis. The Fall 2000 study augments the March 2000 study, and concludes that tall rides sited in the area defined for such development will not be substantially visible from Glen Lake or its shoreline, the Glens Falls Country Club or the Bike Trail.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 205 **(Mr. Stephen L. Johnson, Queensbury and Glens Falls; written comments dated August 29, 2000):**

With respect to the DGEIS' conclusion that there will be no "significant audible noise," Commenter states that, "The wording here, 'no significant audible noise' suggests some audible sound. Determining whether this sound is noise or significant noise requires concerted opinion from those who hear those sounds. Evaluating 'audible noise' level significance involves many factors. Measuring noise levels at times and locations identified by the public and then ensuring that sound levels never rise above those measured levels would seem one method of cooperative agreement." Commenter then asks, "What methods determine community judgments about 'audibility', 'noise', and the modifying term 'significant'?"

RESPONSE 205

Refer to Responses 3, 6, 7, and 205.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 206 **(Mr. Stephen L. Johnson, Queensbury and Glens Falls; written comments dated August 29, 2000):**

Commenter claims that the currently valuation of all of Glen Lake property is $45 million while Great Escape property is valued at $17.2 million, "The difference in current valuations between the Park and Glen Lake property will remain preponderantly weighted toward Glen Lake property owners. Additional rides add greatly to Traffic, Noise, Visual Impacts, and increased attendance creates more Waste Water for disposal. Because the Park activity creates these Public needs, both within and outside the Private Park, how much cost should the Public bear?"

RESPONSE 206

The Applicant believes that the DGEIS establishes that the economic benefits of the Project far exceed the minor and incremental costs of providing additional public services. Any increased public costs for wastewater disposal will be borne by the Park rather than the general public. The purpose of the GEIS is to identify environmental impacts due to the park and to detail appropriate mitigation measures for each of the resources identified, with such measures to be paid for by the Applicant.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 207 **(Mr. Stephen L. Johnson, Queensbury and Glens Falls; written comments dated August 29, 2000):**

With respect to statements in the DGEIS where applicant uses language such as 'conform to existing,' 'function at the same or improved levels,' 'levels will remain consistent,' and 'meets standards,' Commenter states that, "These qualitative statements require explicit unbiased measures of:

1. Local traffic; travel speed, travel convenience, and travel safety.
2. Water quality entering Glen Lake at its upstream inlet.
3. Resident opinion about Park visibility and or visibility changes.
4. Sounds and/or ratings of sounds emanating from the Park by people within ranges of audibility."

RESPONSE 207

The qualitative statements in the DGEIS are conclusions based on detailed technical analysis of local traffic operations within the study area. The improvements recommended in the Traffic Impact Study will improve the convenience of travel through the study area. Traffic control (e.g. signals) and geometry at the intersections within the Route 9 corridor largely influence travel safety and travel speed. The proposed improvements will meet all applicable design standards to promote safe and efficient travel through the study area.

With respect to water quality, modeling of wastewater and stormwater mitigation proposals demonstrates quantitatively that water quality levels will be maintained or improved. The Planning Board intends to require monitoring of Glen Lake water quality to determine if impacts are occurring from the Great Escape.

With respect to visibility and noise, qualitative statements are based on monitoring or simulations using accepted assessment criteria rather than the opinions of some residents. The Planning Board believes that this is the most unbiased and appropriate way of considering these impacts.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section G.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 208 **(Mr. Erwin and Ms. Virginia Funk, 17 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; written comments dated August 29, 2000):**

Commenters have been residents of Twicwood for 27 years and state that, "for most of those years, this was an oasis in the middle of chaos, when you came up the Twicwood hill, you were in another world, one of beauty and quiet." Commenters then state that, "the change started creeping in several years ago, none of which we created...it meant level the land, cut down the trees!" Commenters believe that "with the removal of the trees and buffers, noise became an issue" when two years ago the Alpine Bobsled was introduced at the Park.

RESPONSE 208

The audibility of the Alpine Boblsed has to do with its own peculiar sound generating characteristics as discussed in DGEIS Appendix 7 and FGEIS Section 4.1. The sound measurements taken over the last 11 years do not show significant increases in sound levels, which would indicate that vegetation cutting and other activities associated with the Great Escape have bot, with the exception of the Bobsled, significantly affected the noise environment.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 209 **(Mr. Erwin and Ms. Virginia Funk, 17 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; written comments dated August 29, 2000):**

Commenters state that, "Sound studies portrayed in the DGEIS are flawed! The methods, the timing, the conclusions are all wrong. The main source of the noise, the bobsled, was not running."

RESPONSE 209

See Section FGEIS 4.1, "Sound Studies". The Bobsled was operating on September 6, 1999, and on October 30, 1999.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 210 **(Mr. Erwin and Ms. Virginia Funk, 17 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; written comments dated August 29, 2000):**

Commenters state that, "While the Bobsled is an issue now, the future may bring many more problems with similar rides. We want them solved before they became part of the Park. Another problem with the Great Escape has been concerts. Again, our good neighbor has subjected us to loud music (?) at nighttime hours. What are the rules concerning concerts? Concerts were never a part of the previous Great Escape!"

RESPONSE 210

See Response 532.

DGEIS Reference: See page 4-23.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 211 **(Mr. Erwin and Ms. Virginia Funk, 17 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; written comments dated August 29, 2000):**

Commenters ask, "Why focus only on sound levels? What about nuisances? Why doesn't Queensbury use the wisdom of Glens Falls and establish nuisance laws to eliminate nuisance noises from Great Escape. Does the impact statement address low level, rhythmic nuisance noises [such as Commenters claim are produced by the Bobsled]?"

RESPONSE 211

The Town Board is considering enacting a noise ordinance.

Also, refer to Response 3 and 37.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 212 **(Ms. Karen C. Angleson, 1 Greenwood Lane, Queensbury; written comments dated August 29, 2000):**

Commenter, questioning the DGEIS' conclusion that there is no causal relationship between audible noise and Park visitor attendance levels, states that, "on page 4-23 the [DGEIS] states that the 1990 sound levels at the monitoring sites have remained unchanged over the past 10 years, despite increased attendance and the addition of rides and attractions. Table 3-9 states there are an increase of 8.2 dB in Courthouse Estates and 5.7 dB in Twicwood."

RESPONSE 212

The comparison noted above looks at two specific peak measurements during the 1990 and 1999 tests. These are instantaneous peaks which can be due to any number of specific sound events such as cars, or trucks passing nearby or airplanes overhead. It is necessary to examine the entire data sets including averages, and Lgo or Leq to get the accurate representation of normal ambient sound levels at the receptor monitoring locations. Examining all the data in 1990, the arithmetic average is 47 dBA and in 1999 is 48.5 dBA at Twicwood. At Courthouse Estates, the 1990 average was 50.2 dBA, and in 1999 it was 52 dBA. As a rule, there must be a 3 dBA change in sound in order to be perceivable. Recent work by the Town (Chazen Consultants, Appendix 4.2) in both Twicwood and Courthouse states similar sound levels were measured during their survey work. The changes are below this threshold, therefore on the average, sound levels have not significantly changed in the three neighborhoods studied.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 213 **(Ms. Donna M. Harubin, 11 Nacy Drive, Lake George; written comments dated August 30, 2000):**

Commenter, a 30 year resident of Queensbury who lives on Glen Lake, states that, "over the years we've made many trips to Storytown/ Great Escape" and claims that she was disappointed on her visit in August of 1999 with the "disrepair and neglect that has taken place since Mr. Woods owned the Park....grounds were unkept...weeds growing everywhere...you could smell sewage...the waters were murky with papers...bottles and trash thrown in them...garbage stench coming from the restaurants....trash thrown behind buildings..." Commenter then states that, "In closing I feel if Six Flags can't care for their park, how are they going to care about the environment or people who live in the area!"

RESPONSE 213

Comment noted. The Applicant has indicated it takes great pride in the way its Park looks and operates. The Park is spending double what it spent five years ago on the upkeep of the Park. Facility upgrades are a year-around project. The Applicant states that if any guest ever expresses a concern about our Park, it is addressed immediatly.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 214 (Mr. Kevin Dineen, Queensbury; written comments dated August 30, 2000):

Commenter, a professional hockey player, expanded on his oral comments that the improvements associated with the Project will not improve the theme Park experience but that the Project simply reflects the wishes of "big business" and "big money," by stating that, "Great Escape attorneys also told me the lack of expansion could seriously affect the viability of the Park. I have seen this ploy with professional sports franchises, give us what we want or we may move. It works every time, tax breaks for the team to stay, a new stadium, anything so cities don't lose that revenue."

RESPONSE 214

The practical experience of many Commenters to the EIS is consistent with applicant's view that if needed investments are not made to maintain and improve a business which depends on public patronage, that business will generally decline. See e.g., in particular Responses 91 and 94-95.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 215 **(Ms. Carol E. Eppich, 480 Corinth Road, Queensbury; written comments dated August 30, 2000):**

Commenter, who resides on Corinth Road in West Glens Falls, notes that only the residents from the immediate neighborhoods surrounding the Park speak at Planning Board Meetings where Great Escape is on the agenda repeating the same complaints over and over and that "probably no one from North or South Queensbury" was present at the public hearing held August 29, 2000. Commenter states that many other residents of the Town enjoy the economic and fiscal benefits from the Park and further states that, "people in the areas surrounding the Park have some legitimate concerns...but the history of business on the Route 9 corridor is that of amusements, lodging, and retail services, which thankfully are growing."

RESPONSE 215

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 216 **(Ms. Carol E. Eppich, 480 Corinth Road, Queensbury; written comments dated August 30, 2000):**

Commenter questions whether noise problems complained of by Commenters in neighborhoods near the Park are attributable to residential development itself asserting that, "many trees were removed and not that many were replanted."

RESPONSE 216

See Responses 212 and 6, which suggest that noise levels in the residential neighborhoods has not significantly changed, and that vegetation or its removal does not significantly affect sound propagation from adjacent areas.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 217 **(Ms. Carol E. Eppich, 480 Corinth Road, Queensbury; written comments dated August 30, 2000):**

Commenter is enthusiastic about the Park's plans for expansion, stating, "Go-For-It-Great Escape, do the best you can to excite your visitors, pour more money into our area and we hope you will gain world-wide recognition!"

RESPONSE 217

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 218 **(Mr. E. Peter Marshall, 6 Whippoorwill, Queensbury; written comments dated August 30, 2000):**

Commenter is a "strong supporter of this operation and thankful they [the Great Escape] are here willing to expand and invest millions of dollars in our local economy....We are living in somewhat a depressed geographical region and recent newspaper articles confirm this; just last week our per-capita income was reported on being with the lowest of the national compilation of per capita income. The Great Escape is willing to invest in real estate that will increase real estate tax revenue, payrolls that will be higher and probably for a longer season spread, increased sales tax revenue, nontoxic land uses, services that cost the public little or nothing & I am sure many other benefits that we the Town & County residents will benefit from (more business for other businesses, etc.). This is also (their expansion & building activity) complimentary to the Village and Town of Lake George's 'Exhibition Building' plans. We should work in unison with our neighbors for economic and other mutual growth & development."

RESPONSE 218

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 219 **(Mr. E. Peter Marshall, 6 Whippoorwill, Queensbury; written comments dated August 30, 2000):**

Commenter states, "As for our residential neighborhoods, we need growth in our Town & County to help ease the tax burdens of providing first class municipal services and educational needs. The neighborhoods will see their homes increase in resale market value; my in-laws built two homes in Twicwood and were easily able to sell each at a profit."

Commenter also adds that, "I do believe the [Great Escape] should work close with the Town & its neighbors and think they appear to be doing so. I also favor a main sewer line for businesses on Route 9 pass the Municipal Center to Route 149. I do not think that the [Great Escape] should build their own sewer/waste treatment plant. Hopefully, [Great Escape] and the Town will not be discouraged by those who express opposition. However, those are usually the only ones you hear from."

RESPONSE 219

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 220 **(Douglas M. Petroski, M.D., 49 Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; written comments dated August 31, 2000):**

Commenter states that, "Several issues are of concern to me referable to the expansion plan of the Great Escape as described in their environmental impact statement. In my opinion, the sound analysis was flawed and skewed in the favor of the developers. It was my understanding the Bobsled was not running and at other occasions the Park was closed when these measurements were taken. I can hear the Bobsled, roller coasters and the amplified and un-amplified voices of persons in the Park from my residence on Fitzgerald Road which is one and one-half miles away."

RESPONSE 220

See Responses 205 and 209.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 221 **(Douglas M. Petroski, M.D., 49 Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; written comments dated August 31, 2000):**

Commenter states that, "The [DGEIS] did not mention proposed hours of operation. The sounds emanating from the Park have been a greater source of disturbance to me, to my family and my neighbors since the hours of operation have been increased."

RESPONSE 221

The DGEIS impact analysis assumes that hours of general operation will remain the same as at present, with the peak season closing time being 10 p.m. on weekend evenings only. As noted in Response 32, late evening operations occur less than 30 days per year and the lengthening of hours outside of peak season is unlikely.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 222 **(Douglas M. Petroski, M.D., 49 Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; written comments dated August 31, 2000):**

Commenter states that, "I am concerned about the removal of hillsides and trees by the Samoset and also by the former zoo which in my opinion will increase sound transmission from the Park and from the Northway. No study of this issue was mentioned."

RESPONSE 222

The DGEIS noise study concludes that the proposed grading and vegetation removal associated with the Project will not significantly change noise transmission from the Northway affecting nearby residential subdivisions.

DGEIS Reference: See Section 4 pages 21-22 and Cross Section 4-2A, B, C.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 223 **(Douglas M. Petroski, M.D., 49 Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; written comments dated August 31, 2000):**

Commenter states that, "The [DGEIS] did not address festival parking."

RESPONSE 223

The "festival parking" parking lot design as proposed was addressed in the DGEIS from the Applicant's perspective of why this design would be most efficient and also environmentally least disruptive.

Festival parking was proposed by the Applicant to mitigate traffic impacts, and minimize land required for parking. If conventional retail style parking lots designs were utilized, an additional 20 acres of land would be required to accommodate the level of proposed parking provided for by the Project. See Response 40 for a discussion of the considerations that will be taken into account by the Planning Board in its Findings with respect to festival parking.

DGEIS Reference: See page 2-1-3.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 224 **(Douglas M. Petroski, M.D., 49 Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; written comments dated August 31, 2000):**

Commenter states that he "would disagree with the conclusion that traffic on local collector roads will be increased negligibly as they report [in the DGEIS]. If the Park guests do not use these roads, certainly the 2300 proposed employees will use them to commute to and from their jobs. These roads which I travel on a daily basis are already quite congested during hours of Park operation."

RESPONSE 224

See Response 14 and 16.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section I.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 225 **(Douglas M. Petroski, M.D., 49 Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; written comments dated August 31, 2000):**

Commenter states that he has "concerns about the detrimental effects on the Glen Lake water shed [sic] as the result of constructing a large sewer treatment facility near the Glen Lake fen."

RESPONSE 225

See Responses 198 and 160 and the "alternatives" discussion in the DGEIS at Section 7.4.

The on-site Sewage treatment plant will reduce nutrient loadings to the soil and to the Glen Lake Fen. Typical septic tank effluent has a range of values between 12-14 mgle of phosphorus while the proposed sewage treatment plant will reduce content of phosphorus to 0.20 mgle. The sewage treatment plant will reduce instantaneous phosphorus loading to the soils by approximately 6,000%.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 226 **(Douglas M. Petroski, M.D., 49 Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; written comments dated August 31, 2000):**

Commenter states, "I am concerned that 90 percent of Glen Lake residents will see a 200 foot tall roller coaster from their highly taxed lake front residences. 100 percent of Glen Lake residents and visitors will view this tower while boating."

RESPONSE 226

Tall rides placed as proposed in this FGEIS will not be substantially visible from Glen Lake or its shoreline. Refer to FGEIS Section 4.3, "Visual Analysis 2000-2001." It should also be noted that Glen Lake residences may view similar tall structures such as two radio communications towers in a similar mid-far-range view which does not continue to be a massive visual intrusion once viewers adapt to any change in the built landscape.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 227 **(Douglas M. Petroski, M.D., 49 Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; written comments dated August 31, 2000):**

Commenter believes that, "these changes should not be allowed. Lake front residents already pay a higher property tax than they would for a comparable residence not located on a lake front. The tax structure would have to be amended if these changes were allowed to fairly reflect the diminution in all of our property values."

RESPONSE 227

The data in Section 4.7 of this FGEIS does not support the assumptions that the proposed Project will cause significant adverse impacts to Glen Lake residents, and that Glen Lake property values will be diminished because of the Park's existence or expansion.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 228 (Ms. Patricia A. Davison; written comments dated August 31, 2000):

Commenter, a full-time resident of Western New York who last winter bought a single family "camp" style home on the north side of Glen Lake, states that the applicant's "proposed increase in attendance and development will have negligible impact on the surround environment is absurd."

RESPONSE 228

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 229 **(Ms. Patricia A. Davison; written comments dated August 31, 2000):**

Commenter, who purchased a vacation home on Glen Lake last winter, she could hear the Park in summer and was "shocked to hear from year round residents that the Great Escape was proposing to expand attendance and buildings in the area that makes up the Glen Lake watershed."

RESPONSE 229

Sound levels on Glen Lake were measured during the Summer 2000 both at the location that has been monitored since 1990 and on the lake surface itself at the Ash Road location.

Additional sampling completed in 2000 demonstrated that the sound environment at Glen Lake is consistent. Glen Lake west Leq was 51 while Glen Lake Northwest was 46-55 Leq. The long term Leq 48.7 between 1990-1999 sampling from the Glen Lake site on Birdsal Road. This indicates that Glen Lake Birdsal Road is representative of the sound levels on Glen Lake. The inventory completed in 2000 included numerous other location along with the two sites on Glen Lake. The Leq (sound level 90% of the time) in each of the communities was measured in 1999 while the Bobsled was and was not operating.

	Bobsled operating	Bobsled not operating
Glen Lake West	42	NA
Glen Lake Northwest	39-45	40-44
Bay Bridge	46	42-47
Glen Lake Country Club	54 (windy day)	44-45
Indian Hills	45	39
Leland Estates	46	40
Twicwood	50	47

The data indicates that the Glen Lake community is not usually impacted by sounds from the Great Escape.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 230 (Ms. Patricia A. Davison; written comments dated August 31, 2000):

Commenter states that it is "inconceivable to me in this day and age that a town the size of Queensbury would not have invested in the infrastructure and zoning ordinances to protect a beautiful lake such as Glen Lake."

RESPONSE 230

Land uses and densities near Glen Lake are regulated by the Town of Queensbury Zoning Ordinance. If by "infrastructure", Commenter is referring to a public sewer system to serve Glen Lake residents, it has never been established that such a collection system would be economically feasible, and in the instance of public sewer, it is not the "Town" which decides to invest in such infrastructure but rather those homeowners who would have to agree to pay proposed sewer rates. With annual sewer rates in the typical $2,000 - $2,500 range for rural lakeside systems, it is far from clear that Glen Lake residents would support a public sewer system. In any event, placing a sewer around Glen Lake is not a component of this project.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 231 (Ms. Patricia A. Davison; written comments dated August 31, 2000):

Commenter claims that the DGEIS conclusion that an "increase in attendance and buildings will have a negligible impact on the surrounding area and lake is simply false" based on her familiarity with "the expansions they have had at Six Flags Darien Lake in western NY." Commenter then goes on to cite various elements of the Park at Darien Lake she dislikes, such as a "200 foot roller coaster which can be seen and heard for miles which sticks out like a sore thumb on the surrounding landscape...Darien Lake's algae covered runoff ponds and weedy lake strewn with Park garbage...the lines of car and buses spewing exhaust waiting to enter the Park."

RESPONSE 231

The comment is a statement of opinion about another amusement Park located on flat terrain in a rural area far removed from other development and population centers, which an environmental setting is quite unlike that pertaining to the Great Escape as discussed in the DGEIS. In any event, the Planning Board's task is to review the specific impacts associated with this project.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 232 (Ms. Patricia A. Davison; written comments dated August 31, 2000):

Commenter asserts that additional accidents are likely to occur on Route 9 due to "the additional traffic generated by people picking up and dropping off kids to avoid the parking fee" that Great Escape will charge.

RESPONSE 232

Currently, there are more vehicles on the east side of Route 9 than proposed for the reconfigured entrance area in the Project, and potential vehicle/pedestrian conflicts exist near the front gate as a result of drivers discharging and picking up passengers. The pedestrian and vehicular safety will be improved with the proposed plan. An area will be designated for drop off and pick-up on the west side of Route 9, near the southern end of the access road at the new Martha's parking lot. Drivers will enter the southern access road across from Round Pond Road, and be directed to a shuttle stop in the Maroon parking lot. Drivers will not pass through the tollbooth and will exit at the signal-controlled intersection at Round Pond Road. Pedestrians (the passengers) will then take a shuttle and use the pedestrian bridge to cross over Route 9 to the front gate.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 233 (Ms. Patricia A. Davison; written comments dated August 31, 2000):

Commenter objects to applicant's proposal to "build[] its own private (prone to failure) water treatment system right on the edge of the Glen Lake wetlands. Excuse me – I may be naïve – but isn't the town supposed to be supplying access to these services for the good of the entire community and to ensure the plant is run correctly and within code?"

RESPONSE 233

It is not necessarily correct to assume that municipally-owned facilities are operated any better than privately-owned facilities. Both are required to meet the same high standards as regulated by the NYSDEC and both facilities go through the same review process for design and construction. The Glens Falls facility recently contracted out for its operation service and so both facilities will be operated by private industry. In New York there are both types of ownership of wastewater facilities, municipal districts and private sewer corporations. If facilities existed, The Great Escape's preference would be to discharge into a municipal sewer main and has been working to that end but it will likely take several more years of further planning and engineering effort and governmental approvals before a public sewer can actually be available at the Park, if indeed this is to happen. In the near-term, therefore as a parallel track, the Park desires to go ahead with the on-site facility design. Refer to DGEIS Section 7.4, Alternative 5.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 234 (Ms. Patricia A. Davison; written comments dated August 31, 2000):

Commenter states that, "Simply put – as an outsider I can tell you the overly ambitious plans of the Great Escape on the limited real estate it has available will destroy Glen Lake, surrounding neighborhoods and ultimately the quality of life in the residential community of Queensbury. Six Flags appears to be pursuing a one size fits all Park strategy and the 'improvements' they have installed at Darien Lake simply will not fit at the Great Escape. I'm guessing that Six Flags Darien Lake (between camping, the Park and the resort) is at least 10 times the size of usable Great Escape lands."

RESPONSE 234

Comment noted. The applicant believes that the Great Escape site can confortably accommodate existing and proposed development with an adequate buffer between the Park and surrounding land uses. A hotel similar to Darien Lakes is the only similar facility at Darien Lakes which is being proposed at the Great Escape. On-site campgrounds, a SPAC-sized concert amphitheater and other elements of the Darien Lakes resort are not being proposed as part of the Great Escape Project.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 235 (Ms. Patricia A. Davison; written comments dated August 31, 2000):

Commenter states, "Again, as a new Glen Lake homeowner it is inconceivable that so little has been done in Queensbury to protect the Glen Lake watershed. Western NY would love to have a Glen Lake to protect! I urge you to reject the...proposed expansions as inappropriate for the beautiful area that is (was) Queensbury. The Northeast already has too many Six Flags Darien Lakes and Six Flags New Jerseys – that's why us out of towners come up to Lake George. I urge you not to throw away beautiful Glen Lake to a profit hungry out of town corporation which will do anything and everything to enhance its bottom line."

RESPONSE 235

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 236 **(Mr. Stuart Mesinger, The Chazen Companies; written comments dated September 1, 2000):**

Commenter, the Town of Queensbury's consultant, presented his thoughts regarding the extension of the comment period, "Where comment periods are extended, such extensions rarely exceed 30 days. If such an extension were granted in this case, a total comment period of 2 ½ months will have been provided, which in my judgment is more than adequate time to review this impact statement."

RESPONSE 236

The comment period ultimately provided was extended per the suggestion of Commenter and others. The comment period was in fact extended 47 days (greater than the 30 days extension mentioned by Commenter as being "rarely exceeded"). The total comment period was 91 days, several times SEQR's minimum 30 day review period.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 237 **(Ms. Sharon Nicpon, 16 Heresford Lane, Queensbury; written comments dated September 4, 2000):**

Commenter states that, "a 600 page study should not be allowed to replace pure common sense and overshadow the reality of the expansion would do to the Town of Queensbury. Building new entrances and pedestrian bridges will not solve the problem of the influx of thousands of people to the area. There will be more traffic on ALL of our area roads, more noise and pollution not to mention additional strain on medical professionals called upon for medical emergencies created by more people in an already crowded area. I have experienced all of this in other "amusement park towns." Do not let Queensbury become another Orlando!"

RESPONSE 237

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 238 **(Ms. Sharon Nicpon, 16 Heresford Lane, Queensbury; written comments dated September 4, 2000):**

Commenter states, "My family visited the Great Escape early in the season and it was a disappointment. The Park has become shabby looking and many of the rides were closed....If the owners of The Great Escape can't keep up what they have now, how will the[y] run an even larger park??!! The Great Escape is becoming a large noisy eyesore and I truly sympathize with the surrounding neighborhoods."

RESPONSE 238

Comment noted.

The Applicant noted that the Park takes great pride in the way it looks and spends millions of dollars each year to maintain it. It tries to have all rides open every time a guest visits, but for various reasons may have an attraction down. Any attraction not open for the day is posted on the main gate so that guests will not be inconvenienced.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 239 (Mr. Mark Prendeville, Ash Drive, Glen Lake; written comments dated September 5, 2000):

Commenter claims that, "the ecosystem in the Glen Lake watershed has declined in the last 35 years I have traveled in it," and further states that he is "against a paved parking lot area anywhere near the watershed that feeds into Glen Lake."

RESPONSE 239

See Responses 196, 181, 146 and 131.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 240 **(Mr. Mark Prendeville, Ash Drive, Glen Lake; written comments dated September 5, 2000):**

Commenter states, "I am against a sewer treatment plant on site. Great Escape should be required to hook up to the municipal sewer line. Run it up from Gambles. Glen Lake water quality is a fragile ecosystem that does not need any additional phosphate loading."

RESPONSE 240

See Responses 233, 196, 181, 146, 131, 64.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 241 **(Mr. Mark Prendeville, Ash Drive, Glen Lake; written comments dated September 5, 2000):**

Commenter states that, "A light should be placed at the entrance to Glen Lake road to make exit from that road going south possible during the summer season."

RESPONSE 241

See Response 135. A traffic light is proposed at Glen Lake Road.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 242 **(Mr. Mark Prendeville, Ash Drive, Glen Lake; written comments dated September 5, 2000):**

Commenter states, "Great Escape currently has a drain valve located on their flume ride that dumps chlorinated water down the hill into the Glen Lake watershed. Control is located on the side of the holding pond in back of Ghost town. When holding pond is filled it sometimes overflows down hill into watershed."

RESPONSE 242

Data indicates that the wetland is healthy performing as any healthy wetland performs buffering run off, reducing nutrients and organic loads etc... The pool water discharge is dechlorinated through holding and evaporation for 4-5 days and is recharged to groundwater at a number of locations as uncontaminated potable water which does not need to be treated in the Park's permitted septic system.

Annually the closing of the water Park requires that the facility is empty of all the disinfected water. The process that has been followed is to allow the chlorine to naturally degrade and dissipate up to a week until it reaches undetectable levels. At this point the water is recharged into the local watershed at a number of locations. The process to empty the water Park takes approximately 10 days.

As to the holding tank overflow, it is a minor accidental discharge and if the water contains chlorine disinfectant it will be rapidly absorbed into the soil, therefore impact on the Lake is very minor.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 243 **(Mr. Mark Prendeville, Ash Drive, Glen Lake; written comments dated September 5, 2000):**

Commenter asks, "There is a dam at the end of Jungle Land in the Park where Great Escape controls the level of water flowing past. Do they have the necessary permits from DEC for that."

RESPONSE 243

The referenced structure is a wier and it is too low and holds back insufficient water to be regulated under DEC rules as a dam. DEC regulations exist to prevent downstream users from flood hazard if a dam is potentially unsafe and could be breached. In order to be considered a dam, a structure must be ten feet tall and/or hold 1,000,000+ gallons of water.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 244 **(Mr. Robert C. Westcott, D.D.S., 84 Glenwood Avenue, Queensbury; written comments dated September 5, 2000):**

Commenter, a member of the Glens Falls Country Club, writes in opposition to the proposed expansion and believes that "the expansion would have a disasterous[sic] effect on the town." Commenter states that, "the proposed roller coaster, rising to a height of 200 feet, would be one of the highest structures north of Albany. It would be a constant disturbance to the Glens Falls Country Club as it would be highly visible and audible as it rises above the tree line."

RESPONSE 244

As noted in FGEIS Section 4.3, "Visual Analysis 2000-2001," tall rides placed as shown within a defined area of the Park already developed with rides and attractions, will not be substantially visible from the Glens Falls Country Club.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 245 (Mr. Robert C. Westcott, D.D.S., 84 Glenwood Avenue, Queensbury; written comments dated September 5, 2000):

Commenter asks, "What is the elevation of the land at the site of the proposed new roller coaster relative to the elevation of its neighbors? It appears that it would be higher and, therefore, would add additional height to the structure."

RESPONSE 245

Location #2 which was described in the March 2000 study is relatively higher in elevation. FGEIS Section 4.3, "Visual Analysis 2000-2001," augments the March 2000 study by analyzing a range of potential ride heights in different positions within the Park. The Fall 2000 study concludes with a defined area within the developed portion of the Park that is believed to be compatible with the Park and its environs in their existing aesthetic context for development of tall rides. If placed in these locations such tall rides will not be substantially visible from Glen Lake, the Glens Falls Country Club or the Bike Trail.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 246 **(Mr. Robert C. Westcott, D.D.S., 84 Glenwood Avenue, Queensbury; written comments dated September 5, 2000):**

Commenter asks, "how much of the structure would be visible from the Country Club and other adjoining venues." Commenter further suggests that, "one way to be sure would be to launch a surveyors balloon tethered to a 200 foot rope so that all concerned parties cold see for themselves what the visual impact would be. This technique has been used before in Queensbury."

RESPONSE 246

The original March, 2000 visual impact study in the DGEIS used balloons. FGEIS Section 4.3, "Visual Analysis 2000-2001," describes the work conducted to augment the March 2000 study. The study also relies on field analysis of several large (4 foot diameter) balloons flown at known heights and various known locations in order to define an area within the Park that is suitable for development of tall rides. Many photographs are provided so that the reader can follow the progression and reasoning of the study to see how the visual threshold area is derived. It is the conclusion of the study that a ride developed in the defined area will not be substantially visible from the Country Club, the Warren County Bike Trail or Glen Lake.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 247 **(Mr. Robert C. Westcott, D.D.S., 84 Glenwood Avenue, Queensbury; written comments dated September 5, 2000):**

Referring to the proposed 200 foot ride, Commenter asks, "is there a site on The Great Escape campus that would conceal the coaster from its neighbors?"

RESPONSE 247

Yes, there is an area of the Park suitable for development of tall rides which substantially eliminates potential views from virtually all residences near the Park. Refer to FGEIS Section 4.3, "Visual Analysis 2000-2001," which augments the March 2000 study and defines the area suitable for development of tall rides.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 248 **(Mr. Robert C. Westcott, D.D.S., 84 Glenwood Avenue, Queensbury; written comments dated September 5, 2000):**

Commenter asks, "Does the [Planning] Board wish to 'preserve the rural nature of the town' as we have been told in the past?"

RESPONSE 248

The Planning Board has authority to regulate land uses in accordance with the local zoning. The proposal by the Great Escape is in compliance with the local zoning. The property has been the site of an amusement Park since 1955 and has vested rights to continue that particular use, in addition to being within a RC-15 district which is expressly intended to allow and foster the existing and proposed amusement Park uses. The Planning Board has the responsibility to balance the relative impacts of the proposed project as it relates to local zoning and community impacts, and the balancing of such impacts is a central purpose of this SEQRA process. The master plan and local zoning both clearly state that the amusement Park is compatible with adjacent land uses. The proposed area to be redeveloped includes two motels, an amusement Park, and two private residences all within 300-500' of the I-87 Northway.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 249 **(Mr. Kenneth C. Hopper, M.D.; written comments dated September 6, 2000):**

Commenter is "convinced that this is an environmental disaster for Queensbury. Recognizing a positive economic impact I wish to express my opposition to expansion. This is based on its environmental impact, the noise pollution, the additional traffic congestion, and the ridiculous addition of a twenty story roller coaster, which would certainly be widely visible and a detraction from its environment."

RESPONSE 249

Comment noted.

Refer to FGEIS Section 4.3, "Visual Analysis 2000-2001," which defines an area of the Park for siting tall rides that is believed to be compatible with the existing context of the Park and the surrounding area, with the Town Zoning Ordinance, and the goals of the Project sponsor.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 250 **(Mr. James P. Merrigan, Ph.D., Psychological Associates, P.C., 551 Bay Road, Queensbury; written comments dated September 6, 2000):**

Commenter, who owns an office building at 551 Bay Road, and resides on Seelye Road in Cleverdale, opposes the current expansion plans citing "(1) Glen Lake, both the residential community and concern about storm water runoff'", "(2) The effect of noise pollution and congestion on the three residential neighborhoods that border the Park", and "(3) Because the Town of Queensbury should maintain its integrity as a residential area and not allow developers like the Great Escape to redefine the town by creating a Six Flags type mega-theme Park."

RESPONSE 250

See DGEIS pages 4-28-34 for a discussion of stormwater, and pages 4-20-23 for a discussion of noise.

The zoning of the property allows all the proposed uses. The Town Zoning Ordinance Section 179.21.B states that the amusement Park and residential uses are compatible.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 251 **(Ms. Virginia Etu, 42 Nacy Road, Lake George; written comments dated September 9, 2000):**

Commenter believes, "traffic will be a problem on secondary roads, such as the Glen Lake Road and Round Pond Road. We, who live on these roads and those which connect, have already become burdened by the current Park traffic. It is nearly impossible to enter Route 9 from the Glen Lake Road now, (or vice versa) and for this road and others to be addressed so minimally in the EIS clearly shows a flaw in the traffic study." Commenter then asks, "won't the increase in attendance and the proposed traffic light configurations add more cars to these roads, as local residents try to avoid Park patronage?" Commenter doubts DGEIS' conclusion that the proposed mitigation measures will result in levels of service that are either the same or improved stating that currently exist, "currently there exists a problem. There is no evidence to support those proposed mitigation measures will result in improved levels. One point five million people in 136 days on a 1-mile stretch of road will certainly not improve levels of service, no matter what is proposed."

RESPONSE 251

See Responses 17 and 135. A traffic light is proposed at Glen Lake Road to facilitate turning onto or off of Route 9. The proposed access road will remove Great Escape traffic from Route 9 earlier and the improved parking lots will allow patrons to enter the site more quickly thereby reducing the impact that queues of vehicles currently have on Route 9. It is not expected that the proposed traffic light will add more cars to the local roads. The Level of Service analyses summarized in Chapter III of the Traffic Impact Study provide evidence that the proposed mitigation measures will result in similar or improved operating conditions on Route 9 and its intersections with other roads in the Study Area. The NYSDOT and the Lead Agency's environmental consultant have agreed with these conclusions.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section G.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 252 **(Ms. Virginia Etu, 42 Nacy Road, Lake George; written comments dated September 9, 2000):**

Commenter disagrees with the DGEIS' conclusion that there will be no significant impact to audible noise and further claims that she does not believe that "noise reduction will be a priority for the Park or the Town." Commenter claims that "it will eventually become a 'live with it' mentality," as Commenter asserts happened with respect to neighbor complaints regarding the Alpine Bobsled.

RESPONSE 252

Comment noted. See Response 130.

DGEIS Reference: See pages 3-34-45, 4-20-23 of the DGEIS.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 253 **(Ms. Virginia Etu, 42 Nacy Road, Lake George; written comments dated September 9, 2000):**

Commenter questions the location of the Glen Lake sound monitoring station and the DGEIS' characterization on Page 3-22 of the Glen Lake neighborhood as "six or seven homes located along the southwesterly portion of Glen Lake" and asks, "is this a purposeful attempt to minimize the Glen Lake Neighborhood in the DGEIS? The Glen Lake community is over 300 households. Any description or studies performed should include all riparian landowners."

RESPONSE 253

The Planning Board agrees and is aware that the Glen lake neighborhood consists of more than a few homes.

See Section 4.1, "2000 Sound Studies." The Glen Lake monitoring site is representative of a location 3,500 feet from the center of the Great Escape. This site was close enough to the Great Escape to allow monitoring of sound from the facility while still picking up the unique lake sounds (boats, personal watercraft) that occur at that location. The site was also a representative monitoring location because it was the part of Glen Lake closest to the Park.

The study site on Glen Lake was representative of the sound environment at the lake. Additional sound sampling was completed at Glen Lake In August 2000. The results of this work is found in Section 4.1, "2000 Sound Studies." The results from other monitoring locations on Glen Lake were consistent with the previous studies using the original Glen Lake monitoring location.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 254 **(Ms. Virginia Etu, 42 Nacy Road, Lake George; written comments dated September 9, 2000):**

Commenter believes that water quality "will be affected tremendously by the proposed Park expansion." Commenter disagrees with a statement in the DGEIS "that the groundwater will not be impacted because no grading will occur at or below the water table level because the groundwater table generally is more than 6 feet below grade is inaccurate." Commenter asserts that the water table is not in fact six feet below the parking lots because, "the land upon which the existing parking lots in area C are built was created by filled in land upon which gravel was placed over wetlands." Commenter states that applicant's engineers "should have known this and for them to formulate their conclusions without this knowledge should make all of us question the validity of their report."

RESPONSE 254

See Response 67.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 255 **(Mr. Thomas J. Mayer and Ms. Michele M. Mayer, 56 Barber Road, Queensbury; written comments dated September 10, 2000):**

Commenters are "registering our opposition to the Great Escape Environmental Impact Statement. The visual impact to Glen Lake from clear cutting and a ride visible to 90% of the lake area will destroy the Adirondack feel of Glen Lake and be a huge blot on the landscape. The removal of the tree buffer between the fen and the lake will increase the noise level from the Park and the Northway. Paving the clear cut area will increase harmful runoff [from] motor vehicles. Effluent from the proposed sewage plant will place a large strain on the buffering effect of the fen. A Six Flags style amusement Park does not belong crowded into a narrow corridor in such close proximity to residential areas. It does not fit with the image the town tries to project."

RESPONSE 255

The Town Zoning Ordinance indicates that the Great Escape Amusement Park is suitably located, as the Park lies within the Recreation/Commercial town zoning district. The Recreation/Commercial zone is intended to "isolate, protect and encourage the expansion of the recreation industry....Residential uses (seasonal included) are considered compatible with RC Zones" (per Town Zoning Ordinance Section 179.21.B).

As noted in FGEIS Section 4.3, "Visual Analysis 2000-2001," tall rides placed in the area defined for such development will not be substantially visible from Glen Lake or its shoreline, the Glens Falls Country Club or the Bike Trail.

The NYS SPDES permit program for sewage treatment plants is based on the requirement that the permitted discharge be of better quality than the receiving waters, this is to insure the improvement of the waters throughout the state of New York. This program is a statewide success as the waters across the state have improved considerably over the past two plus decades that the program has been in effect. The proposed effluent quality of the wastewater facility exceeds many of the requirements for potable water and will be of higher quality than any of the surrounding waters. Subsurface discharge is an additional design element not required by the SPDES program but put forth to insure an additional level of protection. The design of the treatment process incorporates the technology that is used in drinking water facilities to insure the integrity of the water quality. The soil conditions will be tested and the design done according to regulatory requirements for the soils. Currently all of the waste is being treated with septic tanks and the effluent is discharged to the ground with no apparent negative impact to Glen Lake as proven by the total phosphorous level in the Lake as mentioned in this comment. The Great Escape proposal is to improve the treatment of this waste with biological treatment, physical/chemical treatment and finally filtration equal to the standards established for microfiltration and then disinfection, an improvement of 4 additional levels of treatment than is currently being done. So if the current level of treatment is having no apparent impact on Glen Lake an improvement will certainly continue the no impact scenario. As stated, the soils will be tested and approved before the final design is completed.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 256 **(Mr. J. Scott Wood, President, Lake George Regional Chamber of Commerce, P.O. Box 272, Lake George; written comments dated September 11, 2000):**

Commenter provided a resolution of the Lake George Regional Chamber of Commerce Resolution Number 3-2000, which supports Great Escape's plans for expansion and urges the Planning Board to make the public aware of the Park's great benefits to Warren County that such an expansion would provide, such as promoting tourism, which Commenter describes as "the number one industry in Warren County," job creation, and improved quality of life due to the increase in employment at the Park.

RESPONSE 256

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 257 **(Mr. Richard W. Carlson, Regional Planning & Program Manager, State of New York, Department of Transportation, 84 Holland Avenue, Albany; written comments dated September 11, 2000):**

Commenter, an involved agency which must approve any plans for modifying entrances off of the state highway or modifications to or within the state highway right-of-way, states with respect to the mitigation measures and phasing of improvements, "An overall concept plan showing Route 9 from the I-87 northbound ramp intersection to Round Pond Road needs to be provided. The plan should show all traffic and pedestrian improvements by phase. It is unclear what exactly is proposed in the area of the existing access drives/traffic signals and proposed pedestrian crossing. The GEIS must demonstrate that the project sponsor has control of the land necessary to complete the transportation mitigation plan."

RESPONSE 257

Phase 1 improvements include the construction of the pedestrian bridge. Phase 2 improvements are shown on DGEIS Figure 3.31 and described in Section G of the Traffic Impact Study. Phase 2 improvements include construction of the southern end of the access road across from Round Pond Road and the installation of a traffic signal at Route 9. A detailed project description was also included in Section 2 of the DGEIS to summarize what is proposed in the area of the existing access drives/traffic signals and proposed pedestrian crossing. Gates will close off existing entry points along the west side of Route 9. It is intended that the existing driveways on the west side of Route 9 will be used only during emergencies and for maintenance/administrative access. The improvements in this area, including the pedestrian bridge, are illustrated on Figure 2-8A of the DGEIS. The existing southern access drive and traffic signal will be replaced with the new improvements described for Phase 2. Phase 3 improvements are shown on Figures 3.32, 3.33 and 3.34 of the Traffic Impact Study. The Phase 3 improvements include widening Route 9, construction of the northern end of the access road and installation of a traffic signal at Glen Lake Road. All improvements can be constructed on land owned either by the Great Escape or within the existing State Highway right-of-way.

All transportation mitigation measures are feasible and can be constructed either on land owned/controlled by Great Escape or within the State Right of Way. Any access changes for Great Escape will be subject to the typical NYSDOT review as part of the highway work permit application process.

The DGEIS Figures 2-9 and 2-10 illustrate the proposed layout of the Route 9 fencing. The Great Escape understands the need for fencing in order to discourage at grade crossing of Route 9 and force use of the pedestrian bridge. The fence will be on a landscape mound that will increase the height of the structure and make it a more imposing facility to further restrict the visibility of the entry gates east of Route 9. A fencing plan is enclosed to clarify the extent of fencing. In areas of limited visibility to the public or travelers, the fence will be chain link. It is anticipated that a fence will run from the Adirondack Coach House to Martha's as a decorative themed element, with the remaining portions fronting on Route 9 being chain link.

In the future, all the existing entry points to the existing lots on the west side of Route 9 will be gated. The Adirondack Coach House will continue to have an independent entry. At this time it is impractical to detail the entry closures, signal changes, and pavement markings since these modifications will be subject to a complex phasing plan. The final design will be subject of driveways to site plan review and DOT work permit requirements.

The only entry area issue is making provision for left turns for southbound vehicles in order to enter the drop off plaza and mobility impaired parking lot on the east side of Route 9. This can be resolved once signal timing on the north and south entries into the ring road system is determined. It is believed that adequate gaps can be created to allow for these turning movements, and all these items should be addressed during the advanced design phase and site plan review.

The Great Escape has committed to build the pedestrian crossing within two years. In order to meet that commitment it will be necessary to advance construction plans for the Route 9 corridor and north parking during the coming months during which construction phasing will be determined along with signal removal, driveway closure and signal design will be planned. The Great Escape will provide NYSDOT with all applicable plans for the Route 9 Corridor when the pedestrian bridge plans are submitted.

To the extent possible with lands under the control of the Great Escape, access management measures have been proposed on Route 9. The number of access points on Route 9 between Glen Lake Road and Round Pond Road will be reduced as a result of the proposed Great Escape Expansion. The existing motel in the northeast corner of the Route 9/Round Pond Road intersection is not under the control of the Great Escape. It appears from the survey information provided by NYSDOT that the parking area and a portion of the motel structure are within the NYSDOT right-of-way on Route 9. The Great Escape does not have the right or authority to deny the continued use of the existing driveways serving the motel. The Great Escape has offered to work with the property owner to provide primary access to the motel from Round Pond Road, east of Route 9. It may be necessary to implement turn restrictions and/or close the southern driveway serving the motel to ensure adequate operating conditions at the Route 9/Round Pond Road intersection. Similar measures may be warranted at the Route 9/Glen Lake Road intersection.

DGEIS Reference: Section 2; Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section G.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 258 **(Mr. Richard W. Carlson, Regional Planning & Program Manager, State of New York, Department of Transportation, 84 Holland Avenue, Albany; written comments dated September 11, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to the mitigation measures and phasing of improvements, "The traffic study is based on a five-step incremental approach to represent an increase in annual attendance from 900,000 visitors to an ultimate goal of 1.5 million. This approach, which comes out to 10.75 percent per year for five years, was agreed upon for the purpose of the traffic study to directly evaluate the peak hour impacts on the adjacent roadways. We are uncomfortable, however, tying the phased mitigation plan to annual attendance turnstile figures. There are a number of factors, such as transit use, vehicle-occupancy rates or trip-distribution that could result in a significant deviation from the peak hour trip-generation numbers projected. A monitoring plan including peak hour traffic counts should be set up to determine the timing and adequacy of the proposed mitigation measures."

RESPONSE 258

Great Escape has committed to build the pedestrian bridge within two years. As part of the construction of the pedestrian bridge, the existing southern driveway will be eliminated. Construction of the southern portion of the new access (ring) road, across from Round Pond Road, will be initiated at that time. On-site grading and construction phasing will require that construction of the northern section of the access road also begin at the same time.

Therefore, the monitoring plan is applicable only to the improvements on Route 9, north of the Great Escape and the improvements to the Exit 20 northbound off-ramp. The Applicant proposes the following monitoring plan for implementation of the off-site highway improvements.

Turning movement traffic counts will be collected from 9:30 AM to 11:30 AM during a typical Tuesday and Saturday in August at the intersections of Route 9/Exit 20 northbound ramps and Route 9/Gurney Lane. Automatic traffic counts will be collected at the Route 9/ Glen Lake Road and Route 9/Round Pond Road intersections. The traffic counts will be collected annually until the improvements are implemented, and submitted to NYSDOT and the Town for review. The improvements at Route 9/Exit 20 will be required when the combined volume of traffic in the southbound through lane and the eastbound right turn lane at either intersection during either peak hour reaches a threshold listed in the following table:

Intersection	**Combined Peak Hour Volume in Southbound Through Lane and Eastbound Right Turn Lane**	
	Weekday AM Peak Hour	Saturday AM Peak Hour
Route 9/Exit 20 NB Ramps	1,320	1,454
Route 9/Gurney Lane	1,368	1,404

Source: Great Escape Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement, July 2000, Volume 2 of 3, Appendix 4, Traffic Impact Study, page 52 (Figure 3.23) and page 57 (Figure 3.28).

The combination of critical volumes in the southbound through lane and the eastbound right turn lane will account for a possible change in the trip distribution, modal split, vehicle occupancy, etc. Improvements could be constructed prior to reaching the specified traffic count threshold, assuming a NYSDOT Highway Work Permit is secured. The Lead Agency will review this proposed monitoring plan in conclusion with the DOT after making its Findings.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter V.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 259 **(Mr. Richard W. Carlson, Regional Planning & Program Manager, State of New York, Department of Transportation, 84 Holland Avenue, Albany; written comments dated September 11, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to the mitigation measures and phasing of improvements, "The additional southbound thru-lane on Route 9 proposed under Phase 3 becomes an exclusive right-turn lane at the northern access road across from Glen Lake Road. Our experience shows this can result in unfamiliar drivers destined elsewhere becoming trapped in the lane. The lane must be carried through the proposed signal and then merged back to one lane south of the intersection."

RESPONSE 259

As suggested, the proposed widening of Route 9 will be extended south through the intersection of Glen Lake Road and merged back to one southbound lane south of the proposed traffic signal.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section G

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 260 **(Mr. Richard W. Carlson, Regional Planning & Program Manager, State of New York, Department of Transportation, 84 Holland Avenue, Albany; written comments dated September 11, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to the mitigation measures and phasing of improvements, "The traffic study must evaluate signal warrants for the proposed new traffic signals along Route 9 at Glen Lake Road and Round Pond Road. If warranted and approved for installation, would these signals revert to flashing yellow during the off-season, similar to the existing Great Escape traffic signals?"

RESPONSE 260

The traffic exiting the new southern access drive across from Round Pond Road will be high enough during several hours during the summer to meet the peak hour and peak four hour Federal warrants for a traffic signal. When the northern end of the access road is constructed across from Glen Lake Road, the volume at this intersection will be high enough to meet, at a minimum, the peak hour warrant and the four-hour warrant. The additional traffic count data that will be collected as part of the monitoring plan (See Response 258) will determine if the eight-hour warrants will be met. It is anticipated that the signals would revert to flashing yellow during the off-season. The proposed signals at the northern and southern limits of access road will also have the added benefit of providing controlled ingress and egress for the Glen Lake Road and Round Pond Road local collector roads.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section G.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 261 **(Mr. Richard W. Carlson, Regional Planning & Program Manager, State of New York, Department of Transportation, 84 Holland Avenue, Albany; written comments dated September 11, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to the mitigation measures and phasing of improvements, "The traffic study discusses signal timing optimization as part of Transportation System Management (TSM) measures that could be used to help mitigate the impacts of the expansion. There may also be significant benefits to the overall operation along this section of Route 9 with an interconnected system of traffic signals. This must be evaluated, as well."

RESPONSE 261

System benefits will be realized from an interconnected system of traffic signals on Route 9. During the design phase of the off-site improvements, it is recommended that alternatives such as wireless radio technology be considered in lieu of a hard wire connection for the interconnect, particularly because there is more than 1,000 feet between some of the proposed traffic signals.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section G.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 262 **(Mr. Richard W. Carlson, Regional Planning & Program Manager, State of New York, Department of Transportation, 84 Holland Avenue, Albany; written comments dated September 11, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to the mitigation measures and phasing of improvements, "Based on our initial review, the proposal to eliminate the exclusive northbound approach phases at both the Route 9/ Gurney Lane and the Route 9/I-87 Exit 20 NB Ramps intersections concerns us. Motorists destined to the interstate highway not only expect but should have a protected left-turn movement. The costs of this improvement in terms of traffic operation and safety weighted against the potential benefits needs to be evaluated further."

RESPONSE 262

It is not recommended that the exclusive northbound approach phases be eliminated at both the Route 9/Gurney Lane and Route 9/I-87 Exit 20 northbound ramps intersection. The Level of Service results summarized in Table 3.6 and Table 3.7 in the Traffic Impact Study included an exclusive northbound phase at the Route 9/I-87 Exit 20 northbound ramp intersection for both peak hours through the 2004 design year (Phase 5). Refer to the Level of Service reports on pages B-41 and B-58 of Appendix B of the Traffic Impact Study. The exclusive phase for Route 9 northbound at Gurney Lane does not get called during each cycle of the traffic signal during the mid-morning peak hour of the generator. The intersection was analyzed with average signal timing, which did not include the exclusive northbound phase during the Saturday peak hour. During other hours of the day, the exclusive northbound approach phase gets called more frequently. The exclusive northbound approach signal is automatically actuated by a loop detector control which is buried beneath the pavement of the left turn lane. The loop detector permits the left hand turn to be actuated only during those times when there is turning traffic seeking to use the exclusive northbound approach. The project sponsor does not propose to eliminate the exclusive northbound phase at either intersection on Route 9. (See FGEIS Section 4.6 for Revised Level of Service Reports).

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section G.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 263 **(Mr. Richard W. Carlson, Regional Planning & Program Manager, State of New York, Department of Transportation, 84 Holland Avenue, Albany; written comments dated September 11, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to the parking lots and pedestrian crossing, "The proposed grade-separated pedestrian crossing of Route 9 is an essential part of the first phase of the mitigation plan. It will be a considerable improvement not only for the safety of pedestrians but for the vehicular traffic along Route 9, as well. We question the practicability of the pedestrian tunnel and have concerns regarding its long term maintenance. We strongly prefer the pedestrian bridge alternative."

RESPONSE 263

A pedestrian bridge is also the applicant's preferred alternative for the proposed grade-separated pedestrian crossing.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section G.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 264 **(Mr. Richard W. Carlson, Regional Planning & Program Manager, State of New York, Department of Transportation, 84 Holland Avenue, Albany; written comments dated September 11, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to the parking lots and pedestrian crossing, "In connection with the pedestrian bridge, it is proposed that all at-grade pedestrian crossings be eliminated. Consideration should be given to pedestrian traffic along Route 9 from nearby establishments and the ability of this traffic to cross Route 9. In addition, what are the limits of the fencing and how will the breaks in the fencing be controlled?"

RESPONSE 264

People staying at the existing motel and cabins south of the Park and east of Route 9 will utilize the existing sidewalk and will enter the Park after walking under the pedestrian bridge. People walking up the west side of Route 9 will come into the Park property behind the fence, walk to the pedestrian bridge (which will have ramps on both its north and south sides) and cross Route 9 into the Park. The fence will extend along the Park property line parallel to Route 9, on both sides of the highway. The breaks in fencing will be gated. Refer to DGEIS Figures 2-8 and 2-10, "Pedestrian Bridge," and "US Route 9 Planting Concept," respectively.

To the extent possible with lands under the control of the Great Escape, access management measures have been proposed on Route 9. The number of access points on Route 9 between Glen Lake Road and Round Pond Road will be reduced as a result of the proposed Great Escape Expansion. The existing motel in the northeast corner of the Route 9/Round Pond Road intersection is not under the control of the Great Escape. It appears from the survey information provided by NYSDOT that the parking area and a portion of the motel structure are within the NYSDOT right-of-way on Route 9. The Great Escape does not have the right or authority to deny the continued use of the existing driveways serving the motel. The Great Escape has offered to work with the property owner to provide primary access to the motel from Round Pond Road, east of Route 9. It may be necessary to implement turn restrictions and/or close the southern driveway serving the motel to ensure adequate operating conditions at the Route 9/Round Pond Road intersection. Similar measures may be warranted at the Route 9/Glen Lake Road intersection.

All transportation mitigation measures are feasible and can be constructed either on land owned/controlled by Great Escape or within the State Right of Way. Any access changes for Great Escape will be subject to the typical NYSDOT review as part of the highway work permit application process.

The DGEIS Figures 2-9 and 2-10 illustrate the proposed layout of the Route 9 fencing. The Great Escape understands the need for fencing in order to discourage at grade crossing of Route 9 and force use of the pedestrian bridge. The fence will be on a landscape mound that will increase the height of the structure and make it a more imposing facility to further restrict the visibility of the entry gates east of Route 9. A fencing plan is enclosed to clarify the extent of fencing. In areas of limited visibility to the public or travelers, the fence will be chain link. It is anticipated that a fence will run from the Adirondack Coach House to Martha's as a decorative themed element, with the remaining portions fronting on Route 9 being chain link.

In the future, all the existing entry points to the existing lots on the west side of Route 9 will be gated. The Adirondack Coach House will continue to have an independent entry. At this time it is impractical to detail the entry closures, signal changes, and pavement markings since these modifications will be subject to a complex phasing plan. The final design will be subject of driveways to site plan review and DOT work permit requirements.

The only entry area issue is making provision for left turns for southbound vehicles in order to enter the drop off plaza and mobility impaired parking lot on the east side of Route 9. This can be resolved once signal timing on the north and south entries into the ring road system is determined. It is believed that adequate gaps can be created to allow for these turning movements, and all these items should be addressed during the advanced design phase and site plan review.

The Great Escape has committed to build the pedestrian crossing within two years. In order to meet that commitment it will be necessary to advance construction plans for the Route 9 corridor and north parking during the coming months during which construction phasing will be determined along with signal removal, driveway closure and signal design will be planned. The Great Escape will provide NYSDOT with all applicable plans for the Route 9 Corridor when the pedestrian bridge plans are submitted.

To the extent possible with lands under the control of the Great Escape, access management measures have been proposed on Route 9. The number of access points on Route 9 between Glen Lake Road and Round Pond Road will be reduced as a result of the proposed Great Escape Expansion. The existing motel in the northeast corner of the Route 9/Round Pond Road intersection is not under the control of the Great Escape. It appears from the survey information provided by NYSDOT that the parking area and a portion of the motel structure are within the NYSDOT right-of-way on Route 9. The Great Escape does not have the right or authority to deny the continued use of the existing driveways serving the motel. The Great Escape has offered to work with the property owner to provide primary access to the motel from Round Pond Road, east of Route 9. It may be necessary to implement turn restrictions and/or close the southern driveway serving the motel to ensure adequate operating conditions at the Route 9/Round Pond Road intersection. Similar measures may be warranted at the Route 9/Glen Lake Road intersection.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 265 **(Mr. Richard W. Carlson, Regional Planning & Program Manager, State of New York, Department of Transportation, 84 Holland Avenue, Albany; written comments dated September 11, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to the parking lots and pedestrian crossing, "We have concerns with the ultimate effectiveness of the parking lot and shuttle bus system. The internal circulation of the shuttle busses and the large number of patron parking maneuvers, as well as patrons getting into and out of their vehicles, may create enough conflicts to slow the shuttle bus system down. Should this occur and a temptation is presented for people to walk, are the fencing limits and other restrictive means sufficient to prevent people from crossing Route 9 other than at the pedestrian bridge?"

RESPONSE 265

It is believed that the fencing limits will deter people from crossing Route 9 instead of utilizing the pedestrian bridge. Also, refer to Responses 289 through 294.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 266 **(Mr. Richard W. Carlson, Regional Planning & Program Manager, State of New York, Department of Transportation, 84 Holland Avenue, Albany; written comments dated September 11, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to the parking lots and pedestrian crossing, "The phasing of parking lot improvements as outlined on Pages 2-18 and 2-19 of the DGEIS suggest that the northern parking lots (Red & Yellow lots) will be completed prior to the northern section of the access road at the Glen Lake Road intersection. If these lots are to be utilized, how will they be accessed in the interim?"

RESPONSE 266

It is likely that the construction of the ring road will occur along the west side of the existing parking areas, to both the north and the south in phases that match with paving of parking areas. It is possible that the red and yellow lots will be graded and temporarily stabilized and not paved until the lots to the south are paved.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 267 **(Mr. Richard W. Carlson, Regional Planning & Program Manager, State of New York, Department of Transportation, 84 Holland Avenue, Albany; written comments dated September 11, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to the Level of Service Analysis, which Commenter advises should be reviewed to determine if the following comment affects the scale of the proposed mitigation plan, "With respect to the capacity analysis runs for the Route 9/Gurney Lane and Route 9/Exit 20 NB Ramps intersections, the yellow and all red inputs should be four seconds and one second, respectively. The analyses did not include the all red portion."

RESPONSE 267

The Level of Service analyses for the Route 9/Gurney Lane and Route 9/Exit 20 northbound ramps intersections were run with four seconds of yellow and one second all red. The Level of Service reports in Attachment 267-1 summarize the results of the new analyses. The scale of the proposed mitigation plan is not affected by the addition of the one second "all red".

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section G.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 268 **(Mr. Richard W. Carlson, Regional Planning & Program Manager, State of New York, Department of Transportation, 84 Holland Avenue, Albany; written comments dated September 11, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to the Level of Service Analysis, which Commenter advises should be reviewed to determine if the following comment affects the scale of the proposed mitigation plan, "The short form report printouts in the traffic impact study do not show the Peak Hour Factors used. The factor can easily control the results."

RESPONSE 268

The short form report of the Level of Service analyses was provided to make the Traffic Impact Study more "user-friendly". The peak hour factors do influence the results of the Level of Service analysis. A Peak Hour Factor of 0.90 was used for analysis of existing traffic conditions, as per NYSDOT Region 1 standard practice. It is likely that future traffic volume conditions could result in higher peak hour factors. The use of higher peak hour factors would likely improve the Level of Service results. The analysis contained in the DGEIS is slightly conservative in that a 0.90 peak hour factor was also assumed for future traffic conditions.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section G.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 269 **(Mr. Richard W. Carlson, Regional Planning & Program Manager, State of New York, Department of Transportation, 84 Holland Avenue, Albany; written comments dated September 11, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to the Level of Service Analysis, which Commenter advises should be reviewed to determine if the following comment affects the scale of the proposed mitigation plan, "The Route 9/Route 254 analysis used the wrong operation. The existing phasing has leading left-turn arrows on Route 9."

RESPONSE 269

The Level of Service for the Route 9/Route 254 intersection was rerun with the leading left turn arrows on Route 9. The Level of Service reports in Attachment 269-1 summarize the results of the new analyses. The Route 9/Route 254 intersection was not analyzed in the future conditions because the proposed expansion is adding fewer than 100 trips to that intersection. The analysis of existing conditions has no effect on the recommended mitigation plan.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section G.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 270 **(Mr. Richard W. Carlson, Regional Planning & Program Manager, State of New York, Department of Transportation, 84 Holland Avenue, Albany; written comments dated September 11, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to the Level of Service Analysis, which Commenter advises should be reviewed to determine if the following comment affects the scale of the proposed mitigation plan, "The Route 9/Route 149 analysis used the wrong operation, as well. The side roads are split phased. The 2004 weekday Build analysis is missing from the report."

RESPONSE 270

During the morning peak hours, there are very few trips (only 40) exiting the retail driveway on the west side of Route 9 (Dexter), opposite Route 149, and only 1 trip turned left out of the driveway. The Level of Service for the Route 9/Route 149 intersection was rerun with the split phasing. The reports in Attachment 270-1 summarize the results of the Level of Service analyses with split phasing. Permitting the eastbound and westbound green phases to run concurrently would reduce the delay at this intersection. The detector on the driveway could have an extended delay to allow the right turns to turn on red during an appropriate gap, but still provide a short protected green phase if necessary. It is not possible to model the flexibility of modern signal detectors with the Highway Capacity Software.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section G.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 271 **(Ms. Denise F. Paddock, 330 Glen Lake Road, Lake George; written comments dated September 11, 2000):**

Commenter doubts the economic benefits of the Park cited in the DGEIS claiming that, "the Great Escape patrons are primarily day visitors…[who] use our resources and leave without spending any additional monies – not even for gas." Commenter believes that overnight visitors are attracted to the area not because of the Park but because "it is a beautiful, quiet area with clean air, beautiful vistas, clean water, free of urban noise and other problems."

RESPONSE 271

Data provided by the Park based on their patron's home zip codes indicates that approximately 40% of Park visitors are overnight visitors who are visiting the region for multi-day stays and are most presumably staying in commercial lodging accommodations. It is the considered opinion of many local tourism promoters that the Park serves as one of the major "draws" which attracts overnight visitors to the region.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 272 **(Ms. Denise F. Paddock, 330 Glen Lake Road, Lake George; written comments dated September 11, 2000):**

Commenter objects to the proposal to "remove the trees along Route 9, and I-87" claiming that their removal will "produce substantial noise, create an unattractive entrance to the Queensbury/ Lake George/ Adirondack region, increase run-off, erosion and water pollution."

Commenter states that, "even now, one of the ugliest spots on I-87 is just south of Exit 20, as you come down the hill looking at the existing (and unpaved) parking lots of the Great Escape."

RESPONSE 272

Comment noted. See Responses 196, 181, 146, 131, 64, 63, 254.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 273 **(Ms. Denise F. Paddock, 330 Glen Lake Road, Lake George; written comments dated September 11, 2000):**

Commenter states that, "I also have concerns about the effectiveness of the proposed waste water treatment. If the quality of the effluent is so good, why not reuse, recycle it in the Park rather than ultimately ending up in Glen Lake? Hooking into the existing sewer system makes more environmental sense."

RESPONSE 273

Refer to DGEIS Section 7.4, Alternative 5.

While the treated effluent could be used for such purposes as irrigation and landscaping, the Park does not have year-round need for such irrigation or sufficient land area (and need) for irrigation. While use of treated effluent for irrigation is practical in some warmer climates in the south and west, it is not particularly practical in the upstate New York climate.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 274 **(Ms. Denise F. Paddock, 330 Glen Lake Road, Lake George; written comments dated September 11, 2000):**

Commenter states, "The Glens Falls 70 ft water towers are visible from the Northway and other areas. I cannot believe that a ride some 250 ft high would not have a substantial visual impact."

RESPONSE 274

A ride with a height of 200 feet is the maximum height that has been proposed and studied in the DGEIS. Refer to FGEIS Section 4.3, "Visual Analysis 2000-2001," for a detailed report on the methodology utilized in the updated study, the data collected, and the conclusions therein. The visual impact of a tall structure depends on its elevation relative to receptor areas and intervening topography and vegetation. Structure height is just one factor, and it is not necessarily correct to assume that because a 70 foot water tower or a 20 story building such as the CNA building may have a visual impact at their particular locations that a structure of a similar height inside the Park will also have an impact.

DGEIS Reference: See Response 29

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 275 **(Ms. Denise F. Paddock, 330 Glen Lake Road, Lake George; written comments dated September 11, 2000):**

Commenter states, "The Great Escape in Lake George/Queensbury is unlike many of Premier Parks other amusement parks. It is built on a wetlands, sandwiched between two residential areas, a lake and an interstate. It is not a big empty field, and most of what happens at the Great Escape dramatically affects their immediate neighbors."

RESPONSE 275

Siting of a large facility anywhere presents design challenges and site-specific issues and concerns. The Planning Board and the Applicant's goals are that the project not cause significant adverse impacts to its environmental or community surroundings. The recommended mitigation measures are intended to achieve these goals.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 276 **(Mr. Walter J. Law, 4274 Lake Shore Drive, Diamond Point; written comments dated September 11, 2000):**

Commenter, a resident of Diamond Point, and his wife travel frequently on Route 9 to get to area supermarkets and retail stores as well as other destinations. Commenter chastises the Planning Board's previous decisions regarding the "miracle half-mile" on Route 9 near the Route 149 intersection pointing to traffic congestion and stating that, "you people should have known that the traffic generated by those stores would not fit on Route 9, a two lane road." Commenter states that, "Great Escape gives [the Planning Board] another opportunity to screw things up. I have never heard of an amusement park that exists on both sides of a state road." Commenter suggests that the Planning Board will have to "look very carefully at the traffic situation." Commenter further states that, "it is not realistic to turn a Story Town location into a huge amusement complex. This would be acceptable if the location were out in the woods someplace and an exit could be built off the Northway. [The Planning Board] must keep in mind that Great Escape does not own Route 9 and that people who use Route 9 have a right to continue to use it."

RESPONSE 276

Great Escape has a sister park in a similar setting (Riverside, Agawam, MA) with the parking lots located on the opposite side of the highway from the amusement area. A pedestrian bridge similarly serves the sister park. The improvements recommended in the Traffic Impact Study that would be paid for by Great Escape would provide year-round benefits to all users of Route 9. Unlike the "million-dollar half-mile" area, there would be very few driveways on the section of Route 9 south of Exit 20. There would only be two primary points of access for the Great Escape parking area on the west side of Route 9 and they would both be controlled by a traffic signal.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 277 **(Mr. James D. Horwitz, President of the Glens Falls Country Club, Round Pond Road, Glens Falls; written comments dated September 11, 2000):**

Commenter advises the board of a resolution passed by the Glens Falls Country Club "expressing its concern regarding the noise, traffic, visual and aesthetic implications that would result from implementation of the generic plan proposed in the Great Escape's DGEIS."

RESPONSE 277

See Response 280.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 278 **(Mr. James D. Horwitz, President of the Glens Falls Country Club, Round Pond Road, Glens Falls; written comments dated September 11, 2000):**

Commenter states the Country Club's "opposition to the...DGEIS is directed to the concerns about increased traffic on Round Pond Road; increased noise from the anticipated growth in annual attendees from 900,000 to 1,500,000; and the suggested construction of a 200 foot structure that would be used for a new roller coaster."

Commenter observes that, "Round Pond serves as an artery for the east to west population traveling to Route 9 and the Great Escape," and notes that, "golfers must therefore cross the road twice while playing either a 9 hole or 18 hole round." Commenter states that, "Although we have no studies to site[sic], it is indisputable that there has been a significant increase in Round Pond traffic creating a safety concern for golfers crossing the road."

RESPONSE 278

See Response 14. Round Pond Road is a Warren County road (CR 17). Round Pond Road is a collector road with a posted speed limit of 40 mph. The intended function of the road is to provide for east-west travel through this area of the Town. The trip assignment summarized on Figure 3.20 of the Traffic Impact Study indicates that the proposed expansion of Great Escape is anticipated to increase the traffic on Round Pond Road by a maximum of only 25 one-way trips.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section I.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 279 **(Mr. James D. Horwitz, President of the Glens Falls Country Club, Round Pond Road, Glens Falls; written comments dated September 11, 2000):**

Commenter states that, "No studies are necessary either with respect to the concern regarding increased noise. Today, both rides and riders are audible from the [Glens Falls Country Club] clubhouse and many locations on the course."

RESPONSE 279

Comment noted. See FGEIS Section 4.1, "2000 Sound Studies."

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 280 **(Mr. James D. Horwitz, President of the Glens Falls Country Club, Round Pond Road, Glens Falls; written comments dated September 11, 2000):**

Commenter states that, "there is a significant visibility concern about the construction of a 200 foot structure that would be used for a roller coaster or other ride. The visibility maps submitted by the Great Escape demonstrates that such a structure would be visible from both Glen Lake and Round Pond and therefore from both [Glens Falls Country Club's] first tee and eighteenth green, starting and finishing holes the status of which is important to the [Club] and generically to many other quality golf courses."

RESPONSE 280

Refer to FGEIS Section 4.3, "Visual Analysis 2000-2001," for the results of the additional work conducted in order to define an area within the Park suitable for development of tall rides. Tall rides situated in the threshold area defined will not be substantially visible from the Glens Falls Country Club Clubhouse or the golf course.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 281 **(Mr. James D. Horwitz, President of the Glens Falls Country Club, Round Pond Road, Glens Falls; written comments dated September 11, 2000):**

Commenter states that the Glens Falls Country Club "respectfully request[s] that the Planning Board disapprove the Great Escape's DGEIS."

RESPONSE 281

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 282 **(Mr. Joseph E. Trombley and Ms. Claire M. Trombley, 25 Cedarwood Drive, Queensbury; written comments dated September 12, 2000):**

Commenters believe that since they moved to the Town of Queensbury in 1969 that the town is a "great place to live and raise a family" and stated that they "would be saddened to see this community become something less than a wonderful place to live." Commenters also state that, "we are sure that the community of Kissimee – St. Cloud, Florida also faced this crossroad at some point in the past when they approved Disney World and later Park expansion as well as the addition of other theme parks. I'm sure you would agree, if you have vacationed there, that it's a nice place to visit but you would not want to live there. We would hate to see our area turn into asphalt parking lots and bumper to bumper traffic."

RESPONSE 282

Comment noted. The developed areas cited built near Disney World were built subsequent to Disney World on the outskirts of the large Disney landholdings. Kissimee and St. Cloud were rural citrus growing communities and there is no evidence such communities reviewed or approved any element of the Disney World project or similar resort development when it was first built in the 1960s.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 283 **(Mr. Joseph E. Trombley and Ms. Claire M. Trombley, 25 Cedarwood Drive, Queensbury; written comments dated September 12, 2000):**

Commenters stated that, "The past few years have given us some small indication of the impact the relatively minor changes at the Great Escape have made on the quality of life in the area. It is now quite evident that the noise level, generated at the Great Escape, has increased in our neighborhood. There is a loud and steady hum in the background during the hours of operation. There is roller coaster sounds and patrons screams as well as a regular opportunity to hear the sounds of shows and fireworks displays. Yet, we are told that future major expansion will not have any impact on the quality of life in our community."

Commenters list a number of their concerns, such as, "the traffic in our area has become a bigger and bigger problem as a result of the changes made over the past few years at the Great Escape...the sewage treatment plant on the high ground above the wetlands and Glen Lake is an obvious concern...removal of additional trees along the Northway to construct the hotel and convention center and the resulting increased highway noise are also a major concern."

Commenters further state that, "we are asked to exchange the nature of our community as a great place to live for increased property taxes from the Great Escape, increases in our share of sales tax, and some additional seasonal minimum wage jobs. We cannot be sure that these additional revenues will even come close to the additional costs of highway maintenance, police costs and the many additional costs both expected and not expected related to the Great Escape's expansion plans."

RESPONSE 283

Comment noted. The DGEIS establishes that the Park expansion is not anticipated to result in significant increases in public services and infrastructure needed to support the Park.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 284 **(Mr. James A. Berg, President & CEO, Adirondack Regional Chambers of Commerce, 136 Warren Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated September 15, 2000):**

Commenter, President and CEO of the Adirondack Regional Chambers of Commerce writes in support of the proposed expansion of the Great Escape, "We strongly believe that **THE GREAT ESCAPE** and its owners understand their responsibility to this community and will continue to take all reasonable steps to secure that quality of life along with economic growth of the region's economy is achieved in accordance with the ARCC's mission statement."

RESPONSE 284

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 285 **(Mr. Michael C. Hoffman, President, Holiday Inn – Turf at Lake George, U.S. Route 9 & 9N, Lake George; written comments dated September 24, 2000):**

Commenter writes "as a businessman who owns a lodging facility in Warren County overlooking Lake George. From this point of view, I am all for the expansion. I now that the Great Escape brings tens of thousands of visitors to our area annually and that many of these visitors require the amenities or conveniences of a full service hotel. The impact of the Park on our facility is tremendous, and I believe that it has become even greater since it was purchased by Premier Parks, Inc. I suspect that the reason for the increased impact with the new ownership is that they have a larger marketing budget and that they have implemented several new rides and attractions in the past few years."

RESPONSE 285

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 286 **(Mr. Michael C. Hoffman, President, Holiday Inn – Turf at Lake George, U.S. Route 9 & 9N, Lake George; written comments dated September 24, 2000):**

Commenter states that, "From the residents' point of view, of which I am not (I live in Albany), I think that the Great Escape has a moral obligation to do all that is possible and reasonable to mitigate the issues. These issues include traffic flow, visual and noise impact, as well as other issues such as sewer and water usage. From what I understand and believe, the Great Escape will not walk away from their responsibility to do the right thing."

RESPONSE 286

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 287 **(Mr. Michael C. Hoffman, President, Holiday Inn – Turf at Lake George, U.S. Route 9 & 9N, Lake George; written comments dated September 24, 2000):**

Commenter states that, "The Great Escape is located in an area where tourism is the predominate industry. It is probably the number two attraction in our area (at least during the summer season) with the lake itself being number one. I firmly believe that it is the hope and aspiration of every business to be allowed to grow and develop. Growth creates opportunities for employees. These opportunities in turn help create the winning and consistent team that a company must have to contend with in this very competitive market. It is very difficult to excel in any business in today's competitive marketplace. It is my hope that the Planning Board can find the middle ground that will allow the Park the expansion that it requests yet satisfy all of the reasonable issues that affect the area's residents and environment. To make matters more difficult, whatever the decision, it needs to be done in a timely manner."

RESPONSE 287

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 288 **(Mr. Scott Sopczyk, Staff Director, Adirondack-Glens Falls Transportation Council, Washington County Municipal Center, A-204 383 Upper Broadway, Fort Edward; written comments rec'd September 25, 2000):**

Commenter "recognizes that the DGEIS is not intended to provide the level of detail that would be included in a site plan" but notes that some of its comments "may require such levels of specific site detail for resolution" and states that "they have been included at this stage so that they might be more thoroughly considered as more detailed site plans are prepared."

RESPONSE 288

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 289 **(Mr. Scott Sopczyk, Staff Director, Adirondack-Glens Falls Transportation Council, Washington County Municipal Center, A-204 383 Upper Broadway, Fort Edward; written comments rec'd September 25, 2000):**

Commenter states, "The proposal to construct a pedestrian bridge over Route 9 is a very positive step toward reducing the pedestrian/vehicle conflicts and traffic delays that currently occur in front of the Park. For this...new connection to be effective however, it is essential that pedestrians be conveniently and efficiently channeled to use the bridge and not tempted to use at grade shortcuts across Route 9. The DGEIS does include several measures that begin to achieve this (e.g., some perimeter fencing to limit access to Route 9 and the provision of a shuttle service to take Park visitors from their parking lot to the bridge crossing area), but the available design information still raises several concerns."

RESPONSE 289

This proposal does direct pedestrians to utilize the pedestrian bridge by use of perimeter fencing which extends from the north end of the green parking lot to the south end of the entry gates/white parking lot. Heavily landscaped berms are proposed for this entire length and for the area adjacent to the pink parking lot. Pedestrian crossings of Route 9 at grade will not be possible anywhere within this zone. Service access drives to these parking lots will be gated.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 290 **(Mr. Scott Sopczyk, Staff Director, Adirondack-Glens Falls Transportation Council, Washington County Municipal Center, A-204 383 Upper Broadway, Fort Edward; written comments rec'd September 25, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to parking lot layout and shuttle service, "First, given the extensive layout of the parking lots, it is crucial that the shuttle service be convenient and efficient if it is to be used. The on-site circulation plan provided in volume 1 of the DGEIS does not adequately provide for efficient shuttle circulation. The lots are laid out in such a way that the shuttle will be using the same parking lot circulation lanes and perimeter roadway as all of the Parks' visitors. This will create delays in shuttle operations as well as safety concerns as they will be forced to navigate through pedestrians in the parking lots and other vehicles as they move to/from parking spaces. This will especially be a problem in the late afternoon and evening hours when visitors may be leaving from a variety of lot locations simultaneously. Without an effective shuttle, visitors will be tempted to use Route 9 sidewalks to access the Park, which will not longer have any designated pedestrian crossing. The perimeter fencing does not completely restrict access to Route 9; breaks occur at a number of locations that would allow pedestrians to short-cut the bride (existing entrances, Martha's, Hotel, north entrance, etc.). Further, the recommended improvements indicate that only the existing southern signal in front of the Park will be removed. If the northern signal remains it will be adjacent to an access driveway that will provide an obvious temptation for pedestrians to cross if it seems quicker than the bridge."

RESPONSE 290

The shuttle is a vehicle and will be using the same circulation routes as the automobiles. Shuttles will operate along a designated route and be operated by trained drivers. As is the case in most major amusement parks, at-grade shuttle service shares the route with pedestrians and cars without sacrificing either safety or efficiency. The shuttle route will be along the east side of the parking lot so three shuttle only driveways between the parking lots will be required to accommodate this plan on the north end of the property. On the south the parking fields are already connected. The shuttle will have to make two crossing of the ring road and will use the ring road for a short distance between maroon and green lots. A separate shuttle only land can not be created along the ring road due to the limited pre-existing road crossing of the wetlands. See FGEIS Section 4.10, Figure 4.10, Shuttle Bus Route.

Pedestrians will not be permitted to cross Route 9 at grade due to extensive landscaping and fencing on both sides of the highway. The location of Martha's and the Hotel is far from the Park entrance gates and therefore pedestrians will prefer the shuttle over walking the distance to the bridge and/or gates.

Pedestrian crossing at grade will not be permitted at any access drive whether there is a signal or not because gates will prohibit movement.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 291 **(Mr. Scott Sopczyk, Staff Director, Adirondack-Glens Falls Transportation Council, Washington County Municipal Center, A-204 383 Upper Broadway, Fort Edward; written comments rec'd September 25, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to parking lot layout and shuttle service that, "Some other theme parks that provide parking lot shuttles often operate it along its own dedicated path that is used exclusively by the shuttle with well organized stops at each lot. The existing proposal not only fails to provide efficient shuttle circulation, but also identifies only minimally sized stop locations with no separated passenger waiting area. Further, the parking lots provide no defined alternative pedestrian travel routes to/from the plaza area for anyone who chooses not to wait for a shuttle. This also is a key element that needs to be incorporated into the design at this stage as it could impact lot layout and number of spaces available. To further aid shuttle operation, the bridge plaza design should include a shuttle stop on both sides of the wetland area. This would improve shuttle efficiency by keeping southern lot shuttles from having to cross the wetland bridge into the green parking lot."

RESPONSE 291

Many major amusement parks do not have travel lanes exclusively designated for shuttles. This proposal includes a designated shuttle route which shares space with cars. This design is efficient, as it provides maximum parking with minimal pavement.

Shuttle stop locations have been placed for maximum efficiency and sized to provide sufficient space for the expected number of people at one time. These areas are curbed to provide separation from autos and will include landscaping and benches.

This proposal purposefully does not include extensive pedestrian routes as it seeks to strengthen use of the shuttles. This will decrease the potential pedestrian/car conflicts.

Shuttle stops are provided on both the north and south sides of the wetlands for access to both bridge access points.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 292 **(Mr. Scott Sopczyk, Staff Director, Adirondack-Glens Falls Transportation Council, Washington County Municipal Center, A-204 383 Upper Broadway, Fort Edward; written comments rec'd September 25, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to parking lot layout and shuttle service, "information regarding the shuttle's hours of operation, vehicle type/capacity and numbers in operation should also be available. The potential consequences are significant enough that this detail is needed in order to adequately complete this review. The proposal to offer a shuttle is a good one that, if well designed and operated, will be a real enhancement to the Park's facilities and perhaps lessen negative reactions from visitors at having to pay a parking toll. A poorly designed shuttle system on the other hand will not eliminate the current pedestrian crossing problems on Route 9."

RESPONSE 292

The Planning Board will review the operational aspects of the shuttle system during site plan review. See Section 4.13 Shuttle Plan.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 293 **(Mr. Scott Sopczyk, Staff Director, Adirondack-Glens Falls Transportation Council, Washington County Municipal Center, A-204 383 Upper Broadway, Fort Edward; written comments rec'd September 25, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to bus entry/exit, "The lot's layout may work for school and charter buses but will likely cause delays to transit buses and trolleys that operate on set time schedules as they maneuver with other buses for curb space and passengers. The Great Escape has been a regular supporter of transit services in the past, and transit/trolley passenger boarding areas with bus pull-outs and shelters should be considered on both sides of Route 9. They could be located along Rte 9 in the vicinity of the driveway for the "White" parking lot. This location could provide easy access to the pedestrian bridge plaza and be separated enough from the north driveway signal that passengers would not be tempted to cross at grade instead of using the [pedestrian] bridge."

RESPONSE 293

The bus loading area has been designed to accommodate school, charter buses and potentially mass transit buses and trolleys. Bus drop-offs have not been provided directly on Route 9 due to safety concerns regarding pedestrians waiting along Route 9, or being discharged on Route 9. The goal is to bring people into the site.

No conflict is anticipated between the various types of buses. School buses will have the most buses simultaneously loading and are part of scheduled school programs which occur in May and June prior to the Park's peak season. The charter buses are a comparatively small part of the total vehicle load for a short time period and will not conflict with other vehicles. Mass transit buses can be accommodated within the bus loading area.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 294 **(Mr. Scott Sopczyk, Staff Director, Adirondack-Glens Falls Transportation Council, Washington County Municipal Center, A-204 383 Upper Broadway, Fort Edward; written comments rec'd September 25, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to bus entry/exit, "Another issue regarding the layout of this area is the location of the handicapped parking area within the bus loading area. The close proximity of these two functions suggests that conflicts could occur. For example, will persons with wheelchairs and other mobility impairments need to access their vehicles by passing through crowds of people boarding/exiting buses and then pass between parked and maneuvering buses? An alternative bus boarding/handicapped parking configuration should be considered."

RESPONSE 294

The goal of this proposal is to allow close and easy access for both bus loading and sight/mobility impaired patron's parking. Bus loading will occur at specific times and will not be a constant function.

Pedestrian circulation is accommodated on a sidewalk along the retaining wall at the eastern side of the loading area and is not in conflict with the buses.

Many alternative designs were developed and studied for this area, including providing sight/mobility impaired parking on the "outer ring" and bus loading in the center. The proposed scheme best accommodates the needs of the sight/mobility impaired and bus patrons.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 295 **(Mr. Scott Sopczyk, Staff Director, Adirondack-Glens Falls Transportation Council, Washington County Municipal Center, A-204 383 Upper Broadway, Fort Edward; written comments rec'd September 25, 2000):**

Commenter states that the statement on page 3-32 of volume 1 of the DGEIS that provides that the "even when the Great Escape is open, it does not contribute any meaningful traffic during the morning peak hour" is "debatable to say the least. The TIS element of the DGEIS states 'The critical time period for analysis of potential traffic impacts (is)...during weekday and Saturday morning peak hour' The analysis goes on to report that of the approx. 1200 veh. two-way volume in the vicinity of the Park during the peak hour, 735 to 820 driveway trips occur at Park lots. This volume clearly seems meaningful."

RESPONSE 295

The statement in the DGEIS was referring to the overall commuter morning peak hour, which typically occurs between 7:00 and 9:00 AM, and not the peak hour of the generator (Great Escape) which occurs between 10:00 and 11:00 AM. The volume of traffic cited in the comment is the existing trip generation of the Great Escape during the peak hour of the generator.

DGEIS Reference: Volume 1, Section 3.5.2, page 3-23.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 296 **(Mr. Scott Sopczyk, Staff Director, Adirondack-Glens Falls Transportation Council, Washington County Municipal Center, A-204 383 Upper Broadway, Fort Edward; written comments rec'd September 25, 2000):**

Commenter states that, "Also significant is the impact of increased Park employment. The DGEIS indicates that up to 900 additional jobs will be added at the Park at full build-out (+200 full-time and +600 part-time). Since many of these employees may arrive before the visitors, the period of significant traffic impact in the AM may spread to cover an earlier period of time. The effective period of changes to signal timing patterns may need to reflect this. The travel patterns of employees are also likely to be different than visitors, with most of them likely approaching from the south and along local roads. 900 additional employees could pose significant traffic impacts and is only marginally addressed in the TIS."

RESPONSE 296

See Response 16. While there will be an increase in employee trips, the net increase will be considerably smaller than the increase in patron trips. The peak hour of combined traffic volumes on Route 9 will continue to be the 10:00 to 11:00 AM peak hour of patron arrival.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section I.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 297 **(Mr. Scott Sopczyk, Staff Director, Adirondack-Glens Falls Transportation Council, Washington County Municipal Center, A-204 383 Upper Broadway, Fort Edward; written comments rec'd September 25, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to the NYSDOT Improvements, "The TIS makes reference (TIS pg. 14-15) to additional [benefits to be felt] from NYSDOT Route 9 improvements. As was expressed by {Adirondack-Glens Falls Transportation Council] to CME in earlier comments to a preliminary draft, these improvements were essentially complete for the 1999 summer season. No additional benefits should be expected from this project. This may be significant since the TIS later assumes no degradation in LOS at attendance level 1 based on these improvements (and signal timing changes) (see TIS pg 21)."

RESPONSE 297

The Traffic Impact Study refers to transportation system management measures that would optimize traffic flow through the corridor (see page 15 of the TIS). TSM measures such as signal timing and phasing changes were proposed, but were not in reference to the NYSDOT Route 9 project. Ultimately, any proposed changes to the signal timing or phasing on Route 9 would have to be approved by NYSDOT. See Response 270.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section C.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 298 **(Mr. Scott Sopczyk, Staff Director, Adirondack-Glens Falls Transportation Council, Washington County Municipal Center, A-204 383 Upper Broadway, Fort Edward; written comments rec'd September 25, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to Exit 20 signal timing changes, "An essential element of the proposed signal timing changes is the elimination of the exclusive northbound phase at the northbound ramps. While this may improve the *overall* operation of the intersection it will also impair access to the northbound ramp of I-87 for northbound Route 9 traffic (111+vph). The LOS for this northbound left movement under the proposed phasing change is not presented in the TIS. Since this is an interstate approach it is a significant movement and deserves more extensive discussion and presentation of the analysis. Given the high volume of southbound traffic, it is unlikely that unprotected northbound lefts will be possible. Further, references to the proposed timing changes suggest that it will only be required for the "peak" period. This peak period needs to be better defined (10:00am to 11:00am? 9:00am to 11:00am? PM also?). NYSDOT needs to determine the significance of this concern, as well as the significance of potentially diverting these 111+ vehicles per hour further north through the outlet area and through the Rte 9/149 intersection to the Exit 21 northbound ramps."

RESPONSE 298

See Response 262.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section G.

Impact to DGEIS:

Rev 1

COMMENT 299 **(Ms. Marilyn Ryba, Senior Planner, Town of Queensbury, 742 Bay Road, Queensbury; written comments dated September 26, 2000):**

Commenter recites a comment received from Harry England concerning the need for a map of the Great Escape project area with and overlay of the zoning districts for public view and notes that, "This should go into Section 4, page 4-39 of Volume 1 [of the DGEIS]."

RESPONSE 299

Refer to DGEIS Figure 3-4, "Zoning," which is provided in Section 3, "Existing Environmental Setting," and indicates the Park boundaries.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 300 **(Ms. Lisa T. Angleson, 118 Benjamin Street, Schenectady; written comments dated September 27, 2000):**

Commenter, whose husband of thirteen years grew up in Twicwood, frequently visits the Queensbury area. Commenter states that, "The changes along Route 9 between visits have been minimal at times, but within the last three years have been monumental and not necessarily for the better. The Great Escape's land acquisitions and plans to enlarge the Park severely impact this section of Route 9. I understand the need for economic growth in the area, but The Great Escape is not going to provide what the surrounding communities need for economic growth. The Great Escape provides short-term summer employment, and can only provide long-term employment to a limited number of people by expanding into, and infringing upon, the immediate community areas. This is not sustainable economic growth, and in fact harms the quality of life in the surrounding neighborhoods in exchange for a limited number of jobs."

RESPONSE 300

Comment noted. The facts and studies presented in the DGEIS do indicate a substantial growth in Park payroll and attendant economic benefit.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 301 **(Ms. Lisa T. Angleson, 118 Benjamin Street, Schenectady; written comments dated September 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "The Great Escape has already changed the beauty of the community. They will only continue to irreversibly damage the landscape with long expanses of pavement, the deforestation of the corridor, more and more rides that can be seen from afar, incredible amounts of traffic, damage to the area watershed with runoff, and increased noise. The Planning Board must take note of the negative patterns of expansion the community already suffers with in regard to traffic and noise. The Great Escape's expansion will not aid your community; it will only further deteriorate the neighboring communities and the entire area into a commercialized eyesore that will not attract visitors. The commercialization of the neighborhoods will also effect [sic] the livability of the area, giving prospective residents a reason not to move to the area."

RESPONSE 301

Comment noted. The Park is an allowed use under the Town Zoning Ordinance. The conceptual plans for expansion of necessary support facilities proposed in this Project are intended to mitigate impacts on surrounding lands and waters from existing conditions.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 302 **(Ms. Lisa T. Angleson, 118 Benjamin Street, Schenectady; written comments dated September 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "The expansion plans submitted by The Great Escape have many discrepancies, and the proposed changes are horrifying to consider. Please, carefully evaluate the impact of the proposed plans, and listen carefully to the community concerns during the decision-making process."

RESPONSE 302

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 303 **(Ms. Marianne McGowan, Queensbury; written comments dated September 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "As anyone can see, the Great Escape is located smack dab in the Glen Lake watershed. When one looks at the lay of the land from Round Pond through to Glen Lake you first encounter the Great Escape parking area (formerly wetlands). The Great Escape Swan ride then takes one through the stream that flows into the Glen Lake Fen at the rear of the park. With today's wetland protections the Great Escape would never had [sic] been allowed to fill in the wetlands or propose to locate a park in its current location."

RESPONSE 303

Commenter's thesis that today's wetlands laws would have not allowed the Park to be built in its current location is debatable. The vast majority of the Park's existing development occurred within the ~ 90 acre upland portion of Area "A", as opposed to the surrounding ±250 acre regulated wetlands and 100' adjacent area buffers. The State DEC regulatory apparatus of ECL Art. 24 has been in place since 1975 and there have been only limited applications to develop near the regulated wetlands since that time. In any event, no development or filling in or near wetlands is proposed for the Project and the DGEIS identified measures so that the regulated wetlands will not be adversely affected by the Project development or operation. Moreover, development near or within regulated wetlands may be permitted by the State DEC upon a sufficient showing of need and proposed mitigation. DEC Art. 24 regulation is a permit scheme rather than an outright prohibition of development.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 304 **(Ms. Marianne McGowan, Queensbury; written comments dated September 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "Six Flags (formerly Premier) was well aware of the constraints of the Great Escape when it was purchased. They purchased a landlocked park smack dab in the Glen Lake Watershed bordered by three residential communities. For Six Flags to propose an expansion of this magnitude in an environmentally sensitive area closely bordered by residential communities is unconscionable. As citizens we'd all like to have the freedom to make unencumbered changes to our properties. However, for the good of the town zoning laws exist which restrict unwise and intrusive development. This proposed expansion to benefit the Six Flags corporate coffers is unwise zoning development for the Town of Queensbury. Therefore, it is my belief that Six Flags DGEIS claim of negligible water quality, traffic, noise, stormwater management is flawed..."

RESPONSE 304

The Applicant contends that the DGEIS documents that the Park owns and manages sufficient non-sensitive lands in Park Areas C and A to build the proposed improvements without impacting the sensitive areas of its site which surround the developed core. The Planning Board will consider all factors related to environmental impact in reaching its decision on the project.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 305 **(Ms. Marianne McGowan, Queensbury; written comments dated September 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "the addition of 600,000 more visitors to the confined location of the Great Escape is simply too much for the sensitive environmental and residential area that surrounds Glen Lake. Sure, I'd like to build a 1,000 foot home on my 40 foot lake access lot on Glen Lake but Queensbury has zoning regulations that prevent this. However, if you'd give me a variance to build I could even rent it out and by doing so generate valuable tourism jobs and dollars for our community! Obviously I have not pursued this flawed endeavor because I realize that my lot is simply to[sic] small to build a home and also preserve lake quality. The same situation exists at the Great Escape. The usable land available to the Great Escape is simply too small to support that level of expansion AND most importantly preserve what's left of the Glen Lake ecosystem. Six Flags should not be allowed to bully the Town of Queensbury into approving an inappropriate expansion. The addition of minimum wage summer jobs will not offset the negative impact the expansion will have on Glen Lake, surrounding communities and the Town of Queensbury."

RESPONSE 305

The development proposed by applicant complies with existing zoning, unlike the example cited by Commenter. No variances from the zoning code or special permissions are being sought. The Applicant disagrees with the Commenter's assumptions that the Park does not have sufficient developable, non-sensitive land or that Glen Lake water quality is affected or threatened. See Responses 303-4, 407.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 306 **(Ms. Marianne McGowan, Queensbury; written comments dated September 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "Adding a 200 room hotel and parking on the land bordering Rt. 9 and the Northway will increase the already intolerable Rt. 9 traffic noise on surrounding communities – including Glen Lake. All area residents currently have for a noise buffer from Interstate 87 are the pine trees that border Rt. 87 and Rt.9. Removing these trees will make living in Courtyard Estates [sic] impossible. Take a walk their neighborhood one evening. All that is heard now is the unceasing overwhelming noise of Rt. 87."

RESPONSE 306

The available data suggests that any tree removal within Applicant's lands near the Route 9/I-87 corridors will not have a significant effect on propagation of traffic noise from those roads to receptor neighborhoods. See Response 6.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 307 **(Ms. Marianne McGowan, Queensbury; written comments dated September 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "Removing the buffering trees along Rt. 9 and within the park will increase the runoff into the Glen Lake fen by funneling additional nutrients and sediment into the lake."

RESPONSE 307

A comprehensive plan for stormwater management for Area C has been prepared. See DGEIS pages 2-15, 4-27-34 and Appendix 3.

See Response 61.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 308 **(Ms. Marianne McGowan, Queensbury; written comments dated September 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "Treated wastewater and stormwater runoff which can include oils, antifreeze etc from 1.5 MILLION VISITORS MUST NOT be deposited back into the Glen Lake Fen. Proper treatment of Sewage and stormwater runoff carrying a host of pollutants are difficult to treat properly. It is unlikely that a for profit corporation that has YET to be responsive to the surrounding community with no history of water treatment would run a plant properly. The Great Escape with its current increase in visitors must be forced to extend and tie into the Glens Falls sewage plant. Additionally, the Glen Lake area does not have access to a municipally treated water supply. Residents who rely on lake water for household use are at risk. Its [sic] about time Queensbury installs the infrastructure to support the development that already has occurred at the Great Escape, the Outlet Malls, and yes, at Glen Lake."

RESPONSE 308

See Responses 37 and 101.

DGEIS Reference: See pages DGEIS 4-27-34.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 309 **(Ms. Marianne McGowan, Queensbury; written comments dated September 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "The Great Escape is proposing increasing storm runoff by paving the parking lots. Even with the best of intentions paving will increase drainage into the Glen Lake ecosystem. There is already way too much improperly drained asphalt in that park. The park should be made to installing [sic] catch basins that feed tainted stormwater into the Glens Falls Sewer system. Paved parking simply is not needed. Additionally, the proposed ring road and sure to come paid parking will only aggravate traffic on Route 9 as people look for ways to avoid paying parking fees. Locals will spend twice as much time on Rt. 9 shuttling people back and forth."

RESPONSE 309

It is not feasible to discharge stormwater to the Glens Falls sewage treatment plant or any publicly owned wastewater treatment plant. During the past twenty years, the Federal Clean Water Act has required the elimination of stormwater discharges into sewage treatment plants. See Traffic Study Appendix 4 of the DGEIS for a discussion of traffic issues.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 310 **(Ms. Marianne McGowan, Queensbury; written comments dated September 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "A 200 foot amusement park ride simply is incompatible with the surrounding community which borders the Adirondack Park. It would be approx. twice as high as the tallest building in Glens Falls which is considered an out of place eyesore."

RESPONSE 310

The tallest building in Glens Falls is an isolated tall structure that is devoid of surrounding mature vegetation and any other tall structures. Such a structure would be considered to have a more significant adverse visual impact. When a tall ride at the Park is considered within the context of the area of the Park already developed with similar rides and tall structures, and which contains a significant covering of mature vegetation, the potential visual impact represents a consolidation of visual effects. Refer to FGEIS Section 4.3, "Visual Analysis 2000 - 2001," which augments the March 2000 study and defines an area within the Park that is suitable for development of tall rides without resulting in substantial adverse impact.

DGEIS Reference: See Response 29

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 311 **(Ms. Marianne McGowan, Queensbury; written comments dated September 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "For those of us who hear the unceasing never ending noise for three years of the Alpine Bobsled from May through October already know about the noise impact the park has had on our homes. Housing values have decreased and the sound is never-ending and maddening. Since the Bobsled installation I wish I lived near the Albany airport – it would be much quieter at least I'd get a noise break between park takeoffs."

"To summarize this point I'm not from Missouri but I believe the Bobsled issue has demonstrated to the Town and citizens of Queensbury how it conducts its business with the town. First the residents' noise concerns were ignored; and then a [sic] ill advised failed solution was tried to placate its citizens while attempting to push through expansion. Before any future 'enhancements' at the Great Escape are allowed the noise from the Bobsled must stop. If it takes removal so be it. Noise of this magnitude on communities would not be permitted by any other business. Its [sic] time Queensbury adopted some tools to shut the Bobsled noise down and prevent this from happening again."

RESPONSE 311

The Great Escape has been working on reducing the noise levels from the Bobsled since the complaints were made and it was discovered that the sound was unique and readily identifiable. The ride was installed in 1998. Sound engineering studies were made in 1999 and remediation was started in 2000. To date over $125,000 has been spent on sound attenuation measures at the Bobsled. The Great Escape has indicated its commitment to continue to take steps to address noise issues.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 312 **(Ms. Marianne McGowan, Queensbury; written comments dated September 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "Once a traffic light is installed at Glen Lake Road park traffic will end up on Glen Lake Road from those visitors coming from northwest of the park (Vermont, Washington County) to avoid 149/Rt.9 and gain easy entrance to the proposed parking lots. Glen Lake is a hilly, twisty road with a 35 mile a [sic] hour speed limit that is NOT enforced. Most importantly the Warren County Bike Path has a BLIND road grade crossing at Glen Lake when going north towards Lake George. Under the current proposal of a traffic light at Glen Lake road will result in more park traffic on Glen Lake road which will exacerbate difficult crossing with cars coming around curves at between 45-50 miles an hour that you cannot see and cannot see you."

RESPONSE 312

See Response 251.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section G.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 313 **(Mr. Stephen L. Johnson, Queensbury; written comments dated October 2, 2000):**

Commenter states that the DGEIS "directly addresses improved visitor accommodation" and "several impacts discussed appear to address improved transient accommodation while diverting attention from more substantial issues relevant to the indigenous population."

RESPONSE 313

Comment noted. It is impossible to respond to Commenter's claim that unidentified impacts relevant to the "indigenous population" outside of the scoping statement for this EIS exist which have not been properly assessed.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 314 **(Mr. Stephen L. Johnson, Queensbury; written comments dated October 2, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to Traffic Impacts, "Existing public roadways, other than Interstate 87, were not planned [n]or are they constructed, to allow the traffic flow anticipated by the Park. Residential roadways in the vicinity of the Park have recently become heavily traveled by commercial and other drivers wishing to avoid Rt. 9 congestion in the miles before and after the Park. Traffic volumes along all local roadways East of I87, North of Aviation and Quaker roads, South of Route 149, and West of Bay Rd. during Park actual peak and nadir [sic] attendance should be empirically determined. Implications differ with presentation methods. Therefore actual measurements, counts, and tangible evidence must determine impacts. Knowledge of traffic volumes during December and January should be compared with traffic volume July and August to judge the impact of Park operation."

RESPONSE 314

The Scoping Document lists the roadways for which detailed analysis was required. Actual measurements and traffic counts were conducted at the locations and during the timeframes determined by the Town's scoping document. The geographic limits of the potentially affected Study Area were agreed upon during scoping with extensive public notice and participation per SEQR's optional "scoping" procedures and input from involved agencies such as the NYSDOT. The areas cited by Commenter were determined by the Planning Board and the Applicant to be outside the Study Area during scoping, in compliance with NYSDOT procedure and SEQR, to properly focus the traffic studies for the EIS on the roadways and intersections judged potentially affected.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 1, Page 2; Appendix 4, Chapter II.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 315 **(Mr. Stephen L. Johnson, Queensbury; written comments dated October 2, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to water quality impacts, "Addition of paved parking lots, the proposed 'ring road', and removal of existing vegetation will increase run off from land beneath these environmental modifications. Introduction of subsurface 'infiltration galleries' mentioned will quite likely control surface water run off. A major concern is the direct infiltration of a large quantity of water (previously taken up, used and exhausted by vegetation) directly into the existing watershed. This infiltrated water, from roads and parking surfaces, will contain much oil by-product contamination that will have an effect on the natural 'digestive process' of the wetland fen downstream from the Park and upstream to Glen Lake. Disturbance of the elements that 'feed' the fen will alter functioning in a bio-geographic area that works like a natural liver or kidney with water entering Glen Lake. Atrophy or luxuriate growth in the fen will change the water quality in Glen Lake."

RESPONSE 315

The stormwater management plan addresses both the quantity and quality of the stormwater. The role of vegetation has already been assessed in the DGEIS discussion of stormwater treatment. Overall, stormwater is not anticipated to be significantly changed as a result of the project (see page 4-32 of the DGEIS). Nevertheless, it is the Planning Board's intention to require a sampling program.

Sampling upstream of the wetland located on Great Escape property and at the discharge indicates the amount of nutrients entering the wetland are reduced by the wetland. Sampling data of Glen Lake indicates a lake in balance with the nutrient load. Total phosphorus and nitrogen sampling of Glen Lake resemble that of a potable water supply. It is hard to quantify the total pounds of nutrient assimilated by the trees, but the amounts assimilated are assumed to be naturally occurring in the soil and the stormwater run-off plan addresses the prevention of nutrient latent runoff. Those areas will be seeded with grass thus addressing the concerns of excessive runoff. As for grease and oil, the Planning Board may choose to require the use of swirl concentrators or other devices to improve stormwater quality. A normally functioning wetland will grow the necessary vegetation to assimilate the nutrient loads, algae and plants grow and die as the nutrient levels change with the increase and decrease of runoff. The wastewater facility will not add to the nutrient loading because of its design and the ultimate discharge point being subsurface.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 316 **(Mr. Stephen L. Johnson, Queensbury; written comments dated October 2, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to water quality impacts, "The proposed 'state of the art tertiary sewage treatment plant' seems able to process waste water into 'virtually drinking water quality' effluent, as the Park's DGEIS Executive Summary...states. Many people live around Glen Lake and downstream from the Park. These Town of Queensbury residents actually, rather than virtually, use water that has passed through the Park before passing to them. Would the Park willingly serve its own treated waste water to its guests?"

RESPONSE 316

The wastewater treatment facility is to be equipped with processes that currently are used in potable water filtration facilities. The filter design has 7 ft. of 1.4 mm silica sand. A chemical coagulant is added prior to the filtration process and the treated effluent is disinfected with chlorine. It then passes into a second filter with 5 ft of 0.9 mm silica sand. The resulting effluent will possess in excess of log – 3 removal of the protozoan giardia and cryptosporidium, as well as 100% kill of coliform bacteria, and the turbidity will be less than 0.1. These are the standards for surface drinking water, and it is after the water is treated to such high standards that it will be discharged into infiltration galleries for additional treatment in the soil. The Great Escape is currently permitted to discharge in excess of 45,000+ gallons per day of septic tank effluent into the soil, with this load currently being treated with subsurface fields and there is no negative impact occurring to the wetland or Glen Lake, as previously stated. Surely with the discharge improvements that include a 90-95+% reduction in BOD5, total suspended solids, coliform, NH3, PO4, giardia, cryptosporidium and other contaminants the subsurface treatment will cause considerably less concern than what is currently in operation. The current systems appear to have no impact to the wetland and Glen Lake as demonstrated by the data supplied by NYSDEC.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 317 **(Mr. Stephen L. Johnson, Queensbury; written comments dated October 2, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to water quality impacts, "Rather than undergo complexities duplicating existing sewage treatment facilities, using the funds earmarked for building a plant to simply pipe effluent to existing municipal facilities would protect area residents, visitors, natural habitats, the beauty of the Glen Lake fen, Glen Lake, and attractive residential areas near the Park."

RESPONSE 317

The funding of the wastewater facility is not the issue, getting a consensus and undertaking planning, permitting, environmental review and engineering efforts between two municipalities and many landowners, and expanding or creating a new sewer district, and the long "lead times" involved, is the issue. The Great Escape therefore is going ahead with the on-site facility design and has agreed to connect with a municipal sewer system, if one ever becomes available.

Refer to DGEIS Section 7.4, Alternative 5.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 318 **(Mr. Stephen L. Johnson, Queensbury; written comments dated October 2, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to visual impacts, "Proposals to modify existing topography by leveling hills and creating increased visibility from I87 (identified at one time as America's Most Scenic Highway) seems a flagrant visual impact. Efforts should be directed toward a public ideal of visibility. That is, maintaining Route I87 as a non-commercial corridor of respite from intrusive visual invasion. Could the Park use some concept like "Invisible From Outside" to guide their expansion?"

RESPONSE 318

See Response 320.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 319 **(Mr. Stephen L. Johnson, Queensbury; written comments dated October 2, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to visual impacts, "Night lighting is proposed to be less intrusive than 'Aviation Mall and other commercial parking lots in Town', however the writers fail to note topographic differences in sight lines between Park or 'other commercial' areas".

RESPONSE 319

The Applicant did not undertake, and the Planning Board did not require, a full comparative assessment of potential visual impacts of local commercial parking lots at night. The quoted statement in the DEIS meant to point out that less illumination would be required than in the typical retail use, thus reducing potential visual impacts and improving the appearance of the lots in the professional views of most planning and architectural experts.

The Great Escape parking lots are in a valley setting which is not readily visible from the surrounding area due to intervening hill sides. There will be no "theme" lighting of rides above tree line, except for lighting necessary to facilitate emergency evacuations.

The Planning Board will review the height of the proposed light fixtures and may require lower fixtures.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 320 **(Mr. Stephen L. Johnson, Queensbury; written comments dated October 2, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to visual impacts, "page iv of the Executive Summary for DGEIS for the Park states that modifications in 'existing established area of the Park (Park Area A) will not be visible from outside the Park.' Will Park areas identified with other letters [e.g. Areas B and C] be visible? Could the Park use some concept like 'Invisible From Outside' to guide their expansion?"

RESPONSE 320

The potential visibility of the development proposed in Park Area C, and the measures proposed to mitigate such impacts, are described in the DGEIS in Sections 2.1.1, 2.1.8, 4.3.3, 4.9.1, 4.9.2, and 4.9.3. No development is proposed in Park Area B. The Park would not be able to use a concept like "Invisible from Outside" to guide the proposed improvements with respect to adjacent highway corridors because of the inherent nature of development in the Park and the character of the surrounding terrain. The existing Park is visible from I-87 and Route 9 and cannot be completely screened due to grades and viewsheds.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 321 **(Mr. Stephen L. Johnson, Queensbury; written comments dated October 2, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to visual impacts, "Rides with elevations above existing tree cover appear to allow clear sight of those rides from most areas surrounding the Park; that is, Glen Lake surface NE of the Park and I87 to the West. Could the Park use some sort of concept like 'Invisible From Outside' to guide their expansion?"

RESPONSE 321

See Response 320. See FGEIS Section 4.1

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 322 **(Mr. Stephen L. Johnson, Queensbury; written comments dated October 2, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to auditory impacts, "Because sounds (i.e. spoken words, music, machinery) base much human activity discussion about 'auditory impacts' often becomes obfuscated. Judging the actuality of audible impacts before sounds are made is difficult. The Park asserts its project, 'will not have adverse visual or audible noise impacts…' 'Adversity' requires evaluation of visual and auditory intent. Similarly with visual impacts some principle like, 'Inaudible From Outside the Park' could guide impact measurement."

RESPONSE 322

The Applicant's noise studies and EIS impact discussion are based on accepted assessment methodology and HUD/EPA standards. These standards do not assume that merely being able to perceive a noise necessarily means that noise is a significant impact incompatible with residential neighborhoods or likely to elicit substantial community noise objections. See Response 3 for a discussion of the Planning Board's intentions with respect to noise monitoring.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 323 **(Mr. Stephen L. Johnson, Queensbury; written comments dated October 2, 2000):**

Commenter states, "The Park in its several iterations over decades, is debatably the first or second oldest in the country; this gives it historical value. Many other parks throughout the world emulate its success. The Park has grown from a small attraction for children into a multimillion-dollar tourist Mecca employing many people. The Park provides sensations and experience sought by many but not all people. Large numbers of people go past the Park in preference for less humanly created attractions visible only in this part of the world; Northern NY and the Adirondacks."

RESPONSE 323

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 324 **(Mr. Stephen L. Johnson, Queensbury; written comments dated October 2, 2000):**

Commenter states, "Measurement of sensible effects created by the Park seems central to the Environmental Impact issue…What impacts exist with, and without, park operation?…traffic flow, water usability, area appearance, area ambient sounds…Undoubtedly the park will create differences in these four conceptual areas. To what degree will history accept these changes?"

"Modification of the existing has robust implications. As a private enterprise that invites others to visit this area, the Park has an obligation to the indigenous public. That obligation, stated simply and directly in a family situation might sound like: 'Yes, you can invite your friends over for a party. Have fun, but remember; don't block the driveway, don't make a mess, clean up after yourself, and don't disturb the neighbors.'"

RESPONSE 324

Comment noted. The Planning Board and the Applicant share the Commenter's desire to minimize impacts from operation of the Great Escape.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 325 **(Ms. Rosanne Meyers, 60 Sweet Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 6, 2000):**

Commenter states, "I feel that any further expansion of the Great Escape amusement park would result in more noise, more traffic and more devastation to the surrounding landscape, wetland and the quality of life of our community."

RESPONSE 325

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 326 **(Ms. Rosanne Meyers, 60 Sweet Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 6, 2000):**

Commenter states, "The Great Escape would like to extend its parking area by clearing land on Round Pond Road as well as leveling and clearing the hill to the Samoset Motel. The open spaces caused by this butchering will increase noise levels from the park as well as the Northway. Who wants to hear more rides, more screaming people and more traffic? It[']s not right for residents living near, and not-so-near, the park to have to tolerate more clamor and more destruction to the natural beauty of our area."

RESPONSE 326

The Great Escape property is zoned for amusements. The local master plans and zoning have determined that residential uses are compatible with the Recreational/Commercial zone. The purpose of this GEIS is to explore ways to allow the Park to operate without causing significant adverse impact to surrounding uses. See also Response 6.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 327 **(Ms. Rosanne Meyers, 60 Sweet Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 6, 2000):**

Commenter states, "The park's draft suggests traffic lights be installed on Route 9 at Glen Lake Road and Round Pond Road. Who wants to sit through more traffic lights?"

RESPONSE 327

It is unlikely that the traffic volumes exiting the existing Great Escape driveways will be high enough to warrant a traffic signal, after the proposed access plan is implemented. The two traffic signals proposed at Glen Lake Road and Round Pond Road would replace the existing traffic signals at the Great Escape site driveways. There would thus not be any additional traffic signals on Route 9 as a result of the proposed expansions, only their relocation to better control traffic.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section G.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 328 **(Ms. Rosanne Meyers, 60 Sweet Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 6, 2000):**

Commenter states, "A pedestrian tunnel or bridge at the park's Route 9 entrance is an improvement I feel is needed."

RESPONSE 328

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 329 **(Ms. Rosanne Meyers, 60 Sweet Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 6, 2000):**

Commenter states, "The expansion of the Great Escape would raise attendance from 900,000 to 1.5 million. Who will be paying for the wear and tear on our roads from the excessive amount of traffic? Who wants to BE in this traffic? Who wants to HEAR this traffic? Who wants to see rides and parking lots instead of the current forests along Route 9 and Round Pond Road?"

RESPONSE 329

Route 9 is well within its design capacity both at present and at the proposed Park "build out". It was recently resurfaced in 1999 by NYSDOT as part of the NYSDOT capital improvement project and is not in need of extraordinary care or maintenance. The visual and noise impacts of the Project are discussed in the DGEIS. Existing "forests" buffering road corridors on Route 9 and Round Pond Road are not proposed to be removed.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 330 **(Ms. Rosanne Meyers, 60 Sweet Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 6, 2000):**

Commenter states, "The Park proposes to build an on-site sewage treatment plant and install pipes to release its stormwater runoff. What [e]ffect will the proposed changes have on Glen Lake? Whose principal water source runs through the Great Escape? The quality of the water for Glen Lake should take [rest is cut off]"

RESPONSE 330

See Response 316.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 331 **(Ms. Rosanne Meyers, 60 Sweet Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 6, 2000):**

Commenter states, "Supporters of the Great Escape expansion claim that it will provide more jobs. Do we really need more low-paying seasonal jobs when the classifieds contain pages upon pages of jobs of this nature?"

RESPONSE 331

Sound public policy would suggest that increasing employment opportunities is generally good. Seasonal or part-time jobs will appeal to many sectors of the labor market such as youth and retirees. The Project will also provide a significant number of new highly paid full-time craft and managerial jobs.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 332 **(Ms. Rosanne Meyers, 60 Sweet Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 6, 2000):**

Commenter states, "The Adirondack Regional Chambers of Commerce feels that the park expansion would 'increase the economic strength and, thus the quality of life in the region.' Do they think most people are going to have any time or money left after visiting the Great Escape to patronize local businesses? The Great Escape expansion is not necessary – it is for the park's benefit. If the Great Escape park grows so will its noise, its traffic, and its overbearingness for residents – not a good 'quality of life' feature to brag about."

RESPONSE 332

Economic data and testimony of other businesses in the DGEIS suggest that Park visitors spend significant time and money patronizing other businesses in the area.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 333 **(Ms. Rosanne Meyers, 60 Sweet Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 6, 2000):**

Commenter states, "Current conditions at the Great Escape amusement park are not very amusing, and should be improved before any expansions are allowed. Many of the animals for display are enclosed in miserable living conditions. The 'Storytown' section is run down with many attractions that should be restored or replaced. Instead of getting bigger, the park should strive to improve the quality of its attractions within its current size."

RESPONSE 333

The Park has and continues to refurbish and upgrade attractions in Park Area A. The petting zoo and animals therein are properly cared for by qualified veterinarians and maintained in accordance with accepted humane standards. Despite Commenter's apparent lack of satisfaction with her visits to the park, attendance levels continue to grow, indicating that many members of the general public do not share Commenter's views.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 334 **(Ms. Rosanne Meyers, 60 Sweet Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 6, 2000):**

Commenter states, "I think most people feel that the Great Escape amusement park is big enough and the proposed expansion is too massive. Crammed within wetlands, lakes and residential area, the park must consider the needs and concerns of its neighbors. I hope our community leaders will listen to the people they serve by stopping the Great Escape from becoming a 'Great Mistake,' and preserving the trueness of our Queensbury motto: 'Home of natural beauty…a good place to live.'"

RESPONSE 334

The Applicant does not believe that a 90 acre developed area surrounded by a 250 acre wetlands buffer on its own property is "crammed in", especially if compared to the more intensive land uses typical of an area which is more urbanized and nearer larger population centers.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 335 **(Mr. George J. Stec, 245 Butler Pond Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 10, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to traffic impacts, "The proposed ring-road and any changes with the existing roads will not bear the increased traffic. Improvements to the current and proposed increase in traffic will be just that – improvements, but not a solution! The geographic location of the park itself dictates the corridors of ingress and egress. Its location at the bottom of a geographic bowl with only north and south approaches. Venturing into the perimeter of the bowl is encroaching into the residential neighborhood of Twicwood, Glen Lake and Courthouse Estates."

RESPONSE 335

Comment noted. The adequacy of proposed system-wide transportation improvements will be determined by NYSDOT, which has reviewed and concurred with the recommendations of this GEIS. The residential subdivisions mentioned were sited in the 1970's and 1980's in a suburban context near established highways, municipal and commercial uses. The essential character of these areas has not changed since those subdivisions were sited. Their surroundings were never typical of a rural or pastoral community, but of a busy suburban community.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 336 **(Mr. George J. Stec, 245 Butler Pond Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 10, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to the proposed parking improvements, "these will concentrate and cause an increase in storm water runoff. How will all the oil, antifreeze, brake-fluids, grease, etc., from the automobiles be contained and prevented from entering the Glen Lake ecosystem? What is your storm water management plan?"

RESPONSE 336

See Response 315.

DGEIS Reference: See pages 4-28 - 4-33 and Appendix 3.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 337 **(Mr. George J. Stec, 245 Butler Pond Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 10, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to wastewater disposal, "the only solution to this problem is to ship it out of the park altogether via a municipal sewage pipe. There is a regional built sewage treatment plant in the City of Glens Falls. There is in place a sewer line within a few miles of the park. Connecting into this municipal sewer system is paramount to any other proposal. This is a permanent solution to a very serious problem. Why is this not being done?"

RESPONSE 337

See Responses 98 and 175. The alternative of public sewer has been thoroughly discussed and evaluated in accordance with SEQR's procedures in both the DGEIS and this FEIS.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 338 **(Mr. George J. Stec, 245 Butler Pond Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 10, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to noise impacts, "the adjoining residential communities definitely should be accommodated in not having their current quality of life compromised by increased noise both during the day and night and over a longer period of time by an extended season. Eliminate or minimize this by shorter hours of the day and a shorter season."

RESPONSE 338

See Response 3.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 339 **(Mr. George J. Stec, 245 Butler Pond Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 10, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to economic impacts, "there are some [benefits] but not as great as your comments in the DGEIS states. When one looks at the potential depreciated value of the homes in the residential areas adjoining the park, I see big losses of property values guaranteed. What is proposed to compensate these people for the property value decrease?"

RESPONSE 339

There is no indication that property values in the residential areas adjoining the Park will be depreciated. Real estate sales data indicates that adjoining commercial development has not hurt residential property values and that property values in the adjacent neighborhoods have appreciated at levels at or above regional averages. See FEIS Section 4.7 which is a study of real estate sales data for neighborhoods within the Study Area undertaken in the summer of 2000.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 340 **(Mr. George J. Stec, 245 Butler Pond Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 10, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to economic impacts, "The taxpayers living in the Queensbury School District will not benefit from the proposed expansion as the park lies within the Lake George School District. Queensbury will get the problems generated by the expansion but the Lake George School District will get the financial rewards. What benefit will the Queensbury School District receive?"

RESPONSE 340

The location of the Park within the Lake George School District as opposed to a Queensbury school district is a governmental decision of the State Legislature which is not within the Park's prerogative to control. The Town of Queensbury and Warren County will also receive substantial increases in ad valorem real property and sales tax receipts far in excess of incremental public services burdens, as documented in the DGEIS.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 341 **(Mr. George J. Stec, 245 Butler Pond Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 10, 2000):**

Commenter states, "The sales tax on $33.00 ticket is .6% - not the 7% that the DGEIS implies. Why not increase this tax to pay for the connection to the municipal sewage line?"

RESPONSE 341

Any change in sales or other tax assessments must be approved by the State Legislature. It is unclear whether such a special sales tax could be enacted even as a "home rule" measure. Other, more conventional ways exist to finance public sewer improvements which would not require special enabling legislation, such as sewer district formation under Town or County laws, which have the further benefit of well-defined and more readily implemented procedures.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 342 **(Mr. George J. Stec, 245 Butler Pond Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 10, 2000):**

Commenter asks with respect to the trade show convention center facility, "why include this when one is being proposed for being located in the Village of Lake George? Why not make a substantial 'donation' to ensure its existence? This consideration would definitely help the 'region' and certainly take off additional pressures on the park[']s environment. Economics come and go but the environment will always be there. Pure and pristine or polluted!"

RESPONSE 342

The Applicant takes no position on the relative merits, environmental or otherwise, of siting the proposed convention center in Lake George or within the Project development. It is not a proponent of locating the facility at the Park, but rather simply made an offer of land if a local government wanted to use it. Additionally, the Applicant reviewed the impacts of that alternative development scenario as part of this EIS process.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 343 **(Mr. George J. Stec, 245 Butler Pond Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 10, 2000):**

Commenter asks with respect to visual impacts, "why is the limit of visible impacts only to the close proximity of the park as illustrated in the DGEIS? In volume I, page iv, paragraph 4, the statement is made 'while virtually all modified development in the existing established are of the park (Park Area A), will not be visible from outside the park, this EIS also studies the potential for new attractions such as rides to create visual impacts.' My home is two miles from the park and I can clearly see 6 rides protruding above the trees already. I find these offensive and definitely marring the landscape from mine as well as others['] point[s] of view living away from the park."

RESPONSE 343

The DGEIS Primary Study Area was defined during scoping (as shown as an approximate circle around the Project in DGEIS Fig. 1-1, Project Location Map) as the area where the most potentially significant environmental impacts could occur and where the environmental impact studies for this Project should accordingly be focused. As shown on Fig. 1-1, the Primary Study Area is a circle with an approximately one mile radius from the Park lands which comprise the Project. For the potential visual impacts with which the Commenter is concerned, the Primary Study Area included the three residential neighborhoods near the Park as well as the Northway and Route 9 travel corridors adjacent to the Park. As noted in many comments, the primary visual impact of concern was that of additional tall structures inside the developed amusement park and their potential effect on the Glen Lake viewshed, including the Warren County Bike Path and the Glens Falls County Club properties. The concern therefore evaluated was the potential visibility of tall structures within the Park on the near- and mid-field viewsheds in the Glen Lake area.

By contrast, this Comment refers to potential far-ground views of Park structures from areas well outside the defined Primary Study Area, such as elevated areas on West Mountain more than two miles from the Project where the Commentor's residence is located. Such impact evaluation is well outside of the agreed-upon scoping and study area definitions agreed upon before the DGEIS was prepared. Additionally, as discussed above, it is reasonable to assume conceptually that potential visibility in <u>far-field</u> views such as Commentor's location can categorically be determined to <u>not</u> constitute a significant adverse visual impact. From the Commentor's vantage point, not only would such structures appear to be relatively small in their relationship to other nearby vegetation and structures, but would also be perceived in the context of other built objects typical of the developed Glens Falls area skyline, such as tall buildings (e.g., CNA Building), industrial smokestacks and the similar structures. Nevertheless, the Planning Board acknowledges the Commenter's concerns.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 344 **(Mr. George J. Stec, 245 Butler Pond Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 10, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to biological environmental resources, "In volume 1, page iv, paragraph 2, there is a statement that reads, 'No protected species of plants or animals exist on the site.' In the same volume page 3-5, paragraph 5, the first sentence states table 3-2 'Flora of the Great Escape Lands East of Interstate 87,' lists the scientific names of all plants identified...in Park Areas A and C. On page 3-10 , there appears in this list wild lupine, scientific name Lupinus perennis. This plant 'is the only known food plant for the larvae' of the Karner Blue Butterfly (Lycaeides Melissa samuelis), an endangered species."

"In volume 3 of the DGEIS, appendix 5, Letters of Record, there is a letter from the U.S. Department of the Interior dated January 11, 2000, and addressed to Dr. Richard P. Futyima of the LA group. That letter deals with the endangered species the Karner Blue butterfly. I quote paragraph 5, 'An evolution of existing habitat at the respective project sites, and its potential to support the Karner Blue butterfly or wild lupine, should be completed. If the evolution indicates that the site has the potential to support the Karner Blue butterfly or its habitat, the site should be surveyed by a qualified person to determine the presence or absence of this species.' By your own admission you have listed the wild lupines as growing in Park Areas A and C!!"

"The following paragraph [in the January 11, 2000 letter] states 'the respective projects environmental documents should identify any direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts on the Karner Blue butterfly or its habitat, and include appropriate measures if necessary, to protect this species and its habitat.' The letter states that the information gathered should be forwarded to its office for evaluation for its potential impact on the Karner Blue butterfly or its habitat 'to determine the need for further consultation pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act."

RESPONSE 344

Wild lupine plants (*Lupinus perennis*) were found at only one location within the project area. More precisely, the plants were found outside of the property acquired by Great Escape, within the NYSDOT-owned land adjacent to US Route 9. They were all concentrated in a narrow strip about 100 feet long, within a power line right-of-way. Signs posted by Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation within that segment of the right-of-way identify it as a habitat preservation area.

Since this wild lupine colony exists off the property controlled by the Great Escape, it will not be the site of any proposed construction for the theme park. Also, the lupine colony is situated on a steep slope, within 20 feet of the pavement on the west side of US Route 9. According to the plan proposed by the Great Escape, a parking lot would be constructed about 30 feet west of the lupines. This parking lot will replace an area of woodland, lawns, and tourist cabins, which does not offer any significant resources for Karner Blue butterflies. If any Karner Blue butterflies exist in this lupine patch, it is unlikely that they will be subjected to a decrease in their resource base or increased mortality from human activities. Because of these various factors, no additional studies were undertaken.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 345 **(Mr. George J. Stec, 245 Butler Pond Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 10, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to biological environmental resources, "There is on file in the planning department of the Town of Queensbury a report prepared by Michael S. Batcher, M.S., consulting Ecological and Environmental Planner. The report was prepared March 15, 1998, and its title is 'Report on 1997 Survey for Lupine (Lupinus perennis) Sites and Karner Blue butterfly (Lycaeides Melissa samuelis) Populations IN the Town of Queensbury, Warren County, New York.' In this report there are six (6) lupine sites that have been identified and mapped that basically encircle the Great Escape's properties. Site No. 1 is located on Rt. 9 on tax I.D. parcel $74-1-8, which is the Samoset property owned by the Great Escape and scheduled for development as part of Park Area C!! Site No. 4, identified as the 'I87 North Site' is located in Park Area B...These two sites alone, not to mention the other 4 sites are examples and proof enough that the whole land holdings constituting the Great Escape Park should be resurveyed to locate and identify the lupine plant – the only known food plant for the Karner Blue butterfly larvae. Within the last 5 years or so, Park Area C, the proposed site for the park[']s expansion has been heavily logged thus improving the site for the expansion of the lupine habitat. Again, I redirect your attention to paragraph 5 in the letter from the U.S. Department of the Interior dated January 11, 2000, and addressed to Dr. Richard P. Futyma of the L.A. Group which requires a reevaluation and/or survey of the site. My question is, has this been done? The N.Y.S. Department of Environmental Conservation should also be contacted on this very critical issue and a survey requested."

RESPONSE 345

Park Area C was surveyed for general vegetation and rare or important plants, such as wild lupines, at the same time that wetland boundaries were delineated, in the middle of June and early July of 1999. This was during the time period when wild lupines were in bloom, or at least identifiable by their vegetative parts. All areas of open vegetation, of the sort in which lupines typically grow, were examined carefully. The only spot where lupines were found corresponds to site No. 1 in the report mentioned by the Commenter. Contrary to the statement by the Commenter, the map in the report by Michael S. Batcher shows this patch of lupines to exist on New York State lands that are part of the right-of-way for US Route 9, and not on the adjacent land owned by Great Escape (i.e., tax parcel 74.-1-8). Similarly, site No. 4 in Batcher's report lies in the median of Interstate 87, and not on the lands of Great Escape (Park Area B).

According to the report by Batcher, as well as information obtained from the NY Natural Heritage Program of NYSDEC, Karner Blue butterflies have never been found in either of these patches of lupines.

At the time of the vegetation survey, only one patch of approximately 0.5 acre in Park Area C was found to have been logged recently. This area was examined, but no lupines were found growing there, nor did it look like prime lupine habitat because of the amount of slash on the ground and the tall herbaceous plants growing there, which would tend to shade out lupines.

The vegetation of Park Area A was studied in mid-October of 1999, at the time when wetland boundaries were delineated in that area. At that time of year, lupines were no longer green and easily seen, but had withered and died. Nonetheless, it was still possible to identify any open, herb-dominated areas with sandy, disturbed soils, which are the preferred habitat for wild lupines. Densely forested areas, such as those covering most of the undeveloped parts of Park Areas A and C, are not suitable for lupines because they are too well-shaded for these sun-loving plants. The few, small areas of open vegetation in Park Area A showed no indications of the presence of lupines or of plants typically associated with them.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 346 (Mr. George J. Stec, 245 Butler Pond Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 10, 2000):

Commenter states with respect to the Wildlife Section of the DGEIS in Section 3.2.3, "paragraph 1 states, 'A list of wildlife observed on site, in addition to those which could potentially inhabit the site due to their regional occurrence and habitat preference, is presented in Table 303.' When you look at the Table which is very lengthy, there are three columns, one is common name, the second...is Scientific name, with a #1, and the third column is Habitat with a #2. The tables lists I, AYIFAUNA, II, MAMMANLIAN FAUNA, III, REPTILIAN AND AMPHIBIAN FAUNA. These basically are birds, mammals, reptiles, snakes, frogs, salamanders and turtles. At the end of the table there is a key that indicates what the numbers represent, #1 representing the taxonomy (common and scientific name), #2, Habitat types and #3, which was not part of the table, as indicating 'species observed during on-site investigation.' My question is, of all the wildlife listed, what species were actually observed by the LA Group biologist? How many times did they visit the site and at what times of year?"

RESPONSE 346

The indicators of the species that were observed on the site were accidentally left out of Table 3-3. A revised version of the table, including species observed during wetland delineation and vegetation survey work, is presented on the following pages. The visits occurred on June 15, July 7 and 8, October 12 and 13, and December 3, 1999.

Table 3-3
Potential Wildlife Occurring on The Great Escape Properties

Common Name	Scientific Name[1]	Habitat[2]
I. AVIFAUNA		
American Bittern	*Botaurus lentiginosus*	WL, AQ
Great Blue Heron	*Ardea herodias*	MF, WL, AQ
Green-Backed Heron	*Butorides striatus*	MF, WL, AQ
Wood Duck	*Aix sponsa*	MF, WL, AQ
American Black Duck	*Anas rubripes*	WL, AQ
Mallard Duck	*Anas platyrhynchos*	WL, AQ
Turkey Vulture	*Cathartes aura*	OF, MF
Northern Harrier	*Circus cyaneus*	WL, MF
Red-Tailed Hawk	*Buteo jamaicensis*	OF, MF
American Kestrel	*Falco sparverius*	OF, MF
Ring-Necked Pheasant	*Phasianus colchicus*	AG, OF
Ruffed Grouse	*Bonasa umbellus*	OF, MF
Wild Turkey	*Meleagris gallopavo*	AG, OF, MF
American Crow[3]	*Corvus brachyrhynchos*	AG, OF, MF
Killdeer	*Charadrius vociferus*	AG, OF, AQ
Spotted Sandpiper	*Actitis macularia*	WL, AQ
Common Snipe	*Gallinago gallinago*	OF, MF, WL
American Woodcock	*Scalopax minor*	AG, OF, MF, WL
Rock Dove	*Columba livia*	AG, OF
Mourning Dove	*Zenaida macroura*	AG, OF
Yellow-billed Cuckoo	*Coccyzus americanus*	OF, MF
Common Barn-Owl	*Tyto alba*	OF, AG, WL
Common Nighthawk	*Chordeiles minor*	OF
Whip-poor-will	*Caprimulgus vociferus*	MF, OF
Ruby-Throated Hummingbird	*Archilochus colubris*	OF, MF
Belted Kingfisher	*Ceryle alcyon*	MF, WL, AQ
Downy Woodpecker	*Picoides pubescens*	OF, MF
Hairy Woodpecker	*Picoides villosus*	OF, MF, WL
Northern Flicker	*Colaptes auratus*	OF, MF
Pileated Woodpecker	*Dryocopus pileatus*	MF
Eastern Wood-Peewee	*Contopus virens*	OF, MF
Eastern Phoebe	*Sayornis phoebe*	MF, AQ
Great-Crested Flycatcher	*Myiarchus crinitus*	OF, MF, WL
Eastern Kingbird	*Tyrannus tyrannus*	OF, MF, AQ
Horned Lark	*Eremophila alpestris*	AG, OF
Tree Swallow	*Tachycineta bicolor*	OF, WL, AQ
Bank Swallow	*Riparia riparia*	AQ
Barn Swallow	*Hirundo rustica*	OF, AQ

Common Name	Scientific Name[1]	Habitat[2]
I. AVIFAUNA (continued)		
Blue Jay[3]	*Cyanocitta cristata*	OF, MF
Black-Capped Chickadee[3]	*Parus atricapillus*	OF, MF
Tufted Titmouse	*Parus bicolor*	MF, WL
Red-Breasted Nuthatch	*Sitta canadensis*	MF
White-Breasted Nuthatch	*Sitta carolinensis*	OF, MF, WL
House Wren	*Troglodytes aedon*	AG, OF, MF, WL
Winter Wren	*Troglodytes troglodytes*	MF, WL
Eastern Bluebird	*Sialia sialis*	AG, OF, WL
Veery	*Catharus fuscescens*	MF, WL
Wood Thrush	*Hylocichla mustelina*	MF, WL, AQ
American Robin[3]	*Turdus migratorius*	AG, OF, MF
Gray Catbird	*Dumetella carolinensis*	OF, MF, WL, AQ
Northern Mockingbird	*Mimus polyglottos*	OF
Brown Thrasher	*Toxostoma rufum*	OF, MF
Cedar Waxwing	*Bombycilla cedrorum*	OF, WL
European Starling	*Sturnus vulgaris*	AG, OF
Red-eyed Vireo	*Vireo olivaceus*	OF, MF
Yellow Warbler	*Dendroica petechia*	OF, SB
Chestnut-sided Warbler	*Dendroica pensylvanica*	OF, MF, SB
Yellow-rumped Warbler	*Dendroica coronata*	MF
Black-and-white Warbler	*Mniotilta varia*	MF
American Redstart	*Setophaga ruticilla*	MF, WL
Ovenbird	*Seiurus aurocapillus*	MF
Common Yellowthroat	*Geothlypis trichas*	OF, WL, SB, AQ
Scarlet Tanager	*Piranga olivacea*	MF
Northern Cardinal	*Cardinalis cardinalis*	OF, MF, WL, SB
Rose-Breasted Grosbeak	*Pheucticus ludovicianus*	OF, WL, SB
Indigo Bunting	*Passerina cyanea*	OF, SB
Eastern Towhee	*Pipilo erythrophthalmus*	OF, SB
Chipping Sparrow	*Spizella passerina*	OF
Song Sparrow	*Melospiza melodia*	OF, SB
Swamp Sparrow	*Melospiza georgiana*	OF, WL
White-throated Sparrow	*Zonotrichia albicollis*	MF, WL
Dark-Eyed Junco	*Junco hyemalis*	MF, SB
Bobolink	*Dolichonyx orizivorus*	AG, OF, WL
Red-Winged Blackbird	*Agelaicus phoeniceus*	AG, OF, SB, WL, AQ
Eastern Meadowlark	*Sturnella magna*	AG, OF
Common Grackle	*Quiscalus quiscula*	OF, MF, WL
Brown-Headed Cowbird	*Molothrus ater*	AG, OF, MF, WL
Baltimore Oriole	*Icterus galbula*	MF, SB
Purple Finch	*Carpodacus purpureus*	OF, MF

Common Name	Scientific Name[1]	Habitat[2]
I. AVIFAUNA (continued)		
House Finch	*Carpodacus mexicanus*	AG, OF
American Goldfinch	*Carduelis tristis*	AG, OF, SB, WL
House Sparrow	*Passer domesticus*	OF
II. MAMMALIAN FAUNA		
Opossum	*Didelphis virginiana*	AG, OF, MF, WL
Masked Shrew	*Sorex cinereus*	OF, MF
Long-Tailed Shrew	*Sorex dispar*	MF, OF, SB
Smokey Shrew	*Sorex fumeus*	OF, MF
Pygmy Shrew	*Sorex hoyi*	OF, MF, WL
Northern Water Shrew	*Sorex palustris*	OF, WL, AQ
Short-Tailed Shrew	*Blarina brevicauda*	OF, MF, WL
Hairy-Tailed Mole	*Parascalops breweri*	OF, MF, WL, AG
Star-Nosed Mole	*Condylura cristata*	AG, OF, MF, WL, AQ
Little Brown Bat	*Myotis lucifugus*	MF, AQ
Northern Myotis	*Myotis septentrionalis*	MF
Silver-Haired Bat	*Lasionycteris noctivagans*	MF, AQ, WL
Eastern Pipistrelle	*Pipistrellus subflavus*	AG, OF, MF, AQ
Big Brown Bat	*Eptesicus fuscus*	AG, OF, MF, AQ
Red Bat	*Lasiurus borealis*	MF
Hoary Bat	*Lasiurus cinereus*	MF
Eastern Cottontail	*Sylvilagus floridanus*	AG, OF, MF, WL
Snowshoe Hare	*Lepus americanus*	MF, WL
Eastern Chipmunk[3]	*Tamias striatus*	MF
Woodchuck	*Marmota monax*	AG, OF, MF
Gray Squirrel[3]	*Sciurus carolinensis*	MF
Red Squirrel	*Tamiasciurus hudsonicus*	MF, WL
Northern Flying Squirrel	*Glaucomys sabrinus*	MF
Southern Flying Squirrel	*Glaucomys volans*	MF
Beaver[3]	*Castor canadensis*	MF, WL, AQ
Woodland Jumping Mouse	*Napaeozapus insignis*	OF, MF, WL
White-Footed Mouse	*Peromyscus leucopus*	OF, MF
Deer Mouse	*Peromyscus maniculatus*	OF, MF
Southern Red-Backed Vole	*Clethrionomys gapperi*	MF, WL
Meadow Vole	*Microtus pennsylvanicus*	AG, OF, MF, WL
Woodland Vole	*Microtus pinetorum*	OF, MF
Muskrat	*Ondatra zibethicus*	WL, AQ
Southern Bog Lemming	*Synaptomys cooperi*	OF, MF,WL
House Mouse	*Mus musculus*	OF, AG
Porcupine	*Erithizon dorsatum*	OF, MF, WL, AQ

Common Name	Scientific Name[1]	Habitat[2]
II. MAMMALIAN FAUNA (continued)		
Coyote	*Canis latrans*	AG, OF, MF, WL
Red Fox	*Vulpes vulpes*	AG, OF, MF
Gray Fox	*Urocyon cinereoargenteus*	OF, MF
Raccoon	*Procyon lotor*	AG, OF, MF, WL, AQ
Short-tailed Weasel	*Mustela erminea*	OF, MF, WL
Long-tailed Weasel	*Mustela frenata*	OF, MF, WL
Mink	*Mustela vison*	AG, OF, MF, WL, AQ
Striped Skunk[3]	*Mephitis mephitis*	AG, OF, MF, WL, AQ
White-tailed Deer[3]	*Odocoileus virginianus*	AG, OF, MF, WL, AQ

Common Name	Scientific Name[1]	Habitat[2]
III. REPTILIAN AND AMPHIBIAN FAUNA		
Snapping Turtle	*Chelydra serpentina*	WL, AQ
Wood Turtle	*Clemmys insculpta*	AG, WL, AQ
Painted Turtle	*Chrysemys picta*	WL, AQ
Northern Water Snake	*Nerodia sipedon*	WL, AQ
Brown Snake	*Storeria dekayi*	OF, MF, WL
Redbelly Snake	*Storeria occipitomaculata*	OF, MF, WL
Common Garter Snake	*Thamnophis sirtalis*	AG, OF, MF, WL
Eastern Ribbon Snake	*Thamnophis sauritis*	WL, OF, AG
Northern Ringneck Snake	*Diadophis punctatus*	MF, OF, WL
Northern Black Racer	*Coluber constrictor*	OF, MF
Smooth Green Snake	*Opheodrys vernalis*	OF, MF
Rat Snake	*Elaphe obsoleta*	AG, OF, MF, WL
Milk Snake	*Lampropeltis triangulum*	AG, OF, MF, WL
Mudpuppy	*Necturus maculosus*	AQ, WL
Jefferson Salamander	*Ambystoma jeffersonianum*	WL, MF, AQ
Blue-Spotted Salamander	*Ambystoma laterale*	WL, MF, AQ
Spotted Salamander	*Ambystoma maculatum*	WL, MF, AQ
Eastern Newt	*Notophthalmus viridescens*	AQ, WL, MF
Dusky Salamander	*Desmognathus fuscus*	WL, MF, AQ
Redback Salamander	*Plethodon cinereus*	WL, MF
Four-Toed Salamander	*Hemidactylium scutatum*	WL, AQ, MF
Spring Salamander	*Gyrinophilus porphyriticus*	WL, MF, AQ
Two-Lined Salamander	*Eurycea bislineata*	WL, MF
American Toad	*Bufo americanus*	WL, AQ, MF, OF, AG
Gray Treefrog	*Hyla versicolor*	WL, AQ
Spring Peeper	*Pseudacris crucifer*	WL, AQ
Bullfrog	*Rana catesbeiana*	WL, AQ
Green Frog	*Rana clamitans*	WL, AQ
Wood Frog	*Rana sylvatica*	MF

Common Name	Scientific Name[1]	Habitat[2]
III. REPTILIAN AND AMPHIBIAN FAUNA (continued)		
Northern Leopard Frog	*Rana pipiens*	WL, AQ, OF
Pickerel Frog	*Rana palustris*	OF, WL, AQ

[1] Taxonomy and distribution data from Andrle and Carroll (1988), Hall (1981), Sutton and Sutton (1986), Conant and Collins (1998), Collins (1981), and Whittaker and Hamilton (1998).

[2] Habitat Types:
AG = Agricultural lands
AQ = Aquatic Habitats
MF = Mature Forest
OF = Old Field
SB = Shrublands
WL = wetland

[3] Species observed during on-site investigation

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS: Errata Corrected

COMMENT 347 **(Mr. George J. Stec, 245 Butler Pond Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 10, 2000):**

Commenter states, "There is in the Environmental Conservation Law (ECL) section 182.6, 'endangered species, threatened species of special concern.' The list has Malluses [sic], Insects, Fishes, Amphibians, Reptiles, Birds and Mammals. It is not just limited to birds, mammals and reptiles as indicated on Table 3-3...In the DEC list of species of special concern there appear 3 amphibians, one reptile and 3 birds that also appear on your Table 3-3!! These are the Jefferson salamander, Blue-spotted salamander, and Spotted salamander, all Amphibians. Also, the Wood turtle, a reptile and the common barn-owl, common night hawk and the Eastern bluebird, all birds. On the DEC list of Endangered Species, is listed the insect Karner Blue butterfly, which I've discussed previously in my comments."

RESPONSE 347

Species such as Jefferson salamander, blue-spotted salamander, spotted salamander, and wood turtle are included on this list (Table 3-3) because there exists on the site some habitat that may support these species. Therefore, they are potential inhabitants of lands owned by Great Escape. However, these species were not observed on the site. The birds included in the table are species that were observed in the general vicinity of the amusement park during the early 1980's, during collection of data for the Breeding Bird Atlas Survey. This data was provided by the NY Natural Heritage Program of NYSDEC.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 348 **(Mr. George J. Stec, 245 Butler Pond Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 10, 2000):**

Commenter questions the DGEIS conclusion contained on page 3-11 that no rare, threatened or endangered wildlife species are known to exist on the site or were observed by L.A. Group biologists.

RESPONSE 348

Comment noted. The statement referred to is a simple statement of the facts. None of the LA group biologists on the site saw any rare, threatened, or endangered species of wildlife, nor are there any records of on-site occurrence of such species in the files of NYSDEC or the US Fish and Wildlife Service.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 349 **(Mr. George J. Stec, 245 Butler Pond Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 10, 2000):**

Commenter states, "Let's talk about the malluses [sic], amphibians and fishes that are also mentioned in the ECL "Endangered species, threatened species and species of special concern." In the park[']s expansion plan they will be crossing streams and infringing on the wetlands. Since the park is situated in a "geographic bowl," a lot of these construction and earth moving activities will have the potential to "accidentally" infringe into the waterways. What affect will any infringement have on the malluses [sic], amphibians, and fishes that exist therein?

RESPONSE 349

See Response 347.

To prevent any effect on aquatic organisms in the course of grading and construction operations, filter-fabric fences and hay bale filter barriers will be erected on the edges of construction zones prior to the commencement of soil-disturbing activities. These erosion-control devices will be inspected on a weekly basis, or immediately after storms depositing 0.5 inch or more of rain, in order to insure that they are in good repair and functioning properly. An environmental monitor will also pay regular visits to look for any impacts on the aquatic and wetland communities on the site.

If silt or other pollutants are found to have been introduced accidentally into waters or wetlands, steps will be taken immediately to stop the flow of those pollutants, and appropriate remediation measures will be undertaken.

DGEIS Reference: Sections 4.4 and 4.5.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 350 **(Mr. George J. Stec, 245 Butler Pond Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 10, 2000):**

Commenter states, "Surveys and a complete inventory of all aquatic plants and animals should have been done. Before the park threatens or infringes into the waterway it should be imperative that these surveys and inventories be done. Who knows what rare or endangered species exists, unless an inventory is done and everything recorded. This inventory should be mandated. In the DGEIS where professional input stresses the uniqueness of this area which suggest a more detailed study of the vegetation and wildlife be undertaken. Don't leave anything to chance."

RESPONSE 350

The DGEIS analysis suggests that the fen will not be impacted by stormwater and that sewage loadings will be reduced. The Planning Board intends to require the implementation of a monitoring program to ensure against impacts to the fen. The lack of significant impact eliminates any need for further resource inventory. LA Group biologists, with doctorate degrees, thoroughly evaluated the project site for rare, threatened and endangered species of wildlife and plant resources and found none.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 351 **(Mr. George J. Stec, 245 Butler Pond Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 10, 2000):**

Commenter states, "my opinion of the DGEIS is that it's incomplete in many areas and appears to have been hastily done. The vegetation and wildlife aspects...have been inadequately presented. I feel they have no idea what they have in the way of their unique, critical environment. The question of the Karner Blue butterfly habitat has to be more thoroughly investigated...The red flag is up. The purpose of the DGEIS is to protect the existing environment not promote economic development!!"

RESPONSE 351

See Responses 345, 346, 347, 348, 349 and 350 concerning natural resource inventories.

The DGEIS indicates clearly which of the ecological communities on the site are relatively rare in New York State, and which are the known locations of rare plants. The Glen Lake fen, which lies north of the amusement part, is the location where these communities and plants are found. The remaining parts of Park Areas A and C are occupied by a variety of common ecological communities, which, according to the definitions of the New York Natural Heritage Program (NYNHP), are shrub swamp, shallow emergent marsh, deep emergent marsh, Appalachian oak-pine forest, hemlock–northern hardwoods forest, successional hardwoods, successional old field, mowed lawn, and brushy cleared land. All of these communities have been assigned Heritage Program element ranks of S4 or S5, which indicate that they are "apparently secure in New York State" (S4) or "demonstrably secure in New York State" (S5). These are by no means unique, rare, or critical ecological communities. As stated, LA Group biologists with doctorate degrees, thoroughly investigated the project site and found no rare, threatened or endangered species of wildlife or vegetation in the project site.

See Response 344 for information on Karner Blue butterfly habitat.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 352 **(Mr. Wm J. Moore, 19 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; written comments dated October 11, 2000):**

Commenter states, "There are times that the noise level from [the Great Escape] and other businesses in the area gets somewhat high and even objectionable, but not to the point where a 'moratorium' should be put on future plans. If anything, the other businesses in the area should be required to conduct [their] own Environmental Impact Statements and conduct themselves in an appropriate manner, better than some have in the past and are doing so today. If requirements are to be put on one Company or Organization they should be applied fairly to all."

RESPONSE 352

Comment noted. The Queensbury Town Board is currently considering the development of a generally applicable townwide noise ordinance which would apply to the Park as well as all businesses generally, as Commenter suggests.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 353 **(Mr. Wm J. Moore, 19 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; written comments dated October 11, 2000):**

Commenter states, "I believe that the Great Escape should be allowed to proceed with expansion plans. These plans should be carefully and reasonably developed to protect both [the Great Escape] and the surrounding areas, including all of Queensbury and the City of Glens Falls. This will mean reasonable cooperation between Queensbury and Glens Falls, which in many cases seems hard to attain."

RESPONSE 353

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 354 **(Mr. Wm J. Moore, 19 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; written comments dated October 11, 2000):**

Commenter states, "The Great Escape's plans must address the issues that many people are concerned about, especially the environment."

RESPONSE 354

Comment noted. The GEIS provides a mechanism by which peoples concern's about the environment must be comprehensively and systematically addressed.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 355 **(Mr. Wm J. Moore, 19 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; written comments dated October 11, 2000):**

Commenter states, "The Planning Board must review these plans without bias and consider Great Escape needs for the next year."

RESPONSE 355

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 356 **(Mr. Wm J. Moore, 19 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; written comments dated October 11, 2000):**

Commenter states, "The City of Glens Falls and the Town of Queensbury officials must work together for sewer and other concerns that can protect the environment and provide economical solutions for the Great Escape."

RESPONSE 356

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 357 **(Mr. Wm J. Moore, 19 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; written comments dated October 11, 2000):**

Commenter states, "The noise situation that exists in this area comes from many areas. Hopefully the noise study that was recently conducted will develop some possible solutions for this and these will be implemented by the governing bodies in place. This includes the contacting of and working with State Department of Transportation for noise from the Northway. Many areas of the Country have installed noise barrier walls along the Interstate highways to muffle traffic noise. I believe that this should be investigated for the section of the Northway between exits 19 and 20."

RESPONSE 357

See Response 3, 6 and 7 for a discussion of the effectiveness of sound barriers.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 358 **(Mr. Wm J. Moore, 19 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; written comments dated October 11, 2000):**

Commenter states, "The Great Escape, the Town of Queensbury and the City of Glens Falls should agree to a committee being formed that will agree to work with the Great Escape to make things happen in a cooperative manner. This committee would have representatives from many aspects concerned with the expansion but would be sworn to have an objective of making the expansion work in the best interests of all factions. This can be done!!! It has been done in other communities where conflicts have developed and successful resolutions have occurred that were satisfactory compromises to all parties. Maybe even better ideas may occur."

RESPONSE 358

The Applicant has agreed to connect to a sewer should one become available to it in the future.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 359 **(Mr. Michael Dansbury, 380 South Post Road, West Windsor, New Jersey; written comments dated October 12, 2000):**

Commenter, a year-round resident of New Jersey who purchased a house on Glen Lake two years ago and visited the area since 1980, states that, "During this time, we have seen many changes in the area. These include the gradual expansion of Story Town/Great Escape. I never minded having the initial small expansion, and was happy to have Great Escape as a neighbor right around the corner. Unfortunately, these small changes [which] did not affect the quality of life on the lake, have become big changes that greatly affect the quality of life for most of us that live on and around the lake."

RESPONSE 359

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 360 **(Mr. Michael Dansbury, 380 South Post Road, West Windsor, New Jersey; written comments dated October 12, 2000):**

Commenter states that, "The most peaceful quiet time I would have when fishing on the lake in the morning hours has been replaced with the annoying and continual screeching noises of Great Escape's new Bobsled Ride. As bad as the noise of this ride is that I can hear from my house on Hemlock Road, I feel very sorry for my neighbors that live in closer proximity to the Bobsled ride, for what they have had to listen to for the past couple of years."

RESPONSE 360

Remedial measures have been put in place to reduce the sound levels from the Bobsled. Further reductions in sound may be achieved once soft wheels can be used. See Responses 132 and 377.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 361 **(Mr. Michael Dansbury, 380 South Post Road, West Windsor, New Jersey; written comments dated October 12, 2000):**

Commenter asks, "How much more unhealthy and annoying noise will we have to be subjected to, if the next 'big new ride', the proposed 200' giant roller coaster is built?"

RESPONSE 361

See Response 3 for a discussion of how the Planning Board proposes to manage noise from the Great Escape.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 362 **(Mr. Michael Dansbury, 380 South Post Road, West Windsor, New Jersey; written comments dated October 12, 2000):**

Commenter asks, "how can Great Escape say in their fact sheet [distributed at the public hearing] that there will be no significant visual impact? I certainly know that a 200' roller coaster would have a very significant and negative visual impact for me and probably ninety percent of our neighbors on the lake. When we bought our house, we planned on seeing the beautiful sunsets behind West Mountain, not the silhouette of an unsightly 200' roller coaster rising above the tree tops."

RESPONSE 362

FGEIS Section 4.3, "Visual Analysis Fall 2000-2001," augments the March 2000 visual study and defines an area within the developed portion of the Park for development of tall rides that is compatible with the Park in its existing visual environment. A tall ride developed in the defined area will not be substantially visible from Glen Lake or its shoreline or the Glens Falls Country Club and bike path.

As noted in FGEIS Section 4.3, the red blinking lights on the antenna towers on West Mountain, Prospect Mountain, and the Warren County Municipal Center are visible from Glen Lake and its shoreline, as are the lights from West Mountain Ski Center.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 363 **(Mr. Michael Dansbury, 380 South Post Road, West Windsor, New Jersey; written comments dated October 12, 2000):**

Commenter asks, "How can Great Escape determine the amount of run-off and that there will be no negative impact to the lake from the anticipated larger traffic volume?"

RESPONSE 363

The methods used to estimate stormwater quantity was HydroCAD (a computer model) based on Technical Release 20 of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Soil Conservation Service.

Stormwater quality estimates were made using methods developed by Metropolitan Washington [D.C.] Council of Government (see page 4-29).

The Planning Board's environmental consultant has worked with the Board to ensure the design of a system that will not adversely impact Glen Lake.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 364 **(Mr. Michael Dansbury, 380 South Post Road, West Windsor, New Jersey; written comments dated October 12, 2000):**

Commenter states that there is a "current and negative impact to traffic, trying to exit Glen Lake Road onto Route 9. It has only been getting worse with each new Great Escape season pass promotion."

RESPONSE 364

See Response 135.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section G.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 365 **(Mr. Michael Dansbury, 380 South Post Road, West Windsor, New Jersey; written comments dated October 12, 2000):**

Commenter states that he has concern about "the potential for the pollution of Glen Lake's pristine water due to what is a sewage treatment proposal that is not acceptable. The chance for disaster to the fen and Glen Lake is just too great. What would the property values of the homes around a polluted Glen Lake be worth?"

RESPONSE 365

See Response 316.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 366 **(Mr. Michael Dansbury, 380 South Post Road, West Windsor, New Jersey; written comments dated October 12, 2000):**

Commenter states, "I have seen and been to many other of the Great Escapes, and similar big theme parks around the country that have been expanded. The problem is that our Great Escape in Queensbury does not have the room to expand to accommodate the type of rides and crowds they want to have. The phrase 'bigger is better' is not always true."

RESPONSE 366

The proposed improvements are infrastructure-related, and identify parking and roadway improvements, wastewater disposal improvements, and electrical upgrades. No expansion of the area developed with rides and attractions within (Park Area A) is proposed. As will always be the case, a change in attractions will be made within Park Area A to continue to offer a new experience to park patrons.

The Great Escape is contained within a 81+ acre upland parcel which is only half developed at this time. There is significant land resources available for further development.

See Responses 97 and 115.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 367 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter, who has been asked to conduct an independent-third-party engineering review of the DGEIS on behalf of the Town of Queensbury Planning Board, states with respect to traffic impacts, "The applicant should propose a monitoring system for the alternative mitigation measure triggering mechanism (i.e., tying traffic improvements to actual volumes, rather than attendance) suggested by DOT."

RESPONSE 367

See Response 258.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 368 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to traffic impacts, "Levels of Service and impacts should be discussed for special events. For example, how are the traffic volumes and Levels of Service affected when a special event such as an evening concert concludes?"

RESPONSE 368

A concert will end at night after the typical PM peak commuter hour and possibly after the retail land uses along Route 9 are closed. The existing traffic volumes on Route 9 at 9:00 PM are approximately 500 trips or 40 percent lower than during the peak hours of the generator (10:00 to 11:00 AM). At 10:00 PM, the existing traffic volumes are approximately 800 trips lower than during the peak hour of the generator. The total traffic volumes traveling on Route 9 when a concert concludes will be comparable to or less than the peak hour traffic conditions analyzed in the Traffic Impact Study. As a result, the Levels of Service will be comparable to or better than those reported in the Traffic Impact Study. The proposed improvements will accommodate worst-case traffic volumes associated with activities at Great Escape. See Response 92.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 369 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to traffic impacts, "Provide an expanded discussion of traffic volumes and impacts on collector roads, specifically Gurney Lane, Glen Lake Road, West Mountain Road and Round Pond Road. For example, page 3-25 [of the DGEIS] asserts that existing traffic volumes on Glen Lake Road are low. This statement should be substantiated and future impacts discussed."

RESPONSE 369

Two-lane collector roads such as Glen Lake Road have a maximum capacity of 1,300 vehicles per hour in one direction. In comparison, the one-way volume on Glen Lake Road is 86 trips in the weekday peak hour (See Figure 2.2 of the Traffic Impact Study). Therefore, the DGEIS asserts that existing traffic volumes on Glen Lake Road are low. The one way volume on Glen Lake Road will increase by 11 trips (See Figure 3.15) during the weekday peak hour at the 1,500,000 annual attendance at Great Escape. Future impacts will be mitigated with the proposed improvements described in the Traffic Impact Study. The following table summarizes the existing geometry, weekday peak hour traffic volumes and future traffic volumes for specific collector roads in the study area. All collector roads will continue to operate at well below the capacity of these roads.

Road Name	**Jurisdiction**	**Lane Width**	**Existing Traffic** (two-way, peak hour)	**Speed Limit**	**Future Traffic** (two-way, peak hour)
Gurney Lane	State	11 ft.	742	Not posted	956
Glen Lake Rd	Town	10 ft.	155	30 mph	185
West Mountain	County	10 ft	Not studied	50 mph	Not studied
Round Pond Rd	County	10 ft.	180	40 mph	224

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section I.

Impact to DGEIS: Augment discussion

COMMENT 370 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to noise impacts, "Residents have asserted that the Alpine Bobsled was not running during the October 29, 1999 sound level measurements. Is this assertion true?"

RESPONSE 370

No.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 371 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to noise impacts, "Was the Alpine Bobsled running during the October 6, 1999 sound level measurements?"

RESPONSE 371

The reference in Table 3, Appendix 7 to "October 6" should have been to "September 6" (the Bobsled was running that day).

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 372 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to noise impacts, "Discuss the potential sound impacts to Glen Lake residential receptors that do not have their line of site to the Park blocked by topography. Do any such receptors exist?"

RESPONSE 372

See Section 4.1 of the FGEIS which documents that Glen Lake receptors with a clear line of sight experience similar noise levels to those determined at the established Glen Lake monitoring location used since 1990.

See Response 57.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 373 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to noise impacts, "Describe the decibel levels that the applicant proposes to apply as the noise thresholds for future rides (DGEIS page 4-23). How do these thresholds compare to the existing sound levels at residential receptors? Given that complaints have been made concerning rides such as the Alpine Bobsled, that have unique noise signatures, yet which appear to fall within these thresholds, how would the proposed thresholds serve to mitigate the impacts from such rides? Similarly, what sort of thresholds should apply to so called "scream rides" designed to elicit high volume screams?"

RESPONSE 373

Refer to Responses 3 and 37.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 374 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to noise impacts, "Describe the applicant's proposed noise monitoring program (DGEIS page 4-28)."

RESPONSE 374

The Leq measurements will be made at the established monitoring locations in Twicwood, Courthouse Estates; and Glen Lake. Measurements will include typical summer Friday or Saturday afternoon readings followed by late pm measurements up until closing. This date will be summarized and reported to the Town in the fall along with the attendance data needed to assure appropriate traffic improvements have been made or are appropriately scheduled for the coming year. Refer to Response 3 regarding proposed monitoring locations and frequency and reporting requirements.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 375 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to noise impacts, "Was the mitigation measure for amplified noise (i.e., aiming speakers inward to the Park – DGEIS page 4-23) employed in 2000? Did the Park receive complaints about noise from amplifiers and speakers in 2000?"

RESPONSE 375

The only complaints were comments made at the SEQRA public hearing in regards to the Elvis impersonator. The Elvis impersonator booth did face towards the south which may have caused the community to hear the beginning of the act. The Park will review the orientation of the loudspeakers within the "Jolly Tree" theatre area. It should be noted that the "Elvis" act only takes place for five 15 minute periods throughout the day during daytime hours.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 376 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to noise impacts, "Discuss concert noise and mitigation. Were concerts held in 2000? If so, were there complaints? Was the mitigation measure discussed at DGEIS page 4-23 employed?"

RESPONSE 376

See Responses 375 and 614.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 377 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to noise impacts, "The applicant committed in the DGEIS to reduce Alpine Bobsled noise by 6 dBA (DGEIS page 3-44). Has this been accomplished? If not, what additional mitigation measures are proposed?"

RESPONSE 377

The installation of the foam insulation on the ride structure has already resulted in a 6 dBA reduction as document by the 2000 noise study measurements. To further reduce sound levels at the Bobsled it will be necessary to find a way of operating the sleds with the softer wheels and keeping the sleds within the design track geometry. The soft wheels cause the sled to ride high in the track which interferes with the ride quality and braking system.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 378 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to noise impacts, "Figure 4-10, Section A shows that the Northway will be *above* the line of site [sic] to Glen Lake in the build condition (Northway elevation is 440'; parking lot elevation is 432'). Given that approximately 200 feet of mature coniferous vegetation are proposed to be removed, it is reasonable to expect that there will be increased noise form the Northway experienced on Glen Lake. This condition should be analyzed."

RESPONSE 378

The Northway will continue to be above the surrounding terrain in the area immediately in front of the Great Escape. The emission point is above-the-ground terrain, and above the shrub vegetation that is critical to the reduction in sound levels. The wood lots adjacent to the Northway lacks high density shrub, therefore, it never was an effective sound barrier and loss of the trees should not lead to an increase in sound transmission. See Response 6.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 379 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to noise impacts, "Figures 4-11 and 4-12 appear to show that residences on Glen Lake and in Courthouse Estates would continue to be protected from Northway noise because the intervening hill would remain. However, the sections have not been carried through to the actual residence locations to confirm this conclusion. If residences are located at a sufficiently high elevation, a line of site [sic] might exist and impacts result. The sections should be continued and the findings discussed. If necessary, additional sections between the Coachhouse Restaurant Exit 20 should be prepared."

RESPONSE 379

FGEIS Exhibit 4.2, Profile 4-2A, shows that the topography east of the Park acts as a buffer to points east such as homes on Glen Lake. Profiles 4-2B and 4-2C show that the Northway is relatively lower in elevation as compared to Courthouse Estates, and that the hillside west of US Route 9 provides intervening topography. As noted in the proposed profiles in both Figures (4-2C provides an exaggerated scale) a significant portion of this hillside will be maintained, and will continue to provide intervening topography which will continue to act as a buffer to noise from the Northway.

Exhibit 4.2 Figures 4-2D and 4-2E show the relation between the Northway and Twicwood. Figure 4-2D shows the changes in elevation as the result of the construction of the light blue parking lot. The Northway and the light blue lot are at the same grade with the light blue lot being excavated down to depth of 435 feet or a decrease of five feet. Figure 4-2E is along the profile line, at an exaggerated scale.

To further clarify the relationship of the Northway to the project site, as well as to show the impacts of the grading on the site, note the following.

Exhibit 4.2, Section 1 – North end of the Samoset. This section shows the Northway northbound lane is slightly below the Samoset cabin elevation. This area will be developed as a parking lot with minimal grading.

Exhibit 4.2, Section 2 – South of the Samoset. The section runs from the Northway to the Glen Lake Fen. The section shows that the Northway is at an elevation of 460 ft. while adjacent land is at an elevation of 508 ft. This area will be developed as a parking lot at an elevation of 485 ft. A wall will be necessary on the east side of the lot with a top elevation of 490 ft. Approximately 30 feet of elevation change will exist between the Northway and the top of the lot wall.

Exhibit 4.2, Section 3 – North of hotel site. The Northway elevation is approximately 460 ft. while the site is at an elevation of 505 ft. The blue parking lot will have a finish grade of 450 to 465 ft. On the east side a wall will be required with a top elevation of 475 ft. to preserve the NYSDOT right-of-way lands to the east. The wall will have an effective height of 10-12 feet above the Northway.

Exhibit 4.2, Section 4 – Main parking lot. The Northway at this location is at an elevation of 415 ft. and the parking lot will be built at an elevation of 406-408 ft.

Exhibit 4.2, Section 5 – South end of parcel at the light blue lot.

Exhibit 4.2, Section 6 – South end at light green and lavender lot to Route 9 and Twicwood. This section shows the relationship of the Northway which is at an elevation of 440 ft and the light green lot which will be reduced to 435 feet. The lavender lot will be at an elevation of 455 to 460 feet. The dip in elevation at a distance of 750 ft. from the Northway is a wetland. Twicwood is 2,400 feet from the Northway and is at an elevation of 500 ft.

The cross section demonstrates that on the north end of the site existing grade will be preserved due to minimal grading at the Samoset and use of walls. In the center of the site the currently existing relationship between the Northway and adjacent land will remain the same. At the south end, the overall same relationship between the Northway and new parking lots will remain very similar to the existing conditions.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 380 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to noise impacts, "Conduct the same DNL noise calculations provided for increased Northway traffic at DGEIS pages 4-40/41 to increased traffic on Rt. 9, using the nearest residential receptors in the Twicwood, Courthouse Estates and Glen Lake neighbors."

RESPONSE 380

It is not feasible to perform the calculation for Glen Lake since the effective distance on the necessary charts end at 4,000 ft. and Glen Lake is 5000 feet from Route 9. Using the same chart and assumption for Twicwood the truck-derived sound would be 59 dBA in 2000 and 60 dBA in 2005. Cars would be below 55 dBA and off the charts during both years The overall change in sound as a result of new traffic at Twicwood will be 1 dBA or less. At Twicwood homes that face Route 9 with Leq of 48-51 would increase to 49-52. Whiles homes near the other location in Twicwood will increase from 48-49 to 49-50. Courthouse Estates is 1,500 feet from Route 9 and current ADT is 18,000 vehicles. At buildout the ADT will be approximately 22,000 which falls in the acceptable category based on work chart 1 for autos and using 25,000 vehicles at 1,500 ft.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 381 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to visual impacts, "We disagree with the conclusion that the potential visual impact of the 200 foot tall structure modeled 'would not be significant' (DGEIS page 4-25). Such a structure would clearly be visible within a large area. Depending on its mass, color and form, the potential impacts could be quite significant. We also note the potential for noise impacts from so called "scream rides" elevated above the surrounding terrain. Absent further discussion of mitigation, we anticipate recommending to the Planning Board that generic approval not be given to a ride of the height modeled in the DGEIS, but that any such elevated ride be subject to site specific site plan and SEQRA approval."

RESPONSE 381

The Visual Analysis 2000-2001 examines alternative locations (as compared to the March 2000 study) for tall rides within the developed area of the park. A tall ride developed in the area defined by the results of the visual study in section 4.3 of this FGEIS will represent a consolidation of visual effects and so will not cause an undue significant adverse visual impact. Such a ride would comply with the Town zoning district regulations encompassing with Park. This zone is the Recreation/Commercial zone, which is intended to "isolate, protect and encourage expansion of the recreation industry."

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 382 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to stormwater management, "Provide a discussion of HydroCAD model (Based on the DGEIS appendices, HydroCAD was the software utilized) used to develop the Stormwater Management Plan (SMP). This discussion will assist the Planning Board in understanding how the proposed management system works. It should include a basic idea of how the software works and a brief description of each component of the model (i.e., subcatchments, ponds, reaches, and links). The sensitivity of the existing wetlands should be addressed and correlated to the effects of the computer model results."

RESPONSE 382

The purpose of stormwater modeling is to estimate the quantity of stormwater that will be derived at a site. Stormwater volume changes when the characteristics of a particular site are altered. The introduction of impervious surfaces reduces the amount of infiltration or recharge occurring on a site. This will increase the volume or quantity of runoff. The addition of impervious surfaces which are smooth and pitched or graded to drain to prevent flooding also changes the rate of velocity of the runoff. An increase in the area of impervious surfaces on a site has a proportionate increase on both the velocity and the volume of stormwater runoff.

Stormwater analysis relies upon examination of various storm events. Storm events have specific return frequencies which are expressed as the 2-year storm, and 5-year storm, etc. These return events are actually the percent chance that a storm will occur in a given year. The 20-year storm has a 2% chance of occurring in any given year while the 100 year storm has a 1% chance. It is entirely possible to have multiple 25-year or 100-year storms in a single year such as occurred in 1996. Each stormwater event has an assigned rainfall amount (in inches) based on the past records kept by the federal National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration ("NOAA"). For the area of the project site, these are as follows:

Return Storm Events	**Rainfall Inches**
2	2.5
10	3.8
50	4.6
100	5.3

Based on the amount of rain, the volume of runoff is calculated. To estimate volume of runoff, the amount of rain, the area under consideration and the curve number are required. A curve number generally represents the ratio of impervious to pervious surface along with the character of the surface. The curve number varies between 30 and 98. As the number approaches 98, the amount of impervious surface increases. The typical impervious surface curve number is 98 while forested areas have a curve number of around 30-50.

The next calculation performed by the computer model estimates when the stormwater will arrive at a particular point. This is the time of concentration which is estimated by hour point during the event typically 12 hours or halfway through the event for Type II events. Time of concentration is determined by distance across the subcatchment, slope in subcatchment, curve number and retention for each subcatchment.

HydroCAD is based on the USDA Technical Release 20 Stormwater Model which is the successor to the commonly used Technical Release 55. The Technical Release 20 calculates individual time of concentration for the individual points in each subcatchment while Technical Release 55 determines a blended time of concentration. The Technical Release 20 is more precise.

A subcatchment is a drainage area such as a parking lot. A reach can be a channel or a pipe that connects subcatchments. Each subcatchment has a specific time of concentration and runoff volume which are accumulated to estimate the total volume of runoff. To moderate the runoff volume it is necessary to add control devices. Control devices that are typically employed are drywells and ponds. The site plan determines the amount of land available for these devices. The designer will, as part of the computer simulation, increase pond sizes until the volume of runoff matches the pre-development conditions. The pond segment also calculates the exfiltration or groundwater recharge. To increase exfiltration it is necessary to increase the number of stormwater basins on the property since the soils cannot be altered. This process of adjusting stormwater basins and drywells until the runoff is controlled establishes the size or number of facilities necessary to moderate stormwater flow.

The stormwater management system has been designed to hold the pre and post release rate at the same levels. Holding the release rates at the same volume will moderate the changes in the water levels of the wetlands. The Glen Lake Fen is over 156 acres and has a corresponding large capacity for accepting stormwater. A major construction between the development area on the west side of Route 9 is the Rush Pond Outlet stream that runs through the Great Escape. The release volume of stormwater must be controlled to avoid flooding of the theme park.

The 2 year event stormwater release rate is slightly higher due to the volume of discharges from Pond 7. Pond 7 (as well as other ponds) will be fitted with additional stormwater treatment devices (swirl concentrator, or storm manager mixbed filters) to improve water quality from entering the stream.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 383 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to stormwater management, "The SMP should include a discussion of the hydrologic and hydraulic analysis that is conducted through HydroCAD. The existing and proposed watershed conditions should be separately detailed to include: clear description of stormwater runoff patterns and any conveyance facilities; location and description of on- or off-site discharge points; design points to be used for comparison purposes should be located, described and called out; and the HydroCAD results for each storm even at each design point should be tabulated."

RESPONSE 383

The existing site is divided into thirteen (13) subcatchment areas as indicated on Sheets 1a, 1b, 1c of the SMP and in the DGEIS Figure 2-18, 2-19, and 2-20.

Subcatchments one (1) and three (3) drain to existing catch basins along Route 9 and are then directed under the highway to a large wetland east of Park Area C.

Subcatchments five (5), six (6) and eleven (11) drain to an existing system along Route 9 and are directed, via pipes to the large culvert and stream which runs under Route 9 and through the park to the east.

Subcatchments four (4), seven (7), eight (8), nine (9), ten (10) and thirteen (13) all drain to existing wetlands within the site. These areas eventually drain to the same culvert and stream which runs through the park to the east.

Subcatchments two (2) and four (4) drain off site to the west.

Subcatchments one (1), three (3), five (5), six (6) and eleven (11) will receive no additional flows from the proposed development. With the regrading of the site the existing system along Route 9 in this area will experience a reduction in flows.

Existing runoff patterns are indicated on Sheets 1a, 1b and 1c along with the existing volumes of runoff. Existing site is divided into 13 subcatchments based on topography and the prior development such as at the Coach House or parking lots.

In the post development condition these 13 subcatchments become 124 subcatch due to changes required by the site plan such as the addition of paved parking and the hotel. A subcatchment for the developed condition may be a paved parking area of a few 1000 square feet including the drywell treatment device.

The proposed drainage system is broken down into 124 subcatchment areas which will drain through a total of 96 drywells and 12 detention basins. Flows, along with pond locations are indicated on Sheets 2a, 2b and 2c. The release rate at the Route 9 culvert is managed to match the pre-development release rate.

HydroCAD results are tabulated on the summary sheets. In section 4.14 a summary stormwater report is found that includes the post-development subcatchment schematic which shows the individual subcatch changes in discharge.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 384 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to stormwater management, "Stormwater runoff is recognized as a major contributor of pollution that can adversely affect the quality of receiving water bodies. The SMP briefly discusses stormwater quality. NYSDEC guidelines suggest that water quality treatment facilities should be designed to control the first ½ inch of runoff or runoff from the 1 year, 24 hour storm event, or whichever is greater. Design details are needed to evaluate whether the removal efficiencies claimed in the DGEIS will be achieved."

RESPONSE 384

The Town of Queensbury requires that the stormwater management system be sized for the 50 year event. The proposed system controls the release rate of the 50 year event. Smaller events are also controlled. The DGEIS provided the analysis of the 2 year event which is a 2.5 inch rainfall. The analysis of the 2 year and 50 year storm event shows the changes in the amount of the system engaged for the storm. Higher levels of stormwater treatment occur during the 50 year event since that is the design storm, and it is the storm that the entire stormwater management system including detention becomes fully operational (see Table 4-11). The stormwater quality analysis provided in the DGEIS indicates that both the 2 year and 50 year event stormwater quality will be improved or stay the same based on the expected treatment in the system. Treatment capability is based on the physical characteristics of each of the devices and the removal rates ere the lower estimated efficiency for all the devices therefore the removals are conservative. Smaller stormwater events will rely upon the recharge system for treatment which happens to have the highest nutrient removal rates and is therefore protective of the environment.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 385 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to stormwater management, "The SMP should include a more detailed discussion of proposed erosion and sediment control measures. This should include temporary erosion and sediment control facilities that will be used during land clearing, land grading and construction phases in addition to permanent erosion and sediment control facilities with a schedule and maintenance plan. Details should be provided to allow evaluation."

RESPONSE 385

Construction sediment erosion control will be included in site plan review documents when precise positions of facilities are known. Construction erosion control will include use of temporary silt barriers, both hay bale or silt fence, minimization of clearing, control of clearing limits, phasing of construction, rapid stabilization of the construction site, use of temporary settling basin and protection of existing stormwater structures from silt-laden water.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 386 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to stormwater management, "The SMP indicates that the 50 year, 24 hour, Type II storm event was used as the design storm. NYSDEC guidelines suggest analyzing the precipitation data for several return periods (i.e., the 1 year, 2 year, 10 year and 100 year storms for a 24 hour duration)."

RESPONSE 386

The guidelines do not apply. The Great Escape is not a regulated industry. As part of site plan review 6P-3 for construction stormwater, a pollution prevention plan will be prepared. The requested analysis has been prepared and will be used to further refine the stormwater system as it is designed for site plan review.

The 50 year, 24 hour, Type II storm event was used as required by the Town of Queensbury. Pre-development and post-development data for the 2 year, 10 year, 50 year and 100 year storm events are tabulated below. These values are peak runoff rates leaving the site (Park Area C).

Storm	Existing Condition	Proposed Condition
2	0.60 CFS	2.15 CFS
10	5.02 CFS	6.80 CFS
50	11.62 CFS	10.99 CFS
100	20.16 CFS	12.98 CFS

The increase in stormwater flow at the 2 year event is caused by stormwater volume entering stormwater Pond 7. Stormwater discharges from Pond 7 will be further treated by use of swirl concentrator and possibly storm manager mixbed filters. Also during site plan review it may be possible to further minimize discharges.

The table below identifies changes in water elevations as it relates to various stormwater events including the 100 year flood.

		Wetland Elevation Entering Box Culvert	
2 year	Pre	401.7	+.3 feet +4 inches
	Post	402.0	
10 year	Pre	402.1	+.3 feet +4 inches
	Post	402.4	
50 year	Pre	402.5	+.2 feet +2.4 inches
	Post	402.7	
100 year	Pre	402.9	-.1 feet -1.2 inches
	Post	402.8	

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 387 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to stormwater management, "NYSDEC suggests the following design criteria for stormwater quality" which Commenter states the DGEIS "should demonstrate compliance with":

a. "Storm drain system shall be designed to convey the 10 year, 24 hour. Free flow conditions (or backwater analysis) should be discussed in addition to minimum and maximum flows and discharge velocities."

b. "Downstream analysis of the 100 years, 24-hour event, including peak discharge rates, total runoff volumes and evaluation of impacts to receiving waters, wetlands and flood plains should be discussed."

c. "Determining the storage volume and surface area requirements necessary to provide flood control for runoff generated during a 2 year, 10 year and 100 year 24-hour storm events."

d. "Demonstrate that proposed facilities are capable of mitigating the runoff from the 100-year storm event."

RESPONSE 387

A. The storm drains have been designed to accommodate the larger 50 year event. A backwater condition will not occur during the 10 year event.

B. The peak discharge for a 100 year storm in the existing condition is 20.16 CFS. The peak discharge for a 100 year storm in the proposed condition is 12.98 CFS. The peak elevation for the existing wetland for a 100 year storm is 402.9' with a peak storage volume of 0.71. The peak elevation for the existing wetland in the proposed condition is 402.8' with a peak storm of 0.68 acft. There will be no impacts to receiving waters, wetlands and floodplains associated with a 100 year storm event.

C. Additional calculations have been provided in the report for the 2, 10 and 100 year storms.

D. See additional calculations included for a 100 year storm and Response 387(B).

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 388 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to stormwater management, "The SMP should be expanded to include a detailed discussion of specific site characteristics. Items that should be clearly defined are: soil information including names, hydrologic groups, typical slopes, textures of the soil and at what depths they typically occur, depth to the water table and depth to bedrock; topography of the area including the high and low points, general direction and the range of slopes; whether or not the wetlands are designated by USACOE or by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC); a clear description of the stream and associated classification that will receive the stormwater runoff; whether or not the site falls within the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood plains; and rainfall data for all of the storm events previously mentioned."

RESPONSE 388

All of the information requested to be repeated in the SMP is already provided in the DGEIS. The Commenter is referred to DGEIS Section 3.1.2, "Soils," Section 3.1.3, "Topography and Slope," Section 3.1.1, "Geology," Section 3.1.4, "Surface Water Resources," Section 3.1.5, "Groundwater Resources," and Section 3.2.2, "Wetlands." Rainfall data is provided on the first page of each year analyzed, see FGEIS Section 4.3. The two year storm is 2.5", the 10 year storm is 3.8", the 50 year storm is 4.6", and the 100 year storm is 5.3". This data is provided in the Hydrocad ™ computer model, an after-market version of the Federal Department of Agriculture's SCS TR20 and TR55, Urban Hydrology for Small Watersheds model, a well-known reference in the industry.

This material has also been consolidated into a single report found in FGEIS Section 4.14 for the convenience of the readers.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 389 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to stormwater management, "The SMP indicates the precen[ce] of Hinkley, Plainfied and Oakville type soils, all of which are hydrologic soil Group A and are deep excessively drained sandy soils. The USDA Soil Survey of Warren County, Panel 36 indicates the presen[ce] of Wareham (Wa) type solids along the northern side of the existing stream that traverses the site. Wareham (Wa) soils are hydrologic Group C and are somewhat poorly drained to poorly drained soils. The stormwater model should be modified to reflect this type of soil and associative runoff coefficients."

RESPONSE 389

The Wareham soils are the existing parking lots that have already been filled to their current level. To prepare this area for construction, an additional 4-5 feet of Oakville soil will be placed on the lowest portion of the parking lots. The appropriate soil to model for the purposes of establishing exfiltration rates of stormwater discharged to the particular soil involved is therefore the Oakville.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 390 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to stormwater management, "The SMP states the following:

> *'The runoff will be directed through a series of drywells and detention basins to control and treat the first flush of runoff, infiltrate as much stormwater back into the ground as possible, and reduce the peak rate of runoff to existing levels.'*

a. "NYSDEC guidelines suggest that water quality treatment facilities should be designed to control the first ½ inch of runoff or runoff from the 1 year, 24 hour storm event, or whichever is greater. The SMP should identify which design event was used."

b. "The SMP does not indicate if the proposed detention basins are dry detention or extended detention. It must be noted that dry detention ponds provide few, if any water quality benefits and therefore, this practice should not be used as a substitute for water quality treatment practices such as infiltration, retention or extended detention."

c. "The proposed improvements include several detention basins that will be used for groundwater recharge. Since these basins will be used as temporary storage of runoff, provide calculations that demonstrate the basin[']s recovery time for the 50-year event."

d. "Mapping provided as part of the SMP suggest [sic] two proposed detention ponds adjacent to the existing stream and wetlands. Based on a review of the soil survey, they may be located within a soil with low permeability and depths to groundwater at 0 to 1.5 feet below the ground surface. Provide the necessary calculations that demonstrate that these proposed ponds will provide the necessary storage and recharge given the possibility that they may be located in type C soil and groundwater may be shallow. In addition, if the proposed detention basins are in fact located within Type C soil and groundwater is at such shallow depths, will these basins be constructed with a minimum of two feet of separation between the lowest ground elevation within the basin and the seasonal high groundwater elevation. Demonstrate that these criteria will be met."

RESPONSE 390

A. See Response 384.

B. See Table 4-11. This table shows how the stormwater will be treated and estimates the nutrient removal. Detention removes 65% of nitrogen and 19% of phosphorus (Schaeler 1987, Caraco, Clayton and Zielinski 1998). Detention minimizes thermal loading and will operate as long-term detention for smaller events that do not cause a discharge. The proposed system provides a high level of stormwater treatment.

C. See Section 4.3, "Stormwater Analysis."

D. The basins will be constructed in compacted fills to provide separation between the seasonal water table and bottom of the pond.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 391 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to stormwater management, "The SMP briefly discusses a 'design point' as being an existing stream. The design point should be identified under Existing Conditions and expanded upon under Proposed Conditions. The discussion should include tables demonstrating existing and proposed runoff to the stream and the resulting stream velocities at various return periods. Describe how these outfall conditions correlate to stream depths under various return periods."

RESPONSE 391

The SMP does not describe the existing stream as the "design point." The existing stream is described as the "point of discharge" that currently exists. The existing peak flow from Park Area C directed under Route 9 is 11.62 CFS for a 50 year storm. The proposed peak discharge is 10.99 CFS. The proposed rate has been slowed to less than a pre-development rate, thus removing the impact to the existing stream.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 392 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to stormwater management, "Based on the calculations provided, it appears that the base flow of the existing stream was not accounted for as part of the hydraulic analysis. This should included the existing stream geometry and upland areas that drain to it."

RESPONSE 392

The post project stormwater release rates will be lower than the pre-development levels. Stormwater discharges will not cause undue flooding along the corridor due to the low release rates. No assessment of the stream hydrology is necessary.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 393 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to stormwater management, "The SMP states the following:

> *'The system moderates the velocity and volume of stormwater to levels that are similar to existing conditions.'"*

Commenter asks that the DGEIS, "provide a brief summary of the findings that support this statement."

RESPONSE 393

The existing peak runoff leaving the site for a 50 year storm is 11.62 CFS and the proposed is 10.99 CFS. The reduction is 0.63 CFS for a 50 year storm. The existing elevation of the wetland prior to discharge under Route 9 is 402.5 for the peak of a 50 year storm. The proposed elevation is 402.7. The flood elevation is 403.5. The existing wetland stores approximately 0.11 acre feet of additional stormwater within its boundaries during the peak of the 50 year storm. This volume is well within the boundaries or flood elevation of the existing wetland.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 394 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to stormwater management, "Summaries of the stormwater design are included within the calculations provide [sic]. Provide also include summaries at various storm events that can easily correlate existing and proposed stormwater conditions with the body of the report:

a. "Peak flow comparisons for the 2, 10, 50 and 100-year storm events."

b. "Peak volume comparisons for the 2, 10, 50 and 100-year storm events."

c. "Design summaries of each detention pond including pond depths at the 10, 50, and 100-year storm events relative to each pond's flood elevation. Also, demonstrate each pond has adequate recovery time for the 50-year storm event."

d. "Comparison of pre and post stormwater quality correlated to any proposed stormwater management facilities."

RESPONSE 394

A. See Response 386.

B. Peak volume comparisons for existing wetland area prior to discharge under Route 9.

Storm	**Pre-development**	**Post-development elevation/storage (peak)**
2	401.7'/0.08 acft.	402.0'/0.27 acft.
10	402.1'/0.31 acft.	402.4'/0.48 acft.
50	402.5'/0.51 acft.	402.7'/0.62 acft.
100	402.9'/0.71 acft.	402.8'/0.68 acft.

C. Pond depths are included on the computation sheets for each pond for a 2, 10, 50 and 100 year storm. The pond routing summary sheets indicate the peak elevations, flood elevations and peak storage for each pond.

D. See pages 4-28 through 4-34 of the DGEIS where this comparison is provided.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 395 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to stormwater management, "The pre development data provided includes only summary sheets. Include the detailed information for the pre development model similar to the post development data provided."

RESPONSE 395

FGEIS Section 4.9 is a separate volume that contains the Hydrocad computer model analysis of the stormwater system. These voluminous workpapers support the final stormwater designs proposed by the applicant. This data was provided to the Town Planning Board for its review. The substance of the analysis is found in Section 4.14 of the FGEIS which is the summary report on stormwater. This report builds upon the DGEIS stormwater analysis.

The Section 4.9 appendix is available on request, due to its large size and the small number of people who would be interested in reviewing the raw data.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 396 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to stormwater management, "The summary sheets provided for the subcatchment areas for pre and post development indicate that the pre development watershed areas total 68.91 acres, while post development watershed areas total 60.96 acres. Explain the reason for the difference in pre and post development watershed areas."

RESPONSE 396

The 7.95 acres that are not included within the post-development volume are portions of pre-development subcatchments 1, 3, and 5 which, in the post-development condition, will drain to Route 9 and have no impact on the on-site drainage system within Park Area C.

DGEIS Reference: Section 2 pages 15-16.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 397 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to stormwater management, "The post development model shows data for the existing wetlands that will remain, however, it appears that the pre development model does not account for them. How will the impacts of stormwater quantity on the wetlands be evaluated? Clarify how stormwater quantity will impact the existing wetlands."

RESPONSE 397

The pre-development model includes the wetlands. The wetland areas were included within the existing subcatchment areas. They are included within subcatchments 8, 9, 10 and 13. The impacts on wetlands are included within the post-development model. See Response 393.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 398 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to stormwater management, "The post development model accounts for exfiltration rates of 0.1 to 0.2 CFS. Provide documentation that validates the exfiltration rates used."

RESPONSE 398

The exfiltration rate of 0.2 CFS represents a percolation rate of less than ½" per minute or approximately 0.42" per minute. This assumes that an eight foot diameter drywell with a 2 foot stone ring and an average depth of 9' would have an effective infiltration volume of approximately 339 cfs. The existing site soils are well drained sands with a rapid infiltration rate far higher then the 0.2 cfs assumed in the calculation, therefore the recharge rates are low making the assessment very conservative.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 399 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to stormwater management, "The post development data indicates that as many as 12 ponds, representing drywells, detention basins and wetlands flood. In some instances, the flooding is greater than 1 foot above flood elevations.

Post Development Part B:

Pond 101, 3.3' above flood elevation
Pond 122, 2.6' above flood elevation
Pond 123, 2.0' above flood elevation
Pond 127, 2.1' above flood elevation

Post Development Part C:

Pond 3. 1.4' above flood elevation
Pond 17, 5.6' above flood elevation
Pond 28, 2.4' above flood elevation
Pond 34, 3.1' above flood elevation

With the magnitude of flooding occurring at the 50-year storm event how will the proposed drainage system properly convey runoff without adversely [a]ffecting the proposed improvements?"

RESPONSE 399

The proposed flooding occurs over twelve drywell locations and ranges from 0.1' at Drywell 126 to 5.6' at Drywell 17. About half of the drywells occur in paved areas and the other half occur in lawn areas. The worst case flooding would occur at Drywell 17. The flooding is 5.6' above flood elevation 100.1. The area of the highest elevation inputted was 24 square feet. Therefore, the volume over the top of the rim is 24 x 5.6 or 134.4 cubic feet. At a 3 inch depth, this would cover an area of 540 square feet which is equal to approximately three parking spaces. This ponding would happen at the peak of a 50 year storm and will not adversely affect the functioning of the parking area given the short duration that the ponding would occur.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 400 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to stormwater management, "It appears that two copies of Part C of the post development model have been included, 31 Jan 00 and 18 May 00. Which model is correct?"

RESPONSE 400

Both. Revisions were made in the plans which required updates to the stormwater analysis in May.

To remove any confusion, all data has been re-run with a November date at the top of the HyrdoCAD model output sheets.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 401 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to stormwater management, "Pond 4 from Part C, 31 Jan 00 post development model is not described and Pond 19 from both Part C models is not described. Provide the design information for these elements."

RESPONSE 401

The design information has been provided for these two ponds in FGEIS Section 4.9, "Great Escape HydroCAD Date".

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 402 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to stormwater management, "How would the use of a porous material (e.g., gravel or porous blocks) affect the stormwater management system proposed? Would there be greater or lesser runoff? Greater or fewer management facilities? What impact would the use of such materials have on the overall quantity and quality of stormwater ultimately discharged to the Glen Lake system?"

RESPONSE 402

Refer to Responses 87 and 416.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 403 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to stormwater management, "Did the SUNOM model used to assess impacts from runoff include runoff from Park Area A?"

RESPONSE 403

No. Park Area A is not the subject of the DGEIS except as required to facilitate analysis of cumulative impacts associated with new attractions. Park Area A relies upon sheet flow and recharge in undeveloped areas. During upgrades of the utility system (electric, and sewage collection), and while new attractions are added or changed amongst other similar uses previously developed in Area A, higher levels of stormwater management can be incorporated into the design. This has been the practice during recent years that when new attractions are added, improved stormwater management is incorporated into the new site design.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 404 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to sewage treatment, "Provide the distance between the edge of the proposed leach field and the top of bank of the adjacent wetland. Provide the distance to the bottom of the bank. Provide the distance to the edge of the wetland."

RESPONSE 404

The horizontal distance is 70-90 feet and vertical distance is 15-17 feet. The site was visited on May 30, 2001 by Applicant's technical consultants and no seeps or springs were observed on the hill.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 405 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to sewage treatment, "Discuss the use of alternative sites under the control of the Great Escape for the discharge of treated wastewater."

RESPONSE 405

The first site examined was the "sand pit" area in Park Area A, but this site was determined to be unsuitable due to the "stump dump" and other buried demolition debris in this location.

Immediately up-slope of the sand pit along Glen Lake Road are areas that could accommodate recharge beds. These areas will provide greater vertical separation to the wetland and slightly greater horizontal separation. The disadvantage is that the wood lots would have to be cleared.

The sites available for the discharge of the treated effluent are limited by the characteristics of the soil since the proposed design calls for a subsurface discharge. The area up-slope of the sand pit will accept the highly treated effluent and the effluent can be pumped to that site if necessary.

The location of the discharge site and design of the recharge beds would be subject to NYS DEC review and approval.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 406 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to sewage treatment, "Reconcile the apparent discrepancy between the increase in attendance of about 70% (900,000 to 1,500,000) and the increase in projected sewage flow of about 33% (45,000 gpd to 60,000 gpd) from the Park."

RESPONSE 406

Mandatory use of water saving fixtures in the design of the park and hotel means that per visitor water/sewer use will decrease, allowing for greater patronage with water/sewer use growing at a smaller rate.

The current SPDES permit allows for flows of 45,636 gallons per day. The six month water usage from April 14,1999 through October 19, 1999 equaled 27,840,060 gallons billed to Great Escape. There are 10 pools and ponds and water attractions totaling 2,750,000 gallons which were filled one time in this period. If we subtract the one-time pool fill from the gallons billed we are left with 25,091,060 gal. Divide that total of 25,091,060 by 180 days (6 months) = 139,394.77 gpd water use. The estimate for backwash and evaporation equals approx. 120,000 gpd leaving an estimated domestic usage number of 19,395 gpd.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 407 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to sewage treatment, "The DGEIS asserts the[re] will be no impact on Glen Lake from additional phosphorous loading from the Park, but no evidence such as modeling is provided to support this assertion. Provide such evidence."

RESPONSE 407

The Applicant's position is summarized as follows: The wastewater treatment facility is to be equipped with processes that currently are designed in potable water filtration facilities. The filter design has 7 ft. of 1.4 mm silica sand, a chemical coagulant is added prior to the filtration process and the treated effluent is disinfected with chlorine, it then passes into a second filter with 5 ft of 0.9 mm silica sand. The resulting effluent will possess in excess of log – 3 removal of the protozoan giardia and cryptosporidium as well as 100% kill of coliform bacteria. The turbidity will be less than 0.1. These are the standards for surface drinking water; it is after the water is treated to such high standards that it will be discharged into infiltration galleries for additional treatment in the soil. Presently the Great Escape is permitted to discharge in excess of 45,000+ gallons per day of septic tank effluent into the soil, with this load currently being treated with subsurface fields and there is no negative impact occurring to the wetland or Glen Lake as previously stated. With the discharge improvements that include a 95+% reduction in BOD5, total suspended solids, coliform, NH3, PO4, giardia, and cryptosporidium, the subsurface treatment is expected to have considerably less concerns than what is currently in operation. The current systems, as previously stated, appear to have no impact to the wetland and Glen Lake as demonstrated by the data supplied by NYSDEC.

As far as modeling of the wetland and lake there would need to be a baseline for the modeling which would reflect what is occurring in the body of water presently. No modeling data for these bodies of water has been found. Modeling is an extensive scientific process whose results are somewhat subjective based on the snapshot in time when the model is performed, the amount of time observed in the model and the simplicity or complexity of the model chosen. "Overly simple models do not provide an adequate description of mechanisms and/or the system. Models that are too complex compromise the accuracy of predictions by introduction of uncertainties associated with the estimation/specification of large number of coefficients" (Steven Effler, 1996). The cost for a true model will exceed hundreds of thousands of dollars and the results will not yield any more information than what is already known as it relates to the required design of the wastewater treatment facility. It is the Great Escape's contention that there is currently 13 years worth of data to demonstrate an ecosystem in balance as it relates to nutrient loading, and the wastewater treatment facility proposed will most definitely reduce the pounds of nutrients from the current discharge. An estimate of the maximum pound per day of phosphorus as P that currently is discharged into the ground is between 4 and 10 lbs./day, the proposed WWTP will discharge about 0.04 lbs/day (assuming a flow of 0.1 MGD, total P of 0.05 MG/L as demonstrated in data already provided). This is a reduction in phosphorus of 99+%

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 408 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to sewage treatment, "Discuss the alternative treatment technologies or designs that would improve discharge effluent quality over that proposed to be met (see DGEIS page 2-14)? Describe the costs and benefits of meeting such standards."

RESPONSE 408

Designing a wastewater treatment facility is as much art as science and there are a number of different technologies available that will result in a similar effluent quality. The specific processes upstream of the effluent filter were selected because of the years of experience throughout the world with these processes. Activated sludge using an extended air process (mix liquor system) design was selected because of its ability to produce highly stable and consistent effluent quality and its ability to buffer swings in loading operationally by adding food during the low flow periods. The same is true with the de-nitrification process for biological reduction of nutrients, a long track record of success and an uncomplicated design. The effluent filter was selected because of the extensive research done in the New York City reservoir watershed, the most highly regulated in the State, which demonstrates a process that is simple to operate and provides the highest effluent quality available on the market in a singular process. The Applicant selected the processes and design after years of experience in facility operation and facility design taking into consideration the intermittent nature of the waste to be treated. We considered nearly every biological process including attached growth treatment such as trickling filters and rotating biological contractors. At issue with attached growth is the length of time it takes to grow the biomass so the intermittent waste streams will not afford the luxury of a 30 day time period to establish a population of microorganisms. A conventional activated sludge process would require primary settling tanks and the processing of primary sludge which is unstable and highly odorous. The possibility of using sequence batch receptors (SBR) exists and this change is not that difficult as it is similar to the extended aeration process that was selected with less equipment.

The alternatives that could be considered involve changing the secondary biological system from a mix liquor system to a fix media based facility. The mix liquor system is the most common, and include secondary treatment ponds or lagoons, most large municipal plants are a mix liquor (extended aeration, aeration system) while a fix media system (of rotating biological contactors or trickling bed) filters are feasible each has disadvantages. A variation of the mix liquor/activated sludge system is the sequence batch reactor, and open air oxidation ditches. Both of these systems require more space then the proposed extended air activated sludge system. A trickling bed filter would have to be very large to handle the loads and rotating biological contactor would be difficult to size due to expect variation in waste water strength at this site as it relates to the hotel, and amusement park mix in the waste stream. The mix liquor system is more adjustable since detention time can be varied slightly and the volume of air can also be increased or decreased. Each adjustment can be made independently which enhances flexibility and both adjustments will improve waste water quality.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 409 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to grading, "Provide full size grading plans for review."

RESPONSE 409

Plans were submitted to the Town with the DEIS. An additional set was provided with this Final EIS "completeness" submission.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 410 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to grading, "Provide the total amount of cut and fill proposed."

RESPONSE 410

This is a site plan detail dependent on final engineering drawings of the proposed development. At this time, the site is conceptually planned to be graded to balance the cuts and fills. Approximately 100,000 cubic yards of fill is required for preparation of the parking lots on the site and this material is available on site.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 411 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to grading, "The DGEIS states that the average grade reduction in Area C is five feet. What is the maximum grade reduction proposed?"

RESPONSE 411

The maximum excavation occurs at the blue lot where the cut will be 32 feet.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 412 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to grading, "Discuss the amount of fill proposed for the parking areas. How will this fill function in terms of stormwater detention and retention?"

RESPONSE 412

The parking areas—green, purple, brown and beige will be filled to a depth of 4-5 feet in most locations. The fill will provide dry soil above the seasonal water table of at least 3-10 feet especially during the summer season.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 413 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to grading, "DGEIS page 4-22 states 'The hillside grades will be changed to between 0 and 10'. Clarify, the meaning of this statement. Does it mean that a 10' reduction in the hill is proposed?"

RESPONSE 413

In certain locations 10 foot grade charges will occur. These changes occur at the location of the wall section primarily in the yellow and blue parking lots. The NYSDOT Right of Way (ROW) along Route 9 extends to the top of the hill between Route 9 and I-87. This area in the NYSDOT ROW will not be graded and will be held in place by a wall.

The discussion on page 4-22 was specific to the grading at the red and yellow parking lots. The red parking grade changes will involve 0-10 feet of cut while one portion of the yellow lot will require a 15 ft. cut.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 414 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to lighting, "The draft Queensbury zoning ordinance proposed a maximum light fixture height of 20 feet and a uniformity ratio of 4:1. The DGEIS proposed 50 foot tall fixtures with a uniformity ratio of 10:1. In our opinion the very tall parking lot lights proposed will be quite visible and will have a significant impact. Discuss the impacts of, and the Park's position with respect to, utilization of lower fixtures."

RESPONSE 414

As noted in DGEIS Section 2.1.1, the park only remains open into the evening hours on approximately 25 +/- days out of its 128 +/- day season. It is the Applicant's position that use of lower poles would require that more poles would be needed. It is the park's position that the relatively low level of lighting proposed, from between 0.5 and 1.5 foot candles, from fewer tall poles can more easily control the level of perimeter lighting. As noted in DGEIS Section 2.1.1, the pole heights would likely be 40 to 50 feet in height, and will be specified at the time that the site plan review application is submitted. The Lead Agency will weigh the Applicant's position against the light impacts from the tall lights proposed by the Applicant.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 415 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states, "Provide a general discussion of the type and volume of induced growth in the Rt. 9 corridor likely to result if the municipal sewer were extended to the Great Escape."

RESPONSE 415

Applicant does not propose a sewer and whoever does propose a sewer will have to study these impacts. See Responses 175 and 178.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 416 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states, "The DGEIS states that the applicant is opposed to the use of gravel lots because it will slow the filling of spaces by patrons. While perhaps true, this is the current situation, and observation would lead to the conclusion that it is not unacceptable to the population at large. Given the large amount of pavement (and associated stormwater management measures proposed), the applicant should present additional evidence or make a better case that paving the parking areas is a requirement for successful operation of the business."

RESPONSE 416

The Applicant believes the major environmental impact of paving has been addressed by the comprehensive stormwater management plan. The benefit of lot paving as proposed is to speed entry and parking of Park visitors at existing and projected levels. The Applicant believes that, while unpaved lots themselves may not be "unacceptable to the public at large", traffic delays to Park visitors and through travelers resulting from the Park's existing access was becoming clearly unacceptable to the public and the primary reason the Planning Board required the Park to increase parking capacity and propose traffic mitigation like the paved lot and ring road system. Additionally, unpaved parking is less efficient than paved parking lots and would require more acres of clearing to achieve the same number of parking spaces.

The Applicant believes that as a means to address the need to stripe the parking lots and decrease run off it is feasible to use porous pavement in the areas that will be used to park passenger vehicles during the summer. Two factors have contributed to premature failure of porous pavement. The first is typical winter maintenance practices of sanding. The sand plugs the pore spaces in the pavement which eliminates the ability of the pavement to transmit water. Since most of the parking lots will not be used in the winter, this contributing factor to early failure can be avoided. The second factor leading to premature failure is use of porous pavement by heavy trucks or buses. This problem can be avoided by using porous pavement only areas to be used for car parking. The Applicant proposes that conventional pavement be used for the ring road and major driving aisles in the parking lots. The Applicant also proposes that the parking lot at the Hotel also be paved with conventional hotmix asphalt.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 417 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states, "The proposed 10 foot buffers along the Northway will, in our opinion, provide little meaningful screening, visual or otherwise."

RESPONSE 417

Along the Northway corridor grading has been limited by working with the existing contours. Approximately 2,200 feet of the area adjacent to the Northway will not be graded, or grading will be very limited. Planting the buffer zone as illustrated by DGEIS Figure 2-4 will be effective enhancement of the visual environment and the 10 foot buffer is double that required by the zoning ordinance. The DGEIS Figure 2-10 illustrates the character of the planting plan along Route 9 where, due to the grades, it is feasible to provide effective screening for the traveling public. It is impossible to block views from the Northway into the parking lot due to the higher elevation along the Northway corridor in relationship to the parking lots. The Planning Board will weigh these considerations against the use of an alternate parking lot layout that would result in more screening.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 418 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states, "DGEIS page 2-3 states that the Park is open into the evening about 25 days out of every season. Is this intended as a statement of policy with respect to future operations?"

RESPONSE 418

No, it is a simple factual statement regarding existing operations.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 419 **(Mr. Stuart F. Mesinger, AICP, Director, Chazen Engineering and Land Surveying, Inc., 110 Glen Street, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 13, 2000):**

Commenter states, "Provide a large scale USGS topographic map that shows the location of all of the line of site profiles contained in the DGEIS. The map should illustrate the starting and ending point of each profile."

RESPONSE 419

Refer to FGEIS Section 4.2 Figures B,C, D and E, "Locations of Profiles," for this information.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 420 **(Ms. Linda Whittle, Birdsall Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 16, 2000):**

Commenter, a seasonal resident of Birdsall Road, states, "Protection of surface water and groundwater quality is of paramount importance to Glen Lake."

RESPONSE 420

The wastewater treatment facility is to be equipped with processes that currently are designed in potable water filtration facilities. The filter design has 7 ft. of 1.4 mm silica sand, a chemical coagulant is added prior to the filtration process and the treated effluent is disinfected with chlorine, it then passes into a second filter with 5 ft of 0.9 mm silica sand. The resulting effluent will possess in excess of log – 3 removal of the protozoan giardia and cryptosporidium as well as 100% kill of coliform bacteria. The turbidity will be less than 0.1. These are the standards for surface drinking water, it is after the water is treated to such high standards that it will be discharged into infiltration galleys for additional treatment in the soil. Presently the Great Escape is permitted to discharge in excess of 45,000+ gallons per day of septic tank effluent into the soil, with this load currently being treated with subsurface fields and there is no negative impact occurring to the wetland or Glen Lake as previously stated. Surely with the discharge improvements that include a 95+% reduction in BOD5, total suspended solids, coliform, NH3, PO4, giardia, and cryptosporidium, the subsurface treatment will have considerably less concerns than what is currently in operation. The current systems, as previously stated, provide no impact to the wetland and Glen Lake as demonstrated by the data supplied by NYSDEC.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 421 **(Ms. Linda Whittle, Birdsall Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 16, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to noise from the Northway, "The present existing land form between I-87 and Route 9 provides an important sound barrier to reduce Northway noise toward the east. Any parking development in this corridor must at minimum incorporate similar sound alleviation benefits."

RESPONSE 421

The wide NYSDOT held US Route 9 corridor causes the preservation of the hillside to the top of the grades above US Route 9. To maintain the hillside it is necessary to use retaining walls to hold the slope. Figures 4-2B and 4-2C illustrate the preservation of the important portion of the hillside. The wall barrier that is required will have an insertion effect which is a distinct and rapid attenuation of sound at a structure. This is in all likelihood a greater abatement than occurs due to the ground effects of sound traveling over the natural earth.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 422 **(Ms. Linda Whittle, Birdsall Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 16, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to noise from the Park, "Construction of the 23 lot subdivision at Round Pond and Birdsall Roads has provided a sound corridor form the park toward the homes to the east. The existing undeveloped hill owned by John Whalen provides an essential visual and auditory buffer for residents of Glen Lake. This buffer must be maintained. To insure preservation the town should require that the park purchase all or the ridge portion of this hill to be preserved with no cutting and no grading for a perpetual buffer."

RESPONSE 422

The most recent Town Master Plan provides that the existing topography should be maintained on the Whalen property so that Glen Lake residents are buffered from Park noise impacts as they are currently by the undeveloped hill referred to by Commenter. Applicant would therefore expect that current zoning plans for the area would continue to provide that the existing topography on the Whalen property would be maintained.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 423 **(Ms. Linda Whittle, Birdsall Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 16, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to the Park's hours of operation, "The noise from the bobsled ride is ever present and annoying but loud music and Christian Rock until midnight is purely unacceptable. I formally request the board to limit the hours of music and loud entertainment."

RESPONSE 423

The Christian concert demonstrates the importance of position of the music venue in the Park. Prior to the 1999 event, the concert was held in the circus dome without complaint. The "Kingdom Band" festival which was held in the picnic area in 1999 was not held during the 2000 season. All future events will be held in the interior portion of the park and indoor facilities in order to abate excessive sound transmission.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 424 **(Queensbury Environmental Issues Advisory Committee; written comments dated October 17, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to visual impacts, "Consideration of visible impacts should not be limited to the close proximity of the park as illustrated in the DGEIS. In volume I, page iv, paragraph 4, the statement is made 'while virtually all modified development in the existing established area of the park (Park Area A), will not be visible from outside the park, this DGEIS also studies the potential for new attractions such as rides to create visual impacts.' Residences as far as two miles from the park...can clearly see 6 rides protruding above the trees already. Additional rides at or above these levels should be avoided as they are visually dominant in an otherwise undisturbed landscape from many viewpoints."

RESPONSE 424

Refer to Response 343. See FGEIS Section 4.3 "Visual Analysis 2000-2001.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 425 **(Queensbury Environmental Issues Advisory Committee; written comments dated October 17, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to visual impacts, "A major visual impact (and potential environmental impact) of the proposed expansion will be the construction of the large parking facilities in Area C, increasing the parking from 2,600 spaces to 4,000 spaces. The need for this parking is unclear from a total park use perspective. Currently, the existing parking allows for crowds in the park that frequently result in lines of more than 1 hour at most of the popular rides/shows. Consequently, the park under existing build-out seems near capacity. If the number of activities within the park is not expanded by 2-fold, then it seems unnecessary to nearly double the parking capacity. It does not seem reasonable to assume that without considerable increase in facilities within the park, crowds warranting the extensive parking proposed are going to turn out to wait in two-hour-long lines. The total amount of proposed parking should be phased in over a period of years based on the project use related to expansion of Park attractions."

RESPONSE 425

See Response 194.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 426 **(Queensbury Environmental Issues Advisory Committee; written comments dated October 17, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to Traffic/ Parking, "Section 5, page 5-1 states that the proposed loss of vegetation is unavoidable. Some of the loss of the proposed 11.5 acres of forest could be reasonably avoided and more thoroughly mitigated. Figure 4-1 shows that all of the mature trees/shrubs will be removed along the Northway right-of-way to accommodate the expanded parking. The proposed plantings in figure 2-4 appear to be insufficient to provide a visual barrier from the Northway or from Route 9. Since the amount of parking is in excess of what seems to be reasonably needed for the park facilities (see comment [425]), the width of the buffer along the Northway should be increased and some of the large mature trees left in place. In addition, the planting scheme should be sufficient to ensure the view of the massive paved parking area is fully mitigated from both major roadways. This should include a monitoring plan for the plantings, and a commitment to ensure survival or replanting of trees and shrubs for 3 years after planting. The composition of the landscape material should be native species instead of ornamentals wherever possible."

RESPONSE 426

See Response 195.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 427 **(Queensbury Environmental Issues Advisory Committee; written comments dated October 17, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to Traffic/Parking, "The proposal to use excess soil from grading to increase the height of the land along the Northway may assist in providing a visual buffer. However, details of this plan were not provided. The potential negative impacts of this proposal of fill in close proximity to wetlands and the effect on the stormwater management should be addressed. The potential for keeping mature trees in the existing buffer along the Northway would have significantly less environmental impacts than a grading plan to dispose of soil in this area in a way that would require removal of all existing vegetation."

RESPONSE 427

The purpose of filling the lowest lot is to increase the elevation of the lot so that the area is above the floodplain and will provide dry soil for stormwater treatment. It is not practical to build a berm in this location as part of a visual barrier. The provision of dry aerobic soil is important to the water quality protection function of the stormwater plan. Any increase in height of the land (over that shown in the grading plan) from excess soils from grading operations will likely be limited to 5 feet or less, and will not be allowed to occur in wetlands.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 428 **(Queensbury Environmental Issues Advisory Committee; written comments dated October 17, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to Traffic/ Parking, "A parking garage would seem a very viable alternative. There would be a huge reduction in pavement, vegetative removal, and consequently stormwater runoff. If a convention center is to be built, this parking garage could better service the patrons and would be utilized year round. The snow removal operation would be greatly reduced by such a plan."

RESPONSE 428

The Applicant has argued that a parking garage is not feasible due to cost. A parking space on grade costs $1,000 per space while a deck costs $5,000, and a garage with ramps costs $10,000 per space. Assuming that an acre of paved parking accommodates 125 vehicles, the cost of a one acre lot is $125,000. To accommodate the same 125 cars on a deck would cost $325,000 (½ below deck on grade and ½ on deck) and a garage structure for 125 cars is $1,250,000. Beyond cost issues, a parking structure with its narrow aisles and ramps is a cumbersome method of parking cars compared to the proposed "festival parking" designs and would not achieve the applicant's requirement of offering fast parking during peak periods to mitigate off-site traffic congestion in the Study Area. The Planning Board will consider these arguments as well as the benefits of a parking garage in making its Findings.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 429 **(Queensbury Environmental Issues Advisory Committee; written comments dated October 17, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to Surface Waters/ Wetlands Impacts, "The DGEIS concludes that there will be no significant long-term cumulative effects on aquatic ecology. The information provided is insufficient to support this statement. Potential contributions to surface water degradation include stormwater run-off, wastewater discharge and to a lesser extent, waterfowl use...The stormwater plan provides detailed information on how the quantity of stormwater will be treated in order to remain at or below existing conditions. However, the DGEIS does not address stromwater quality. The discharge of the stormwater goes to sensitive aquatic systems and data to support the contention that there will not be long-term degradation of surface water quality resulting from the significant increase in impervious surfaces proposed by the project needs to be presented. Due to the seasonal operation of the Park, alternative surfaces could be used to increase permeability in parking areas that will not need to be plowed in the winter. The DGEIS should address decreasing the impermeable surfaces as an alternative that would decrease the potential for significant surface water quality impacts resulting from stormwater runoff from the parking areas."

RESPONSE 429

See DGEIS Section 7.3. Also refer to Responses 56, 87 and 107.

DGEIS Reference: See DGEIS Section 4 pages 28-34.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 430 **(Queensbury Environmental Issues Advisory Committee; written comments dated October 17, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to Surface Waters/ Wetlands Impacts, "An existing condition within the park that adds to degradation of water quality is the presence of waterfowl within the main stream. Populations of waterfowl may also utilize the proposed stormwater ponds. As mitigation for potential water quality impacts, the Great Escape should implement low-cost measure[s] to manage the water fowl populations. Allowing vegetation to grow along the bank of the stream, fencing and, in particular, signage discouraging the guests from feeding the ducks, should be used to discourage the large resident population from over-use of this section of the stream. Water fowl are notorious for increasing nutrient and coliform contamination in surface water and a proper management program should be implemented. An education program with simple signs requesting the guests not to feed the ducks would be beneficial along the existing restaurant facilities near Subway and Itza Pizzeria."

RESPONSE 430

See Response 197.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 431 **(Queensbury Environmental Issues Advisory Committee; written comments dated October 17, 2000):**

Commenter states, "The pedestrian bridge and/or tunnel are good and necessary alternatives to move people across Route 9. For the safety of the visitor this needs to be done no matter what the outcome of the expansion is. Bike and pedestrian traffic need to have better access and extending the bike path would offer a safer place in which to travel. The idea of parking fees and tollbooths would not be recommended. Since there is such a high volume of traffic in such a short amount of time this would defeat the purpose of good traffic flow and make for a much happier customer. Increase the ticket prices or charge at the main gate in lieu of the tollbooths. Staffing the tollbooths would be expensive and would add a great deal of complexity to the operation. An access road off of Route 9 would alleviate traffic congestion and is probably a better alternative than widening Route 9 facility."

RESPONSE 431

The toll booths and stacking lanes analysis is on page 2-5 of the DGEIS. The booths will collect parking fee from two lanes of traffic. The ring road will accommodate one way traffic, especially from the north during the park entry period (10 AM-12 noon).

Bicycle travel is largely accommodated by the existing Warren County bike path, which serves to provide access to the Great Escape from a wide geographic area. The existing bike path extends west along Round Pond Road to Route 9. Bicycle travel west of Birdsall Road is accommodated in a shared travel lane on Round Pond Road. The County has posted signs on Round Pond Road to heighten awareness of the shared roadway section to Route 9. Bicyclists reaching the Route 9 / Round Pond Road intersection will cross at a pedestrian-actuated crosswalk signal to the bicycle parking area which will be near the Park's new southern access road (in the drop-off area prior to the parking tolls). This bicycle access will serve both Martha's and the Park.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 432 **(Queensbury Environmental Issues Advisory Committee; written comments dated October 17, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to Surface Waters/ Wetlands Impacts, "The sheer volume of paved parking area, for a limited time per year, goes beyond the threshold of what the land can carry. The storm-water runoff would be significant, particularly with the removal of a vast majority of the existing vegetation. There are no specifics given for the type of drywells and detention basins to be used. Certainly with this magnitude of parking area, oil and grid chambers would be used. Voltechnics would be a good choice. They were used by the recent Target Distribution Center in Wilton. Again, there is no mention of the adverse [e]ffects to the wetland from this runoff, nor of the contaminants of heavy metals etc. that might be in the runoff. If there is to be expansion and improvement, the number of parking spaces needs to be mitigated."

RESPONSE 432

The stormwater management plan and the proposed stormwater facilities provide substantial mitigation for potential impacts. The analysis provided demonstrates that the average annual nutrient loading will not substantially increase. The analysis is very conservative, since most parking fields will not be maintained during the winter months which is the period of time when large amount of sand, salt and other debris accumulates in a system and then is discharged during spring melt. The basin adjacent to the Rush Pond outlet will be fitted with swirl concentrators (stormceptors, vortechnics) or advance filter (stormfilter). The Planning Board may require similar measures on other basins; such decisions will be made at the site plan review stage.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 433 **(Queensbury Environmental Issues Advisory Committee; written comments dated October 17, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to Wastewater Disposal, "Page 3-4 states that no activities will involve or intercept with groundwater table is within 6 feet of the surface during parts of the year. In addition, page 2-14 indicates that the effluent from the preferred wastewater treatment alternative will be discharged to a deep sandy soil, which will further reduce nutrient pollution to the regional groundwater system. The design flows for the wastewater treatment system are up to 95,000 GPD (gallons per day). The treated effluent limit for total phosphorous (the nutrient with the greatest potential for contamination of surface water) is 0.5 mg/L. The surface water concentrations of total phosphorous in the surrounding wetlands and the final receiving waters of Glen Lake are 1 to 2 orders of magnitude less than this effluent concentration. The surface water concentrations of total phosphorous (TP) in tributaries to Glen Lake range from 0.009 to 0.040 mg/L TP. Unless the separation from the groundwater and ultimate discharge to surface water is capable of continuously removing a substantial load of TP from the effluent, indefinitely, during all flow conditions, a potential for significant impact to water quality exists. The DGEIS does not provide sufficient information regarding the groundwater or soil conditions, or the proposed wastewater disposal system in section 2.1.10 or Appendix 6 to support the statement that ground water or surface water will not be impacted by the proposed discharge."

RESPONSE 433

Because of the design of the facility, the effluent from the WWTP will be comparable to potable water, this effluent will then be discharged into the ground, not into the waters of Glen Lake or its tributaries. The wastewater treatment facility is to be equipped with processes that currently are designed in potable water filtration facilities. The filter design has 7 ft. of 1.4 mm silica sand, and a chemical coagulant is added prior to the filtration process which chemically reacts with the phosphorous compounds creating a filterable floc particle, making filtration the most effective means of nutrient reduction. The treated effluent is disinfected with chlorine, it then passes into a second filter with 5 ft of 0.9 mm silica sand. The resulting effluent will possess in excess of log – 3 removal of the protozoan giardia and cryptosporidium as well as 100% kill of coliform bacteria. The turbidity will be less than 0.1. Phosphorous will be at "non-detect" levels at most certified labs, depending on the protocol the lab uses.

An extensive report has been provided explaining the specific details of the wastewater facility. Presently the Great Escape is permitted to discharge in excess of 45,000+ gallons per day of septic tank effluent into the soil. Septic effluent contains the most bio-reactive form of phosphorous. This load is currently being treated with subsurface fields and there is no negative impact occurring to the wetland or Glen Lake as previously stated. The discharge of 90,000 GPD as per USEPA standards for rapid infiltration take into account the soil conditions, the size of the infiltration area, the depth to ground water, the distance from a body of water, the waste assimilative capacity of the area, and the quality of the discharge. All of these standards are considered and the design is done to insure no detrimental impact. The current systems, as previously stated, provide no impact to the wetland and Glen Lake as demonstrated by the data supplied by NYSDEC. It is the Great Escape's contention that there is currently 13 years worth of data to demonstrate an ecosystem in balance as it relates to nutrient loading and that the wastewater treatment facility proposed will most definitely reduce the pounds of nutrients from the current discharge. An estimate of the maximum pound per day of phosphorus as P that currently is discharged into the ground is between 4 and 10 lbs/day, the proposed WWTP will discharge about 0.04 lbs/day (assuming a flow of 0.1 MGD, total P of 0.05 mg/L as demonstrated in data already provided) this is a reduction in phosphorus of 99%+.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 434 **(Queensbury Environmental Issues Advisory Committee; written comments dated October 17, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to Wastewater Disposal, "The use of the type of small plant proposed, with relatively high quality effluent capabilities, may not result in significant water quality impacts in the short-term. However, concern is the degradation of groundwater, and ultimate receiving water quality over many years of operation, when the capacity of the sandy soils to remove nutrients may become over-loaded. Mitigation for this long-term impact may be achieved by having the SPDES permit for the plant limited to a discreet time period (3-5 years) and making the permit non-renewable. This should be considered as an alternative in the DGEIS. Prior to the permit expiration, alternatives, such as connecting to municipal sewer should be reconsidered, and the operation and impacts of the system should be re-evaluated."

RESPONSE 434

As previously stated the facility's design would discharge loadings that are 95%+ less in nutrients, total suspended solids, BOD5, turbidity, coliform then the current subsurface systems. There will also be a continuous sampling program because of the SPDES requirements. The discharge of 90,000 GPD as per USEPA standards for rapid infiltration take into account the soil conditions, the size of the infiltration area, the depth to ground water, the distance from a body of water, the waste assimilative capacity of the area, the quality of the discharge. All of these standards are considered and the design is done to insure no detrimental impact. The Planning Board's environmental consultant agrees with the Commentor regarding the importance of application rates to the long-term operation of the system. The Planning Board intends to make this known to the NYSDEC as it reviews the project.

Should a municipal sewer be extended on Route 9 the Great Escape has indicated its willingness to tie into it.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 435 **(Queensbury Environmental Issues Advisory Committee; written comments dated October 17, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to Wastewater Disposal, "A major issue in the wastewater treatment proposal is the lack of resolution of the potential for municipal sewer to serve the Park. The DGEIS should not be finalized until the Town's sewer study is complete. There is a regional sewage treatment plant in the City of Glens Falls and a sewer line within a few miles of the park. Connecting into this municipal system...must be considered."

RESPONSE 435

The DGEIS evaluated the feasibility of connecting to the sewer as one of the "alternatives" included in the DGEIS scope. Sewers are not available at this site and cannot be assumed to be available in the near future.

The Great Escape has indicated its willingness to connect to a sewer should one become available in the future.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 436 **(Queensbury Environmental Issues Advisory Committee; written comments dated October 17, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to Wastewater Disposal, "The DGEIS assumes that the operation and maintenance of the facility will continuously allow attainment of high quality effluent standards. The potential for short-term impacts due to operational difficulties should be considered."

RESPONSE 436

Because of the redundant design which provides back up systems and additional tankage during start up, the facility will have the ability to recycle flow to insure the effluent quality before the flow is discharged. Flow equalization is the most important aspect of the design which will help to insure the facility's ability to absorb the swings in flow and strength of sewage changes. The flow equalization aspect is designed to insure a steady-state condition for the downstream biological processes and the physical/chemical processes. The pilot work performed on the filters selected indicate the ability of the filter to handle loadings which are close to 10X the design for up to two hour periods and still maintain an effluent well within the permitted requirements. The facility will be equipped with process alarms to monitor various different aspects of the operation to insure if a problem begins to develop, the operator will be dispatched. There is an emergency generator to power the entire facility during power outages. The design requirements calls for the facility to be able to handle up to 2.5X the average daily flow of the facility as well. The operators will be required to be certified under the SPDES program which allows only the most qualified people to oversee the operation of a facility of this type. The filter manufacturer guarantees the quality of the effluent from its filters if the operator meets its training requirements, so all operating personnel will be factory-trained to insure that the warranty is in place. Laboratory samples will be collected monthly by a NYS ELAP certified laboratory with those results made available to the public through the SPDES program. Every step has be taken to insure the quality of the effluent from this facility will have no adverse environmental impact.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 437 **(Queensbury Environmental Issues Advisory Committee; written comments dated October 17, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to Wastewater Disposal, "The water used on the site is withdrawn from the Hudson River, supplied by the Town of Queensbury. The discharge of the wastewater out-of-basin, to Halfway Brook should be addressed."

RESPONSE 437

The Hudson River flow is over 1000 cfs (more than 646 million gallons/day) while the water withdrawn for the entire Park, including the proposed improvements, is approximately 0.14 cfs (92,000 +/- gallons/day) or less than 0.00014%. Therefore, this is not considered a significant impact.

The water supplied to Great Escape is drawn from the Hudson River by the Town of Queensbury Water Treatment Facility where it is treated with a series of processes to make the water potable. The current discharge at Great Escape is into the soil, not into Halfway Brook. Because of the recent initiative by US EPA, watershed protection is becoming more and more important. Watersheds are being viewed from a more global approach using TMDL (Total Mass Density Loading). Under the new approach, the discharges both current and future would be considered to be in the Hudson River Watershed, but because the discharge is subsurface, the impact to that watershed would most likely not be considered a part of the TMDL calculation.

The NYS SPDES permit program is based on the requirement that the permitted discharge be of better quality than the receiving waters, this is to insure the improvement of the waters throughout the state of New York. This program is a statewide success as the waters across the state have improved considerably over the past two plus decades that the program has been in effect. The proposed effluent quality of the wastewater facility exceeds many of the requirements for potable water and will be of higher quality than any of the surrounding waters. Subsurface discharge is an additional design element not required by the SPDES program but put forth to insure an additional level of protection. The design of the treatment process incorporates the technology that is used in drinking water facilities to insure the integrity of the water quality. The soil conditions will be tested and the design done according to regulatory requirements for the soils. Currently all of the waste is being treated with septic tanks and the effluent is discharged to the ground with absolutely no negative impact to Glen Lake as proven by the total phosphorous level in the Lake. The Great Escape proposal is to improve the treatment of this waste with biological treatment, physical/chemical treatment and finally filtration equal to the standards established for microfiltration and then disinfection, an improvement of four additional levels of treatment than is currently being done. So, if the current level of only primary in-ground septic treatment is having no apparent impact on Glen Lake, an improvement will certainly continue that no impact scenario.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 438 **(Queensbury Environmental Issues Advisory Committee; written comments dated October 17, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to Noise, "Impacts to the adjoining residential communities must be minimized in order to prevent having their current quality of life compromised by increased noise both during the day and night and over a long period of time by an extended season. Mitigation should include shorter hours of the day and a shorter season."

RESPONSE 438

See Response 3.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 439 **(Queensbury Environmental Issues Advisory Committee; written comments dated October 17, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to Economic Impacts, "The positive economic benefits stated in the DGEIS are countered by negative impacts on residential property values. In addition, taxpayers in the Queensbury School District will not directly benefit from the portion of the proposed park expansion that within the Lake George School District. The sales tax on a $33.00 ticket is 0.6% - not the 7% that the DGEIS implies."

RESPONSE 439

There is no evidence offered by Commenters or others brought forward in the record of this SEQR proceeding to indicate any demonstrated negative effects on property values. The evidence on property values appears to be to the contrary. See Response 168. With respect to the happenstance that property taxes are levied on the Park by the Lake George School District as opposed to Queensbury, see Response 173.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 440 **(Queensbury Environmental Issues Advisory Committee; written comments dated October 17, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to Economic Impacts, "The need for a second convention center if the one in Lake George is built, must be addressed."

RESPONSE 440

The DEIS assumes that the Convention Center will either be built at one location or the other, but not both. Similarly, the DEIS does not seek to independently assess or establish the "need" for a convention center, but assumes the conclusion of the County's study undertaken by the Pinnacle Group that a center is needed. The Applicant, however, not given access to the County consultants or their workpapers to assess need, costs, etc. As far as is known therefore, there is no need for a second convention center at the Park if one is built in Lake George. Since the Applicant did not address need for a convention center at all, there is no reason to perform the evaluation suggested by Commenter.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 441 **(Queensbury Environmental Issues Advisory Committee; written comments dated October 17, 2000):**

In a comment substantially similar to Queensbury Environmental Issues Advisory Committee member George Stec's earlier written comments, Commenter questions whether the DGEIS conclusion that there are "no protected species of plants or animals" at the site given that DGEIS Table 3-2 lists wild lupine (*Lupinus perennis)*, the only known food plant for the larvae of the Karner Blue butterfly (*Lycaedis melissa samuelis*), an endangered species, as existing at the site.

Moreover, Commenter states that the potential for Karner Blue habitat at the site must be further evaluated and discussed pursuant to a letter from the U.S. Department of the Interior dated January 11, 2000, and addressed to Dr. Richard P. Futyima of the LA Group listed in the DGEIS' Letters of Record. Such an evaluation must include "direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to the Karner Blue butterfly or its habitat, and include appropriate measures if necessary, to protect this species and its habitat."

In addition, Commenter states that the "whole land holdings constituting the Great Escape Park should be resurveyed to locate and identify the lupine plant." In support of this recommendation, Commenter cites a report prepared by Michael S. Batcher, M.S., consulting Ecological and Environmental Planner on March 15, 1998, entitled, *Report on 1997 Survey For Lupine* (Lupinus perennis) *Sites and Karner Blue butterfly* (Lycaeides melissa samuelis) *Populations in the Town of Queensbury, Warren County, New York* which identifies six (6) sites where the lupine has been mapped, including two of Great Escape's properties (the Samoset property in Park Area C and Park Area B). Commenter also states that , "Within the last 15 years or so, Park Area C, the proposed site for the park's expansion has been heavily logged thus improving the site for the expansion of the lupine plant habitat. This logging and the time elapsed since it was done has made this area conducive to the expansion of the lupine habitat." According to Commenter, "results of such a survey should be presented along with comments from the N.Y.S. Department of Environmental Conservation regarding the habitat issue and potential impacts of the proposed action."

RESPONSE 441

See Responses 344 and 345.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 442 **(Queensbury Environmental Issues Advisory Committee; written comments dated October 17, 2000):**

In a comment substantially similar to Queensbury Environmental Issues Advisory Committee member George Stec's earlier written comments, Commenter states that there are protected species on the project site, including the Jefferson salamander, the Blue-spotted salamander, the Spotted salamander, the Wood turtle, the common barn-owl, the common night hawk, the Eastern bluebird, and the Karner Blue butterfly, all of which Commenter states are listed as threatened species or species of special concern under Environmental Conservation Law ("ECL") section 182.6. Thus, Commenter states that the statement on DGEIS page 3-11, which states that. 'no rare, threatened or endangered wildlife species are known to exist on the site nor were any observed by L.A. Group biologist,' should be clarified and potential impacts to habitat of any protected species should be addressed.

RESPONSE 442

See Responses 347 and 348. At this point, there are no confirmed records of occurrence on the project site of any of the protected species mentioned by the Commenter. Nor do any of the areas where new development is proposed contain habitats that are particularly likely to harbor such species.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 443 **(Queensbury Environmental Issues Advisory Committee; written comments dated October 17, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to Archaeological Resources, "The fact that there are such significant archeological sites in this area should be an asset to the town. The sites that were located on the Indian Ridge property could very easily be associated with these new sites. Instead of once again paving over an important site, a creative way to preserve and interpret these sites would be of greater benefit to the community, visitors, and for the generations to come. To erase history for the sake of parking lots is unjustified...Preserving the sites should be given due consideration rather than the alternative of a Data Retrieval Investigation...Is not Heritage Tourism being promoted in the community – what an opportunity!"

Commenter further asks, "When will the Phase II archeological investigation take place if it is deemed necessary to impact the sites? With 84 STP'S over a 20 acre parcel, a phase II will offer so much more data, for both the Holtz Terrace and the Kenney Terrace sites. But will they do the investigation? What will happen to these sites, especially if they are eligible for National Register Status?" and furthermore, "Where will the artifacts be placed that have already been recovered and the additional ones yet to be recovered? Do the artifacts belong to the Great Escape, to the Town or the State of New York? Will they ever be made available for public exhibition and interpretation?"

RESPONSE 443

A Phase II archeological study was conducted in December 1999. During the Phase II field work, a small scatter of precontact artifacts were located on the Kenny Terrace, but the site was determined not to be eligible for the National Register by New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation Office (NYS OPRHP). The Holtz Terrace produced more concentrated clusters of precontact artifacts and was determined to be eligible for the National Register by NYS OPRHP. Currently, The Great Escape, Hartgen Archeological Associates, Inc. and NYS OPRHP are working together to determine a preservation/recovery plan. Such a plan must either avoid disturbance to the site or mitigate potential disturbance by conducting a Phase III Data Retrieval study at the site prior to construction. Due to the size, location and configuration of the Holtz Terrace site with respect to the Project, it is anticipated that avoidance will not be feasible and that recovery will be the mitigation proposed. Data retrieval excavations, should it be necessary, will be performed to the highest standards. In regards to ownership of the artifacts, qualifications of the archeologists, and public exhibit and interpretation of the sites please see Response 182. SPHO has approved the archaeological recovery/mitigation plan which will be implemented well in advance of any disturbance or construction on the Kenny Terrace site.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 444 **(Ms. Aileen Kane, Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 17, 2000):**

Commenter, a resident of Fitzgerald Road on Glen Lake, states that, "the decision to build a sewage treatment plant at the edge of the Glen Lake fen is risky. The lake needs protection not danger at its edge." Commenter states further, "If only the two municipalities could cooperate and lay sewer lines so that this could be eliminated."

RESPONSE 444

The wastewater treatment facility is to be equipped with processes that currently are designed in potable water filtration facilities. The filter design has 7 ft. of 1.4 mm silica sand, a chemical coagulant is added prior to the filtration process and the treated effluent is disinfected with chlorine, it then passes into a second filter with 5 ft of 0.9 mm silica sand. The resulting effluent will possess in excess of log 3 removal of the protozoan giardia and cryptosporidium as well as 100% kill of coliform bacteria The turbidity will be less than 0.1. These are the standards for surface drinking water. It is after the water is treated to such high standards that it will be discharged into infiltration galleries for additional treatment in the soil.

Presently the Great Escape is permitted to discharge in excess of 45,000+ gallons per day of septic tank effluent into the soil, this load currently being treated with subsurface fields, and there is no negative impact occurring to the wetland or Glen Lake as previously stated. Surely with the discharge improvements that include a 95+% reduction in BOD5, total suspended solids, coliform, NH3, PO4, giardia, cryptosporidium the subsurface treatment will present considerably less concerns than what is currently in operation.

The current systems, as previously stated, appears to provide no impact to the wetland and Glen Lake as demonstrated by the data supplied by NYSDEC. The discharge of 90,000 GPD as per USEPA standards for rapid infiltration take into account the soil conditions, the size of the infiltration area, the depth to ground water, the distance from a body of water, the waste assimilative capacity of the area, the quality of the discharge. All of these standards are considered and the design is done to insure no detrimental impact. Again, because of the design of the facility, the effluent from the WWTP will be comparable to potable water, this effluent will then be discharged into the ground, not into the waters of Glen Lake or its tributaries. The issue of whether a sewer alternative is reasonable at this time is also addressed in many previous responses, e.g. Response 98.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 445 **(Ms. Aileen Kane, Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 17, 2000):**

Commenter states, "The extensive tree removal that [Great Escape] suggest[s] would make the entrance to our town an eyesore and cause severe runoff, air quality and noise problems. There must be a better way to handle their parking problems." Commenter also notes with respect to visual impacts of the project, "Our view of the mountains at the end of the lake is beautiful. The thought of a huge ride rising in the middle of that scene is hard to believe."

RESPONSE 445

Comment noted. With regard to potential visual impacts, refer to FGEIS Section 4.3, "Visual Analysis 2000-2001."

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 446 **(Ms. Aileen Kane, Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 17, 2000):**

Commenter states, "It is unfortunate that this piece of property [the amusement park] was purchased with the ultimate goal being such growth. It is evident that it is not large enough to accommodate it and [Great Escape's] proposals will change the nature of our town in a very dramatic way. It seems that our environment, our eyes and our ears are being assaulted by the bottom line of a big, distant, unconcerned company."

RESPONSE 446

Comment noted. With respect to the comment that the Park is insufficiently sized to accommodate existing and proposed development, See, Response 97.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 447 (Mr. Robert C. Greene, 4111 State Route 9, Warrensburg; written comments dated October 19, 2000):

Commenter states with respect to traffic impacts, "the objections to stop the expansions because of increased traffic is about like a coyote howling at the moon as it is going to happen regardless of Great Escape's expansion unless there is a drastic change of living." Commenter cites traffic statistics showing that "for several decades the number of vehicles on the roads doubles every ten years," and his personal observations of the growth in traffic in the Glens Falls area and Route 9. Commenter also states that roads (number of lanes, proximity to "volume highways") accessing Six Flags Darien Lake and Six Flags Riverside (Agawam, MA) are similar to or less convenient to major highways than those at the Great Escape, yet those parks support more park visitors than the Great Escape.

RESPONSE 447

Comment noted. The traffic study notes that background traffic growth has approximated 2%/yr. and is assumed to grow at 2%/yr. during the study period.

The number of vehicles on Route 9 has not doubled in ten years. Traffic count data collected by NYSDOT as published in the annual Traffic Volume Reports indicates that the annual average daily traffic (AADT) on Route 9 between Route 254 (Aviation Road) and Exit 20 has increased from 12,800 vehicles per day in 1988 to 17,200 vehicles per day in 1999. This equates to a 34 percent increase in daily traffic or an average of 2.7 percent per year over this time. The Traffic Impact Study included a 2 percent per year annual growth rate in background traffic as the basis for estimating the No-Build traffic volumes for the next 5 years.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 448 **(Mr. Robert C. Greene, 4111 State Route 9, Warrensburg; written comments dated October 19, 2000):**

Commenter states, "As to lake water pollution...there are regulations opposing the robbing of a watershed by pumping sewerage into another watershed."

RESPONSE 448

There are no general rules or prohibitions concerning "water diversion". There is a specific rule protecting the Great Lakes from water diversion. However, this project adds water to the Great Lake Basin. The project does not divert water but consumes potable water from an approved municipal source which utilizes the Hudson River. Refer to Response 437.

The current discharge at Great Escape is into the soil not into receiving waters directly. Because of the initiative by USEPA, watershed is becoming more and more important. Watersheds are being viewed from a more global approach using TMDL (Total Mass Density Loading). Under this approach the discharges both current and future would be considered to be in the Hudson River Watershed but because the discharge is subsurface, the impact to that watershed would most likely not be considered a part of the TMDL calculation.

All other users serviced out of the Hudson River Basin by the Queensbury Water Treatment Plant discharge out of the Hudson River Basin.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 449 **(Mr. Robert C. Greene, 4111 State Route 9, Warrensburg; written comments dated October 19, 2000):**

Commenter asserts with respect to stormwater runoff and consequent pollution of receiving waters, that a greater source of pollution which is may be misidentified as pollution from stormwater runoff may be the activity of animals in or near the water such as ducks, geese, terns, muskrats, and beavers.

RESPONSE 449

See Response 197 concerning wildlife.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 450 **(Mr. Robert C. Greene, 4111 State Route 9, Warrensburg; written comments dated October 19, 2000):**

Commenter disputes any claims that "high buildings or structures would harm their neighborhood" stating that if that were true, "Glens Falls would be in bad shape and Manhattan would be gone."

RESPONSE 450

The comment is noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 451 **(Mr. Robert C. Greene, 4111 State Route 9, Warrensburg; written comments dated October 19, 2000):**

Commenter states that just as businesses moving into an area should not build or buy in established residential areas, residents who build or buy next to existing businesses "must accept the complications of expansions." Commenter further compares Great Escape's efforts to expand its business to the struggle faced by some farmers to continue their businesses after non-farming residents populate an area causing many municipalities to pass Right to Farm legislation aimed at protecting farming businesses.

RESPONSE 451

Comment noted. Additionally it should be noted that all of the so-called "expansion" activities are within lands long designated Recreation-Commercial or Highway-Commercial where such land uses have long since been allowed as of right. The expansion is not within residentially zoned areas or existing buffers between those residential areas and the commercial uses within the Route 9 corridor.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 452 **(Ms. Karen C. Angleson, 1 Greenwood Lane, Queensbury; written comments dated October 20, 2000):**

Commenter submitted a number of emails that she received in response to her request for information regarding the experience of other municipalities with a Six Flags park:

1. Debbie Dachos, Director of Planning and Community Develop., Agawam, MA:
   - Premier Parks purchased a family-owned park in existence for over 50 years located in an Industrial and Agricultural zone abutting some residential property.
   - "Traffic is our primary concern. The amount of traffic has increased tremendously since the park was 'branded' a Six Flags facility."
   - "We also have concerns with parking and sewer and water use."
   - "The Park is open from May through November. The hours vary throughout the season, but are generally from 10:00 AM to 11:00 PM."
   - "Six Flags has not always been in conformance with local laws. We have worked very hard to improve our relationship to insure that violations do not occur."
2. Mayor Duncan, Aurora, Ohio:
   - The Park is in a Commercial/Recreational zoning district in a township located between two municipalities with only about 5% of it located in Aurora.
   - "There are issues with noise, closeness of major rides to the major access roads as well as traffic...[Because the majority of the park is located in another township] we get almost all the traffic, and few of the benefits."
   - "The [park] typically open[s] around the middle of May on weekends only, then every day after Memorial Day until Labor Day, from Labor Day until the end of October they are open on weekends only again."
3. Joanna Johnson, Councilwoman/ Deputy Supervisor, Town of Darien:
   - The park is located in a Recreational District surrounded by a Low Density Residential District.
   - "Noise is a very big issue when they have concerts. It can be heard at times at least 2 miles away."
   - "The roads are not big enough to handle the traffic. They are located on a main state road Rt. 77 and the thruway is about 6 miles north of Six Flags. When they have concerts Rt. 77 is backed up to the Thruway for 10 miles."
   - "Court costs have increased...arrests are for everything from A to Z...drugs, fights, sexual contact with a minor, DWI, ...drug overdose, alcohol overdose,...motor vehicle accidents, after the Further concert we had a girl dead in the parking lot. You['re] asking for trouble the more they expand...
   - "They do create a lot of sales tax for our town and other surrounding towns but, sometimes you wonder when we have problems. We don't have a lot of businesses in Darien as we are a small town. So this helps us even with the problems."
   - The Park is open from the first week in May until Labor Day weekend. Then, only weekends through the rest of Sept and Oct.

RESPONSE 452

These comments involve facilities and surrounding neighborhoods which are not be relevant to this application, which, for instance, does not involve a SPAC-type amphitheater or local squabbles over taxing jurisdictions or rural areas with less direct interstate access, etc. The Planning Board's role in this matter is to consider the specific impacts of this project in this location.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 453 **(Mr. Raymond and Ms. Joan Erb, 19 Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 21, 2000):**

Commenters expanded on Mr. Erb's comments at the public hearing stating their opposition to the removal of trees between the Samoset Motel and the Coach House Restaurant, the impact of such removal on noise and stormwater management, and the aesthetic value of the area. Moreover, Commenters express a preference for a parking garage rather than additional paved parking lots and connection to the Glens Falls sewage system rather than an on-site treatment plant.

RESPONSE 453

See Responses 6, 427, 435 and 428.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 454 **(Mr. Glen and Ms. Regina Powell, 175 Mannis Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 22, 2000):**

Commenters state that, "Clear cutting all the trees from the Samoset Motel to the Coach House Restaurant would be a terrible negative impact on that area!" Commenters cite negative impacts to stormwater management, noise mitigation, and aesthetic value of the area. Commenters express a preference for a parking structure either on the former Animal Land property or on the present parking lot across Route 9 opposite the Park rather than additional paved parking lots.

Furthermore, Commenters state that they have owned a house on Glen Lake since the late 1970s and "have noticed an increase in the noise level, especially when riding, or walking on the Warren County Bike Trail."

RESPONSE 454

See Response 6.

Sound has increased regionally as has traffic on the Northway. The DGEIS includes sound measurements made for the Great Escape which demonstrate that a very small change has occurred in the local sound environment over the past decade.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 455 **(Mr. Michael Guido, M.D., Women's Health Institute, 102 Park Street, Suite 201, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 22, 2000):**

Commenter states that, "the increase in attendance created by Six Flags marketing efforts initiated in 1999 created an untenable stress on traffic and the environment in the vicinity of the Park...Traffic on collateral roadways such as Glen Lake Rd., Round Pond Rd., and Gurney Lane will still be problematic. Studies should be done to determine the levels of service decline on these roads. In addition, without a dedicated exit from I87, the delays on Route 9 will continue as attested by New York State DOT studies."

RESPONSE 455

See Responses 12, 13, 14 and 369. The Traffic Impact Study contained a detailed Level of Service analysis for the intersections of Route 9 at Glen Lake Road, Round Pond Road and Gurney Lane.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section I.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 456 **(Mr. Michael Guido, M.D., Women's Health Institute, 102 Park Street, Suite 201, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 22, 2000):**

Commenter states that the DGEIS' stormwater management plan "merely dealt with the problems of getting the run-off into the groundwater while completely ignoring the pollutants carried in that run-off." Commenter states that the removal of trees between the Samoset Motel and Coachhouse Restaurant will result in additional groundwater pollutants to the Glen Lake watershed and "remove one of the aesthetic assets of our community...an alternative parking plan should be adopted which allows those trees to remain, with an exception for those in the path of the proposed ring road."

RESPONSE 456

See DGEIS Section 4, pages 28-34. See also, Responses 70 and 71.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 457 **(Mr. Michael Guido, M.D., Women's Health Institute, 102 Park Street, Suite 201, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 22, 2000):**

Commenter states that, "Under no circumstances should a sewage treatment plant be built within close proximity to a DEC classified wetland and inlet to a lake. The risk potential is too great and the addition of nutrients to those waters must be prevented at all costs."

Commenter further states that, "the quality of life which makes Queensbury known as 'a nice place to live' must be maintained by zealously protecting the environment which has drawn us to our Town...This project must be severely limited in its size to protect the sensitive environment in which it is located."

RESPONSE 457

The development of a wastewater treatment plant will reduce nutrient loading to the Glen Lake watershed.

The proposed project conforms to both local zoning and the master plan. The local zoning for the RC zones states that residential uses are compatible with the other uses in the zone. The RC zone is intended "to isolate, protect and encourage expansion of the recreation industry" (Town Zoning Ordinance Section 179.21.B).

The wastewater facility proposed location will ultimately be decided after consulting with NYSDEC. The allowable offset from the wetland is determined by NYS law. Because of the redundant design, the alarm monitoring and the technology involved, the risks associated with the facility have been all but eliminated. The wastewater treatment facility is to be equipped with processes that currently are designed in potable water filtration facilities. The filter design has 7 feet of 1.4 mm silica sand, a chemical coagulant is added prior to the filtration process and the treated effluent is disinfected with chlorine, it then passes into a second filter with 5 feet of 0.9 mm silica sand. The resulting effluent will possess in excess of log 3 removal of the protozoan giardia and cryptosporidium as well as 100% kill of coliform bacteria. The turbidity will be less than 0.1. These are the standards for surface drinking water, it is after the water is treated to such high standards that it will be discharged into infiltration galleries for additional treatment in the soil.

Presently the Great Escape is permitted to discharge in excess of 45,000+ gallons per day of septic tank effluent into the soil, this load currently being treated with subsurface fields and there is no negative impact occurring to the wetland or Glen Lake as previously stated. With the discharge improvements that include a 95+% reduction in BOD5, total suspended solids, coliform, NH3, PO4, giardia, cryptosporidium the subsurface treatment is anticipated to have considerably less concerns than what is currently in operation. The current systems, as previously stated, provide no impact to the wetland and Glen Lake as demonstrated by the data supplied by NYSDEC. The discharge of 90,000 GPD as per USEPA standards for rapid infiltration take into account the soil conditions, the size of the infiltration area, the depth to ground water, the distance from a body of water, the waste assimilative capacity of the area, the quality of the discharge. All of these standards are considered and the design is done to insure no detrimental impact. Again, because of the design of the facility the effluent from the WWTP will be comparable to potable water, this effluent will then be discharged into the ground not into the waters of Glen Lake or it tributaries.

With respect to the potential for water contamination because of a spill or other WWTP upset, see Response 66.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 458 (Mr. Robert H. Vannier; written comments dated October 22, 2000):

Commenter states that since he purchased his summer house on Glen Lake in 1958 The amusement park has steadily expanded and, "the character of the area has deteriorated along with expansions. It is high time to call a halt before the area is completely destroyed. There is such a thing as a saturation point and I feel it has been reached. The economic benefits will be for the owners of the park and not to the Town or its residents. The Town already reaps benefits and any expansion will only add to the cost of traffic control, noise pollution, water pollution, erosion, and the lowering of the value of the surrounding real property."

RESPONSE 458

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 459 **(Ms. Elizabeth Galloway, 17 Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 22, 2000):**

Commenter states her opposition to the removal of trees between the Samoset Motel and the Coach House Restaurant, the impact of such removal on noise and stormwater management, and the aesthetic value of the area. Moreover, Commenter expresses a preference for a parking garage rather than additional paved parking lots.

RESPONSE 459

See Responses 35, 427, 428, 435 and 453.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 460 **(Ms. Lorraine Stein, 86 Ash Drive, Lake George; written comments dated October 22, 2000):**

Commenter states that, "I feel that the Great Escape Park…is already at peak development and that any major construction within the Park would have major negative impacts on the watershed and therefore on Glen Lake." Commenter asks whether "current levels of runoff and nutrient loading [to Glen Lake] are acceptable" and "shouldn't the DGEIS prove that storm water runoff and erosion would not adversely [a]ffect the watershed?"

RESPONSE 460

See DGEIS Section 4, pages 28-34.

See Responses 55, 56, 66, 71, 74, 90, 105.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 461

There is no Comment 461. During compilation of the Comments, Comment 460 was inadvertently duplicated.

COMMENT 462 **(Ms. Lorraine Stein, 86 Ash Drive, Lake George; written comments dated October 22, 2000):**

Commenter states that a 200' ride is "unacceptable. Such a ride would tower over the treetops, being visible from all of the surrounding areas, especially from Glen Lake. The proposed ride will be about three times the height of the existing tree line. Picture the two Glens Falls water towers that are visible while driving the Northway. These are an eyesore, and they are only about 30' above the tree line...Further, such a ride will have negative audible noise impacts, being that there are no buffers, trees or otherwise, to block or deflect the screams from the patrons and mechanical noise from the ride itself."

RESPONSE 462

Refer to Responses 274, 280 and 310.

See Section 4.2

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 463 **(Ms. Lorraine Stein, 86 Ash Drive, Lake George; written comments dated October 22, 2000):**

Commenter asks that the Planning Board require that:

1. The project be scaled down.
2. Large buffers of existing trees be left intact to reduce the negative visual and noise impacts and reduce runoff.
3. The project maintain the scenic beauty of the area.
4. The height of all structures, rides, buildings, etc. be kept at or below the tree line.
5. Any motel or other structures be incorporated into the existing landscape setting (e.g., leave numerous mature trees and existing hills).
6. The Great Escape offer better alternatives (e.g., replace existing non-effective rides/attractions with new rides or create unpaved parking lots and keep the majority of existing trees).
7. More water testing be done to insure that current or proposed nutrient levels are not harming Glen Lake or the fen.
8. Great Escape ensure that its development will have no negative impacts on water quality of the watershed (which includes Glen Lake) and Glen Lake property values.

RESPONSE 463

Comments noted and will be considered by the Planning Board in making its Findings.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 464 **(Mr. John R. Buchanan, 66 Reardon Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 22, 2000):**

Commenter states that, "The long-term, balanced future of this community will be best served by encouraging broad business investment and residential growth of a year-round nature. The quality of life in Queensbury (water purity, clean air and natural beauty) is at risk for the benefit of a few non-committed transients. The Great Escape has been given considerable cooperation by this community to our mutual advantage. What is now being asked is unreasonable and should be refused by the planners."

RESPONSE 464

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 465 **(Mr. Paul Derby, 86 Ash Drive, Lake George; written comments dated October 22, 2000):**

Commenter states that, "The Glen Lake fen...is, of course, our protective wetlands, our natural sponge. Perhaps to this point it has been able to absorb the erosion, the nutrient loading, the gasoline and oil contaminants, the road and stormwater runoff, the septic leaching, the fertilizers and pesticides, the garbage and the environmental pollutants from development in the Glen Lake Watershed. But then again, perhaps it has not. We do not know, and the Great Escape's DGEIS did not tell us...because they did not test the Glen Lake fen to see if current, or past, or potential future pollutant levels will or have already reached points of saturation." Commenter asks that the Planning Board require Great Escape to "test current levels of nutrient loading into the Glen Lake fen" and contact "the DEC Lakes and Freshwater Division, especially Scott Kishbaugh or our own Queensbury resident Bill Morton, to run computer models on the effects of pollutants into the fen to determine the rate and approximate time of saturation." Finally, Commenter requests that the Planning Board "stipulate...that if water quality in Glen Lake and its watershed deteriorates in the future due to Great Escape operations that the Great Escape or its parent company or owner/operator at the time...be held legally responsible to Glen Lake, the Town of Queensbury and Town residents and...pay to repair damages, restore water quality and/or pay restitution to its victims."

RESPONSE 465

See Responses 71, 101 and 407 and DGEIS Section 4, pages 28-34.

The most stringent SPDES permits in New York State for phosphorous are located in the NYC Watershed where the receiving waters are phosphorous restricted basins. A phosphorous restricted basin is one that has been proven through scientific investigation to have a residual amount of phosphorous that is so high that the water body cannot naturally assimilate it. This results in algae blooms, euthrophication and a general deterioration of the water quality. All of the data provided by NYSDEC indicates that in fact the Glen Lake watershed is quite healthy. The levels of nutrients are below the recommended standards, the turbidity (clarity) of the lake has been improving, there has never been an algae bloom, and the wetland upstream of the lake consistently lowers the level of nutrients passing through. The ecosystem appears to be in balance. The Great Escape will be treating its wastewater with a state of the art phosphorous filter that will reduce phosphorous to non-detectable levels at most certified labs in New York State. The treated effluent will then be discharged to the soil allowing additional natural filtration to occur. The impact of phosphorous will not be an issue from this facility as the total pounds discharged will be reduced by 99% from the existing treatment systems which currently has no impact on Glen Lake.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 466 **(Mr. Paul Derby, 86 Ash Drive, Lake George; written comments dated October 22, 2000):**

Commenter states that the definition of the Glen Lake Neighborhood given in the DGEIS at page 3-22 "does not accurately show households" and asks if this is a "purposeful attempt to minimize the Glen Lake Neighborhood in the DGEIS?" Commenter states that, "Any description of the Glen Lake Neighborhood should include all riparian owners." Commenter asks that the Planning Board require Great Escape to include all of Glen Lake in its studies of generic environmental impacts of the project.

Furthermore, Commenter states that, "unlike the Twicwood and Courthouse neighborhoods, many of the current Glen Lake homes predate the establishment of Mr. Wood's Park...by the logic of [Great Escape's] argument, the "old-timers" of Glen Lake would be able to nullify current zoning laws and lake front usages, which were not in effect [when their homes were first built].

RESPONSE 466

Additional visual and audible noise data was collected around Glen Lake in August 2000. See Section 4.1, "2000 Sound Studies." See Response 1.

The remainder of this comment is noted. It should also be noted that unlike the Commentor's incorrect comparison to a supposed right of some lake residents to "grandfathered" rights to develop in ways not permitted by current zoning, the Project and existing development is consistent with current zoning, and no requests for variances are involved.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 467 **(Mr. Paul Derby, 86 Ash Drive, Lake George; written comments dated October 22, 2000):**

Commenter states, "A reference was made that Park Area A may be expanded to full build out in the future. As stated on page 4-35 [of the DGEIS]...' the entire 81.7 acres may be converted to impervious surfaces and still conform with the zoning requirements of having 30% permeable area on that lot.'" Commenter asks, "What effect will this have on runoff? Does this meet the criteria for 'appropriate and responsible watershed development' as set forth in the Glen Lake Watershed Management Plan, which was adopted by the Town in 1999?"

RESPONSE 467

It is not expected that impervious surfaces in the amusement area will substantially increase as a result of any new development or improvements. The combination of significantly improved wastewater treatment, reducing nutrient loadings and improved stormwater management will protect Glen Lake.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 468 **(Mr. Paul Derby, 86 Ash Drive, Lake George; written comments dated October 22, 2000):**

Commenter states, "Analysis of data and methodology for storm water runoff will require an expert. Has the Town hired an objective Third Party firm to review this data? If a third party was hired, does the public have access to and time to publicly respond to these reports and data? It has come to my attention that the Chazen report on the Great Escape's storm water runoff data was not available for public review, even though it was legally requested, until October 24 or 25. Will the Planning Board allow the public additional time to review and comment upon this specific and important information?"

RESPONSE 468

All of the public comments of the third-party reviewer, Chazen Engineering, made on behalf of the lead agency Town of Queensbury Planning Board are part of this FGEIS. See Comments 367 to 419.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 469 **(Mr. Paul Derby, 86 Ash Drive, Lake George; written comments dated October 22, 2000):**

Commenter asks, "Do the proposed development and storm water management plans take into consideration the removal of existing trees and vegetation in its water quality and runoff analyses? It seems common sense that existing, mature trees would be better for the natural filtration of nutrient runoff, as compared to 'new plantings' proposals. Will mature trees, which hold up to two tons of soil in place and are the best water and nutrient absorption system available, be preserved to the greatest extent possible to preserve soil retention? Are such alternative conditions being considered for the proposed project? If re-plantings are proposed, what size trees will be required? Shouldn't the size of such trees approximate current conditions?"

RESPONSE 469

The stormwater analysis was completed for both existing and post-construction conditions. The trees to be planted will be nursery stock that is between 3-5 inches caliper. These plants will be growing rapidly which will cause the plants to uptake nutrient at a higher rate than older, slower-growing trees. In any case, the stormwater analysis indicates that nutrient levels will not substantially increase in the stormwater discharges as a result of development. The Planning Board intends to require a monitoring plan to ensure the protection of Glen Lake and the fen.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 470 **(Mr. Paul Derby, 86 Ash Drive, Lake George; written comments dated October 22, 2000):**

Commenter states, "Page 4-32 of the DGEIS states that paved, impervious parking surfaces in Area C will increase from 18.6 to 38.9 acres. How does this proposed development stack up to conditions put forth in the *Glen Lake Watershed Management Plan*? How do the combined development plans for the parking lots, a hotel, a possible convention center AND the build out of Park Area A fit with the *Glen Lake Watershed Management Plan* and its figures for future development acreage within the watershed? Has this watershed plan even been reviewed and considered? Has or will the Planning Board use the Eutromod model – a computer generated model which predicts phosphorous loading to Glen Lake from large developments – in reviewing this DGEIS?"

RESPONSE 470

Based on the analysis in the DGEIS, the combined effect of stormwater management and the proposed sewage treatment plant will decrease nutrient loading attributable to the Great Escape property to Glen Lake from existing levels. The Eutromod model would be somewhat insensitive to the proposed changes in the watershed. Eutromod is a nutrient model that is good at examining impacts of septic systems and uses generalized loading rates for developed areas. The 20.3 acres of land use change will not be significant in the overall size of the watershed of Glen Lake. The total Glen Lake Watershed is 7,692 acres. The 20.3 acres represents 0.0026% of the overall watershed.

See Response 465.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 471 **(Mr. Paul Derby, 86 Ash Drive, Lake George; written comments dated October 22, 2000):**

Commenter states, "There appears to be no recognition in the DGEIS for the potential use of pesticides, herbicides, fertilizers or any other chemicals within newly developed Park Area C. Won't new plantings, building a hotel and convention center, possible parking islands, etc. require the use of pesticides and chemicals? Does any analysis of potential use and impacts from such chemicals upon the surrounding wetlands exist in the DGEIS?"

RESPONSE 471

Fertilizers, pesticides and herbicides can be safely used in accordance with label instructions. The amount will be small and application will be infrequent.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 472 **(Mr. Paul Derby, 86 Ash Drive, Lake George; written comments dated October 22, 2000):**

Commenter asks, "Will Six Flags or the Great Escape consider the donation of the wetland areas to the Open Space Institute or any other non-governmental protective organization as part of its mitigation efforts? Should not this option be seriously considered given the findings of rare flora and fauna – see pages 3-5 & 6. Dr. Norton Miller's report on rare flora and page 4-11 and Appendix letter on the rare Karner Blue Butterfly."

RESPONSE 472

As previously discussed, there is no rare or endangered habitat in the Great Escape owned wetlands, nor is the development of wetlands proposed. The Park has already offered easements to the wetlands in Park Area B to a municipal or land trust organization which could allow passive recreation and conservation activities.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 473 **(Mr. Paul Derby, 86 Ash Drive, Lake George; written comments dated October 22, 2000):**

Commenter asks, "Has the DGEIS used storm water management plan based upon the standards adopted by the Town for the Lake George areas, or have less stringent criteria been used? If less, why? Is not the Glen Lake watershed also an important natural resource?"

RESPONSE 473

The standards used are those of the Town of Queensbury which are both appropriate to the resources involved and legally mandated by Town Planning and Zoning Laws.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 474 **(Mr. Paul Derby, 86 Ash Drive, Lake George; written comments dated October 22, 2000):**

Commenter asks, "Will the Great Escape be required to perform long-term sampling/ monitoring programs on storm water runoff, septic/sewage leachage, and other water quality related aspects? How can the Town and the public check such monitoring practices?"

RESPONSE 474

The sewage treatment plant and wastewater disposal field will be regularly tested in accordance with the typical facility monitoring and reporting requirements of the Park's State Pollution Discharge Elimination System (SPDES) Permit.

The Planning Board intends to require a testing program for the stormwater management system.

To assure that water quality impacts on Rush Pond outlet have been minimized, a limited testing program will be carried out. Permanent stream temperature monitoring devices will be located at three locations along the Rush Pond outlet. Locations will include the stream as it enters the parking lots near I87, a second site at Route 9 and the last site will be near the head of the wetland. At these locations, both base flow samples and rain event samples will be collected annually. Two baseflow samples and two to three rainfall event samples will be obtained annually.

See Responses 101, 198, 74, 85, 160, 436.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 475 **(Mr. Paul Derby, 86 Ash Drive, Lake George; written comments dated October 22, 2000):**

Commenter states, "Proposed figures for sewage amounts [on page 2-12 of DGEIS] appear to not represent a 70% growth rate (from current 45,636 GPD to 60,000 GPD). Should this figure not be closer to 68,000 to 69,000 GPD? Also, how will effectiveness of such a treatment plant be monitored? The proposed nutrient figures for the effluent discharged appear to be minimally within accepted boundaries. Is this adequate given that this plant resides within or immediately adjacent to a sensitive environmentally critical zone? Are there proposed alternative mitigation plans for the released effluent?"

RESPONSE 475

As opposed to currently permitted capacity, the actual flow entering the current subsurface treatment systems, as determined by water usage records, is approximately 19,395 gpd. This average daily flow of 19,395 gallons is received from a population of 900,000 people for the year, with an estimated increase to 1,500,000 people for the year or a 70% increase. The design is extremely conservative, based on a multiplier of three times the current average daily flow. See Responses 420 and 406.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 476 **(Mr. Paul Derby, 86 Ash Drive, Lake George; written comments dated October 22, 2000):**

Commenter states, "Representatives from the Great Escape have, since the Public Hearing, stated that running the sewer line to the Park may be the best alternative. I agree this may be so. The threshold for septic or sewage leachage or effluent discharge should be zero. However, under no conditions should the "no action alternative" option to leave in place and operational the current septic field systems to deal with septic discharge be allowed. Current septic systems will not be able to handle increased usage, and the risk potential to Glen Lake is far too high. A better alternative is their proposed on-site treatment plant. Will the Planning Board require the Great Escape to remove the "no action alternative" from its alternative section?"

RESPONSE 476

The "no action" alternative analysis is a requirement of the SEQR regulations governing the contents of environmental impact statements. See, 6 NYCRR 617.9(b)(5)(v). The "no action" alternative is required to comparatively assess the impacts of the proposal and other alternatives. As noted, the Park is not proposing to continue to operate its existing, permitted system, but to install a new interim system with vastly improved margins of safety.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 477 **(Mr. Paul Derby, 86 Ash Drive, Lake George; written comments dated October 22, 2000):**

Commenter asks, "Will the Planning Board require the Great Escape to consider other alternatives to paved parking within the Park, particularly within the primary parking areas in Park Area C? Possible other alternatives should include (1) a no action alternative which keeps parking lots as grass or dirt areas, (2) the use of new parking area technologies specifically engineered for environmentally sensitive areas? [Commenter attached fliers for Uni Eco-Stone Water Management System and Grass Pave 2]."

RESPONSE 477

Refer to DGEIS Section 7.3, Alternative Parking Lot Layouts, Lot Surfacing and Parking Garage Alternative. See also Response 107.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 478 **(Mr. Paul Derby, 86 Ash Drive, Lake George; written comments dated October 22, 2000):**

Commenter states, "The DGEIS plans to run higher, 50' electricity polls [sic] with more and thicker power lines along Ash Drive and Glen Lake Road are unacceptable. DGEIS claims such a change is within the current 'visual character' of the area. However, a closer look at that path...will show the necessity to remove existing trees and to cut back many, many branches along Ash Drive and Glen Lake Road. This certainly will radically alter the 'visual character' of our neighborhoods. Why not use the Birdsall path or bury the lines, as is the plan within the Park so as not to diminish the functional and aesthetic qualities of the park? In addition, if other alternative plans to run power lines or produce electricity, other than those stated in the DGEIS are used or proposed, will the public have the right to comment on these new proposals?"

RESPONSE 478

See Responses 111 and 113. All proposed projects are subject to site plan review by the Town Planning Board. Public hearings are held on such reviews.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 479 **(Mr. Paul Derby, 86 Ash Drive, Lake George; written comments dated October 22, 2000):**

Commenter asks, "can the Great Escape make alternative plans of any kind without public review and comments? If it cannot, what actions can be taken to remedy deviations from the DGEIS after the fact?"

RESPONSE 479

Per SEQR's procedures, future approvals of any component of the Project will be subject to the Decision, SEQR Findings and impact thresholds determined in this FGEIS process. To the extent that plans are proposed to be modified from those reviewed here, they must undergo a separate review to determine whether such changes are significant enough in terms of their potential adverse impact and consistency with the SEQR Findings and thresholds adopted herein to require additional review. See, e.g., SEQR regulations at 6 NYCRR 617.9(a)(7)(2). These SEQR procedures will require separate review for any modifications which could be environmentally significant in ways not evaluated in this generic EIS. Additionally, site plan review will be required for many components of the action.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 480 **(Mr. Paul Derby, 86 Ash Drive, Lake George; written comments dated October 22, 2000):**

Commenter states that he believes that there is a causal relationship between audible noise impacts in receptor neighborhoods and increased park attendance. Commenter further states that, at his invitation, Great Escape's sound engineers conducted audible noise testing at his home. However, follow-up tests were not done because the Bobsled was not running on subsequent test dates and "preliminary tests do not reflect or consider the conditions of wind change, time of the year or unusual lake and non-lake related activities. Will the Planning Board require further noise/sound testing before it accepts a completed GEIS, and will the public have the opportunity to review these new data and make comments before a GEIS is accepted?"

RESPONSE 480

Additional sound measurements were made in July and August 2000 and during the fall season. The sampling sites are representative of the community sound levels, and with the additional sites added in August 2000, a comprehensive data set is available. The sound study by Chazen on behalf of the Town is consistent with the results presented by the Great Escape. The Planning Board intends to require an ongoing noise monitoring program. See Response 3.

DGEIS Reference: Section 4.1, "2000 Sound Studies"

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 481 **(Mr. Paul Derby, 86 Ash Drive, Lake George; written comments dated October 22, 2000):**

Commenter asks, "Will reduction of hours of operation be considered as a noise mitigation tool? Will the regulation of hours of operation for certain, community-defined nuisance rides or noise producing events or shows be considered? Will the Planning Board in evaluating this DGEIS consider subjective evaluation of nuisance noise? Will the Town of Queensbury consider a reasonable 'Noise Ordinance' and will the affected neighborhoods, including Glen Lake, have input into this process?"

RESPONSE 481

The Town is currently considering a generally applicable Townwide noise ordinance and all residents have an opportunity to participate in that process similar to their role in the consideration and adoption of Town ordinances generally.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 482 **(Mr. Paul Derby, 86 Ash Drive, Lake George; written comments dated October 22, 2000):**

Commenter states, "Apart from the Alpine Bobsled, noise from the Great Escape has not been a problem or an issue to this point for me. Occasional screams or background sounds have not been bothersome...the noise from the Bobsled is not a problem because of decibel levels; rather it is a problem because of the routinized and repetitive low-frequency rumble from that particular ride. Frankly, if the Great Escape had removed this ride or stopped the noise pollution, resistance to development would not be so intense. However, since the Great Escape position has been resistant to community needs, then the only reasonable noise threshold should be a zero-tolerance threshold. We should not have to hear any audible sounds from the park. Only if the Great Escape can effectively mitigate the noise from the Bobsled or any similar noise producing ride or event at the Park, should a compromise position be entertained. Will the Planning Board require the Great Escape to either remove or shut down the Alpine Bobsled or effectively mitigate the noise pollution problem before or as a stipulation to acceptance of a final GEIS?"

RESPONSE 482

See Response 205.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 483 **(Mr. Paul Derby, 86 Ash Drive, Lake George; written comments dated October 22, 2000):**

Commenter states, "The proposed 200' high ride...is unacceptable...this structure will be visible and out of character with the aesthetic character that currently exists [on the bike path at Glen Lake]...Further, Great Escape gives NO alternative mitigation plans (other than a no action plan) and does not tell us how many 200' or other similar rides or structures will be needed to meet expected demands. This is just unacceptable...Perhaps such a ride should be placed in the front of the Park along Route 9. Or perhaps other alternatives should be considered. For example, could the Park Areas be rezoned to allow amusement and entertainment in Park Area C along and near Route 9 and away from residential areas? This could theoretically reduce both visual and noise impacts on nearby residents. It is also reasonable to apply the slippery slope argument here. If thrill seekers need 200' rides this year, why not 300' next and 400' two years later? It would be more appropriate if the thresholds were set now. I suggest that the existing tree line be the upper height threshold for all structures at the Great Escape. Other alternatives besides height should also be considered.... The Town should be wary of so-called thrill rides that ring an entire Park and send off shock waves and loud noise to stimulate the crowds. Will the Town require noise studies, height requirements, and the purposes and functions of any ride during the site plan review process before it is allowed in the Park?"

RESPONSE 483

FGEIS Section 4.3, "Visual Analysis 2000-2001," defines an area within the park for development of tall rides which will not create a significant adverse impact. This defined area sets voluntary thresholds for placement of a tall ride. The GEIS identifies thresholds for visual and noise issues, and notes that specific rides will be subject to site plan approval at the Town Planning Board.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 484 **(Mr. Paul Derby, 86 Ash Drive, Lake George; written comments dated October 22, 2000):**

Commenter states, "The wetlands and water bodies in the vicinity of the Park afford open spaces and scenic vistas. How will the development proposals and future rides maintain the visual quality and fit in with the existing rural and natural character of the area?...Will the development take into consideration potential removal of trees and vegetation on near and along Rush Pond, the Glen Lake Brook and the Glen Lake fen, which would impact the visual as well as the aquatic quality?"

RESPONSE 484

Refer to Response 483 regarding visual quality thresholds. The stormwater management plan considers the clearing proposed as part of the Project. The Project does not involve further "removal of trees and vegetation on, near and along Rush Pond, the Glen Lake Brook and the Glen Lake Fen" as referred to by Commenter.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 485 **(Mr. Paul Derby, 86 Ash Drive, Lake George; written comments dated October 22, 2000):**

Commenter states, "No one denies that the Park makes money and employs people, services and adjunct businesses. However, some perspective on this issue is necessary. At projected levels of full development and with attendance increases to 1.5 million, property valuations from the Great Escape are estimated to grow to $25.7 million. Comparatively, property values for Glen Lake residents exceed $45 million. It appears then that property taxes from Glen Lake far exceeds that of the Great Escape, and further, more than half of Glen Lake residents pay school taxes to Queensbury, while the Great Escape pays none to Queensbury. Recognize also that if Great Escape development causes Glen Lake property values to decrease, then tax revenues to the Town will also diminish. Will the Planning Board make the Great Escape revise the GEIS to reflect these comparative numbers and potential loss of property values in the surrounding neighborhoods caused by the growth of and negative environmental impacts from the Great Escape? And will the Great Escape be held legally responsible for decreasing property values caused by its expansion and environmental impacts? Will the Planning Board stipulate in the GEIS that the Great Escape must ensure local, neighborhood residents that if in fact residents' property values decrease or do not increase at comparable levels that the Great Escape will fully compensate individuals for their losses?"

RESPONSE 485

There is no evidence in this record that Glen Lake is being or will be impacted by the Project, including the concern expressed regarding residential property values. Real estate sales data indicates that Glen Lake property is appreciating consistent with regional norms. Refer to FGEIS Section 4.7. There is no reason to expect that this trend will not continue into the future.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 486 **(Ms. Suzanne Delman, 139 Equinox Drive, Lake George; written comments dated October 23, 2000):**

Commenter, a resident of Courthouse Estates, states her opposition to the project based on "noise of the Alpine Bobsled Ride, the heavy traffic along Route 9 and the eyesores that the Great Escape has created (Parking lots sprawled all over Route 9)." Commenter further states that, "a few minimum-wage summer jobs [do not] make this project worthwhile in terms of the area's economy."

RESPONSE 486

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 487 **(Ms. Mary C. Hilliard, 79 Ash Drive, Lake George; written comments dated October 23, 2000):**

Commenter opposes the proposed expansion on the following grounds:

- The Site "cannot handle 700,000 new customers...without jeopardizing the environment (sewage disposal, traffic). (1)
- The DGEIS' noise and stormwater runoff data are "erroneous." Commenter asks that the Planning Board check the data to ensure it is accurately reported. (2)
- The Jobs that will be created by the project are "minimum wage jobs – not ones that help low-income – middle-income families." (3)
- The Alpine Bobsled produces a noise "clearly above decibel level normal for humans." (4)
- The DGEIS does not accurately report endangered species on the site. (5)
- The stormwater management section of the DGEIS fails to analyze runoff from traffic on Route 9, Glen Lake Road, and Round Pond Road. (6)
- Commenter doubts that the park will not require additional services from governmental agencies. (7)
- The DGEIS fails to adequately reflect objections of the Park's neighbors to the project. (8)

RESPONSE 487

Comments noted. While bulleted item (8) may be true, nothing in SEQR's requirements for EISs or the Scoping Statement requires a DGEIS to "reflect objections of neighbors". That is the purpose of the DGEIS comment period and FGEIS process. This FGEIS does "reflect the objections of the Park's neighbors" as well as responses to all substantive issues regarding potential impacts raised by the public comments. The Planning Board is aware of the objections of some neighbors to the project.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 488 **(Ms. Linda Clark Whitty, 3 Benmost Bur Lane, Lake George; written comments dated October 23, 2000):**

Commenter states that she is frustrated with the park's history (both pre-dating Premier Parks' ownership and since its purchase of the Park) of bending the rules without consequence and states that she fears the DGEIS is full of "misleading legal jargon, unfounded facts, and skewed surveys and statistics." Commenter cites what she considers erroneous data used to calculate storm water runoff that failed to consider run-off into the watershed caused by increased traffic generated by more park visitors and omission of the adopted 1999 Glen Lake Watershed Management Plan.

RESPONSE 488

Comment noted.

See Responses 196, 146, 90, 86, 72.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 489 **(Ms. Linda Clark Whitty, 3 Benmost Bur Lane, Lake George; written comments dated October 23, 2000):**

Commenter criticizes the DGEIS for failure to properly research impact of the project on community services (police, ambulance, road maintenance).

RESPONSE 489

Refer to Response 129. The DGEIS and the service providers interviewed for that study concluded that the Project's potential incremental growth in the number of emergency interventions would not cause a strain on service providers' resources or budgets.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 490 **(Ms. Linda Clark Whitty, 3 Benmost Bur Lane, Lake George; written comments dated October 23, 2000):**

Commenter states that the fact that the park pre-dates residential neighborhoods is no justification for growth and criticizes the DGEIS' failure to identify changes in the park transforming it from a "simple, quiet children's park to a multi million dollar adventure park with rides designed to make people scream," and further criticizes the absence of "any negative economic impacts" of the project in the DGEIS as well as:

1. Failure to properly document alternatives to mitigate impacts as required by SEQR law;

2. Failure to adequately address the traffic impacts on secondary roads and patterns and how this will impact surrounding neighborhoods;

3. Failure to examine the impact of special events and operation of the park beyond the current hours;

4. Failure to identify the impact this project will have on endangered species in the wetlands (fen).

RESPONSE 490

1. See Section 7.0 of the DGEIS.
2. See Response 251.
3. See page 4-23 of the DGEIS.
4. See Responses 346, 347, and 545.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 491 **(Ms. Linda Clark Whitty, 3 Benmost Bur Lane, Lake George; written comments dated October 23, 2000):**

Commenter criticizes the DGEIS for "flawed noise studies," failure to "properly document alternatives to mitigate impacts as required by SEQR law," failure to "adequately address the traffic impacts on secondary roads," failure to examine the impact of special events and operation of the park beyond the current hours, and failure to identify the impact this project will have on endangered species in the wetlands/fen.

RESPONSE 491

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 492 **(Mr. Charles and Ms. Lee York, 14 Birch Road, Lake George; written comments dated October 23, 2000):**

Commenter asks, "Why does the town not require that the identified hazard, unsafe pedestrian access, be resolved before any other issues are allowed at the table?" Commenter states that the Warren County Planning Board had already identified pedestrian safety crossing Route 9 to the Great Escape as a concern and had passed a motion to deny any application by the park that did not include mitigation measures to enhance pedestrian safety. Although Commenter states that the Warren County Planning Board had accepted the use of flag persons as an acceptable solution for a "stop gap measure," he likens including the pedestrian bridge as part of the "expansion package" to "holding hostage" the safety of pedestrians.

RESPONSE 492

Safe pedestrian access to the park is a concern of the Great Escape as well as the public agencies. One of the first improvements that Great Escape plans to make is the construction of the proposed pedestrian bridge and the installation of fencing along the Route 9 frontage to prohibit the unsafe crossing of pedestrians. No improvements are permitted within the Route 9 right-of-way without approval by the NYSDOT and the Town. Aside from the pedestrian bridge, the improvements in parking lot capacity, internal queuing and access improvements to reduce traffic delays and congestion on Route 9 and I-87 were also essentially required by the Planning Board to be included in the proposed Project.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section G.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 493 **(Mr. Charles and Ms. Lee York, 14 Birch Road, Lake George; written comments dated October 23, 2000):**

Commenter states that the "noise emanating from the Great Escape is frequent, routine and predictable...It is not a question of intensity as it is not loud. But it is intrusive, mechanical and continuous. The Great Escape says that they comply with all standards but there are no noise standards in Queensbury at this time....OSHA standards...are designed to protect employees from occupational noise hazards, not neighborhood noise."

RESPONSE 493

Refer to Responses 3, 4 and 37.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 494 **(Mr. Roger A. Ryan, 59 Barber Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 23, 2000):**

Commenter states, "I do not understand how [the Planning Board] can consider this expansion until the existing highway conditions are resolved. Adding 100,000 plus cars a day to an already overtaxed highway system will definitely hurt this area...Who will shop the Million Dollar Half Mile if you can't exit the parking lot[?]...Also, truck traffic will reroute along Quaker and Ridge Roads to eliminate the Exit 20 bottleneck [causing] unhappy landowners."

RESPONSE 494

The proposed expansion will not add 100,000 cars per day to Route 9. At 1,500,000 annual attendance, the typical attendance on a high attendance peak season day in August will be 18,200 people, which is an increase of approximately 7,330 daily visitors. At an average occupancy of 3 persons per vehicle, this equates to an increase of 2,440 vehicles per day. These additional vehicles will be accommodated with the proposed highway improvements recommended in the Traffic Impact Study. There is not anticipated to be a bottleneck at the Exit 20 ramps that would cause truck traffic to reroute.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 495 **(Mr. Roger A. Ryan, 59 Barber Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 23, 2000):**

Commenter, an engineer and water and sanitation specialist, states, "the existing parking lot across the road from the Great Escape...[was] filled and bulldozed over an existing swamp [by former park owner Charles Wood]...That area is so unstable that the existing pedestrian bridge connecting the parking lots has almost sunk out of sight. Raising these lots 5 feet will create additional soil pressure and cause a reduction in the creek size. If the water flow is restricted, the water level in Rush Pond will rise or the faster flow of water will cause the migration of silt in the Glen Lake fen."

RESPONSE 495

The addition of fill in the parking lots allows for better stormwater treatment which will protect the wetland complex and stream water quality. The stream will not be filled. Therefore the channel capacity will not change. The reputed sinking of the headwalls of the culverts is due to inadequate foundation. With foundations that are supported by correct footings, the sinking problems would be eliminated. The proposed pedestrian bridge will be supported on large spread footings aided by geogrids or other stabilizing materials. Placement of fills on the parking lots will not elevate the Rush Pond outlet due to the ground weight displacement.

The filling of the parking lot occurred prior to regulation by state or federal government.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 496 **(Mr. Paul Sheehan, 23 Sylvan Avenue, Queensbury; written comments dated October 23, 2000):**

Commenter, whose family has owned a camp on Glen Lake since 1945, states his opposition to the expansion based on impacts to the "scenic views from the lake...[and] ugly noise pollution that upsets the tranquility of the entire area surrounding Glen Lake."

RESPONSE 496

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 497 **(Ms. Marian Cornell, Glen Lake; written comments dated October 23, 2000):**

Commenter objects to the removal of trees between the Samoset Motel and Coach House Restaurant on the basis of the "aesthetic impact..., the noise impact upon the neighborhoods of Courthouse Estates and Glen Lake, and an enormous impact on Glen Lake from storm-water run-off."

RESPONSE 497

Comment noted. See Responses 427, 428, 435 and 453.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 498 **(Mr. Robert J. Sullivan, 352 Glen Lake Road, Lake George; written comments dated October 23, 2000):**

Commenter objects to approving the expansion without "extending the city sewer line to dispose of [Great Escape's] effluent...Situated as [the park] is on the primary source of water that feeds Glen Lake, the thought of all that effluent being discharged at that location is intolerable."

RESPONSE 498

Comment noted.

See Responses 233, 198, 407, 408, 420.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 499 **(Mr. Robert DiDio, 35 Dineen Road, Lake George; written comments dated October 23, 2000):**

Commenter opposes removal of trees between the Samoset Motel and the Coachhouse Restaurant on the basis of impacts to stormwater management, aesthetic impact, and impacts to noise on the neighborhoods of Courthouse Estates and Glen Lake. Commenter states his preference for a parking structure on the former Animal Land property rather than additional paved parking areas.

RESPONSE 499

Comment noted. See Responses 6, 427, 428, 435 and 453.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 500 **(Ms. Helen P. Stern, 12 Greenwood Lane, Queensbury; written comments dated October 24, 2000):**

Commenter states that, "Traffic problems arise after poor planning and lack of foresight" and asks, "What are the costs to correct the problems? How much is it worth not having to take an additional 15 – 30 minutes each day to get to work or the store? Have road rage incidents increased or decreased in this area?"

RESPONSE 500

While Commenter's statements may be true of some uncoordinated incremental growth in the Route 9 corridor, particularly the factory outlets between the Exit 20 interchange and Route 149, the Traffic Impact Study demonstrates that the Project will provide adequate increased capacity to absorb additional traffic generated by the Park, as it is intended to do. The DGEIS also indicates that capacity on the secondary road network will be adequate for residents' circulation, and delays at intersections and traffic lights on the arterial Route 9 corridor will be improved.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 501 **(Ms. Helen P. Stern, 12 Greenwood Lane, Queensbury; written comments dated October 24, 2000):**

Commenter states that, "Along US Route 9 north of Miller Hill to Exit 20 noise levels have increased dramatically [due to]...go-carts, K of C Outdoor Bands, Great Escape['s] extended hours [and] Bobsled ride." Commenter asks, "What is the effect of constant noise or repetitive noise on people? How late should noise be allowed to encroach into our homes and back yards? Should residents have to close their windows and become prisoners in their homes to avoid noise?"

RESPONSE 501

The commentor's opinion is noted. Accepted government guidelines would indicate that the residential neighborhoods in the Study Area are well within recommended noise levels for residential use during daytime and evening hours such that interference with normal activities and sleep should not occur. The late night noises discussed by Commenter such as "go karts" do not originate at the Great Escape, but at other businesses.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 502 **(Mr. David L. Paddock, 330 Glen Lake Road, Lake George; written comments dated October 24, 2000):**

Commenter states that, "The reality is that the Great Escape will benefit economically but at enormous expense to the environment and hence have a negative economic benefit for others. Not everyone comes to the Adirondacks/Queensbury/Lake George area for the Great Escape. A great many come for the natural beauty, quiet, clean water, etc. And many of the Great Escape patrons are day trippers and they don't spend a nickel outside the Great Escape (not much help to the local economy)."

RESPONSE 502

Applicant's marketing data (patron zip codes recorded at the admission gate turnstiles) indicates that many Park attendees (~40%) are overnight visitors to the region who presumably spend money for lodging, meals and other things while in the area. Additionally, even day visitors spend money for meals, gasoline and other services, as well as visiting other attractions and retail businesses in the area. The DGEIS indicates a substantial net economic and fiscal benefit to the region. The purpose of the GEIS, in part, is to explore ways in which expansion can be accommodated without significant adverse impacts.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 503 **(Mr. David L. Paddock, 330 Glen Lake Road, Lake George; written comments dated October 24, 2000):**

Commenter states, "As a seasonal businesses, the Great Escape does not really need paved parking lots. Gravel or grass would reduce pollutants entering the water table. A parking structure would provided additional parking with less environmental damage."

RESPONSE 503

See Response 35.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 504 **(Mr. David L. Paddock, 330 Glen Lake Road, Lake George; written comments dated October 24, 2000):**

Commenter states, "Today the Great Escape would never be permitted to be built on a wetlands. So why permit it to further damage those wetlands? Storytown in the 1950s was not the same entity the Great Escape is today, nor did it have the same impact environmentally."

RESPONSE 504

Based on the analyses in the GEIS, the project is not anticipated to endanger the wetlands. The project will improve sewage treatment. Stormwater discharges, both quantity and quality, are not anticipated to change significantly.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 505 **(Mr. David L. Paddock, 330 Glen Lake Road, Lake George; written comments dated October 24, 2000):**

Commenter states, "The Town of Queensbury should require the Great Escape to tie into the existing sewer system. That would ensure proper maintenance, eliminate any disposal into the wetlands, and eventually into Glen Lake and bring the sewer line further down Route 9."

RESPONSE 505

The sewer system does not exist in the vicinity of the Great Escape but terminates at Sweet Road, near the new Sleep Motel. Adequate protection for the wetlands has been provided by the proposed Project. The boundary of the wetland has been flagged in the field and is clearly indicated on the survey plan. No filling or wetland disturbance on the east side of Route 9 is proposed. On the west side of Route 9 minor filling to improve existing road crossing of the wetland will be necessary. Any required permits will be obtained (See DGEIS 4.5.1).

See Response 233.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 506 **(Mr. Roger Boor, Vice President, Citizens For Queensbury Steering Committee, P.O. Box 4883, Queensbury; written comments dated October 24, 2000):**

Commenter, on behalf of the Citizens For Queensbury Steering Committee, "a group of common citizens attempting to diligently pursue issues important to maintaining Queensbury as a 'nice place to live,'" asks that the Planning Board "require[] infrastructure construction relating to future growth such as traffic amelioration, parking, pedestrian crossings including overpasses/ underpasses and traffic lights, plus wastewater control (including a connection to the Glens Falls treatment plant), lighting, stormwater management – be completed and paid for by Great Escape."

RESPONSE 506

The traffic, wastewater and other "infrastructure" improvements involved in the Project will be paid for in the first instance by the Great Escape. DOT regulations require that all permitted improvements required to a state highway as a condition of access, both on and off site, be performed and paid for by the developer. However, certain of the off-site improvements such as the Exit 20 reconfiguration which benefit not only the Park but the transportation system generally may be eligible for discretionary state funding contributions.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 507 **(Mr. Roger Boor, Vice President, Citizens For Queensbury Steering Committee, P.O. Box 4883, Queensbury; written comments dated October 24, 2000):**

Commenter asks that the Planning Board "establish[]...guidelines for the height of future attractions and buildings that recognize the need to obtain area variances for any such structures (as defined in the proposed new zoning ordinance) that exceed the 40-feet limit of the RC-15 zone."

RESPONSE 507

The Town Zoning Ordinance identifies a maximum limit on building height of 50 feet in the Recreation/Commercial zone. Rides are not "buildings" as defined by the Ordinance, so this height regulation does not apply. See, definitions of "building" and "building height" in Ordinance §§179-7 and §179-21(C) which clearly refers to "Building" and not "structure" height. FGEIS Section 4.3, "Visual Analysis 2000-2001," defines an area within the park for development of tall rides which will not create significant adverse visual impacts.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 508 **(Mr. Roger Boor, Vice President, Citizens For Queensbury Steering Committee, P.O. Box 4883, Queensbury; written comments dated October 24, 2000):**

Commenter asks that the Planning Board "codif[y]...noise limitations – e.g., 60 dBA at all property boundaries [and place a] limit on [Great Escape's] hours of operation not to exceed the current closing hours of 8 PM on weekdays and 10 PM on weekends with the understanding that special events must comply."

RESPONSE 508

Refer to new response 3.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 509 **(Mr. Roger Boor, Vice President, Citizens For Queensbury Steering Committee, P.O. Box 4883, Queensbury; written comments dated October 24, 2000):**

Commenter asks that the Planning Board require Great Escape's parking lots be "permeable and landscaped and not employ so-called 'festival parking' while tree removal on the hill from the Samoset Motel to the Coach House be limited to the construction of the so-called 'ring' road." Commenter further asks that, "Consideration be given to the construction, with minimum loss of trees on the west side, of a parking garage on the property that previously supported Animal Land."

RESPONSE 509

See Responses 107, 40 and 223.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 510 **(Mr. Roger Boor, Vice President, Citizens For Queensbury Steering Committee, P.O. Box 4883, Queensbury; written comments dated October 24, 2000):**

Commenter states, "Careful attention must be paid to traffic flow pattern projections of the New York State Department of Transportation, including expert review and a determination that traffic flows are satisfactory. This review should also include consideration of pedestrian and bicycle traffic."

Furthermore, Commenter asks that, "Noise impact from the Northway be mitigated as much as possible for residential neighborhoods in proximity to Great Escape."

RESPONSE 510

See DGEIS Appendix 4.

The New York State Department of Transportation reviewed the Traffic Impact Study and made comments, which were responded to in this FGEIS. The NYSDOT has further reviewed and concurred with the responses in this FGEIS. The NYSDOT will continue its involvement with the review of the highway improvement plans, permitting and monitoring the traffic volumes in the area as the Park visitor levels grow to meet planned thresholds for installation of traffic mitigation measures.

The applicant's Traffic Impact Study and the mitigation proposed there and in the DGEIS will be reviewed and approved by the NYSDOT. As their comments (Comments 257 - 270) on the DGEIS indicate, the DOT concurs with the substance of applicant's impact study and proposed mitigation. With respect to noise impacts to residential neighborhoods from the Northway, see Response 6 and 551.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 511 **(Mr. Roger Boor, Vice President, Citizens For Queensbury Steering Committee, P.O. Box 4883, Queensbury; written comments dated October 24, 2000):**

Commenter states, "we would like to cite one reference that demonstrates how the identified concerns and effects on surrounding neighborhoods are summarily dismissed in the DGEIS. For example, in the first paragraph in Section 3.6.1 Sound, reference is made to the fact that [t]his section '...discusses the existing 'acoustical environment' of the receptor neighborhoods'...and the lack of significant accumulative impact of the Park's current operations on the 'receptor neighborhoods'.' We have heard from many residents in the 'receptor neighborhoods' how their lives have been adversely affected by the Park's current operations and yet the DGEIS dismisses their concerns with a turn of the cavalier phrase 'lack of significant accumulative impact.'"

RESPONSE 511

The Planning Board is aware of the concerns the neighbors have with respect to noise from the Great Escape. The Planning Board is also aware that sound levels in surrounding neighborhoods meet the HUD noise guidelines which reflect the governments' best efforts to define standards for community noise levels which are consistent with residential land uses. See Response 3 for the Planning Board's expectations with respect to the monitoring and review of future sound levels.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 512 **(Mr. Robert and Ms. Anne Clark, 10 Benmost Bur Lane, Lake George; written comments dated October 24, 2000):**

Commenters, who have been residents of Glen Lake for over 30 years, state, "Our major concern is the quality of water in and around Glen Lake. This includes the surrounding wetlands. What is alarming us is the lack of a municipal sewer system. This is imperative for any growth to occur. Of course, allowing the Great Escape to build their own would more than likely become a policing nightmare and put our beautiful lake at a greater risk. Furthermore, the effects of storm water run off from the additional 4599 cars will no doubt enter into the Glen Lake fen. This is further insured by the planned removal of trees in the watershed area, which is removing nature's design to prevent this type of damage. It has also come to our attention that the DGEIS produced by the Great Escape Park is not compatible to the adopted Glen Lake Watershed Management Plan. It seems as though this plan should have been a key inclusion in the DGEIS."

RESPONSE 512

The Great Escape has indicated its willingness to connect to a municipal sewer, should one become available. In the meantime, the Park proposes to build a state of the art sewage treatment plant. As previously stated the facility's design would discharge loadings that are 90-95% less in nutrients, total suspended solids, BOD5, turbidity, and coliform then the current subsurface treatment systems. There will also be a continuous sampling program because of the SPDES requirements that will insure zero impact both in the short and long term. The discharge of 90,000 GPD as per USEPA standards for rapid infiltration takes into account the soil conditions, the size of the infiltration area, the depth to ground water, the distance from a body of water, the waste assimilative capacity of the area, and the quality of the discharge. All of these standards are considered and incorporated into treatment plant design to insure no detrimental impact.

The DGEIS provides ample evidence that the project will not lead to contravention the goals of the Glen Lake Management Plan. The Project provides comprehensive stormwater treatment and large improvement in wastewater management which will reduce nutrient loadings. The Project will not change the fisheries or foster invasion of the lake by non-native plants, or animals. The sound studies completed during summer 2000 demonstrated that intermittent sound from the Great Escape are overwhelmed by the localized sources such as boating or other lake activities. The recreational capacity or experience at Glen Lake will not be harmed by the project. The Great Escape is an allowed use and therefore it is an appropriate development in the watershed.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 513 **(Mrs. Dorothy B. Hunt, 34 Reardon Rd., Queensbury; written comments dated October 24, 2000):**

Commenter states her opposition to the removal of trees between the Samoset Motel and the Coach House Restaurant based on the "aesthetic impact of this removal [and]...noise impact upon the neighborhoods of Courthouse Estates and Glen Lake from storm-water run-off" and expresses a preference for construction of a "parking structure on the old Animal Land property" instead of additional paved parking lots.

RESPONSE 513

See Responses 6, 105, 427, 478, 435 and 453. Also see DGEIS Section 7.3.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 514 **(Mr. E. P. Hunt, 34 Reardon Rd., Queensbury; written comments dated October 24, 2000):**

Commenter, a Glen Lake resident for 48 years, states his opposition to the removal of trees between the Samoset Motel and the Coach House Restaurant based on the "aesthetic impact of this removal [and]...noise impact upon the neighborhoods of Courthouse Estates and Glen Lake from storm-water run-off" and expresses a preference for construction of a "parking structure on the old Animal Land property" instead of additional paved parking lots.

RESPONSE 514

Comment noted. Noise issues and the parking garage alternative are addressed in Responses 6 and 35.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 515 **(Ms. Jeanne S. Sullivan, 3 Sullivan Road, Glen Lake, Lake George; written comments dated October 24, 2000):**

Commenter, who has lived at Glen Lake for 52 years and whose husband's family has owned property on Glen Lake for 65 years, states her concern "with the need to prevent clear cutting of trees along the route 9 corridor" and urging that with respect to such removal of trees "noise impact and the drainage problems should be taken very seriously." Commenter further states that, "we hope that any changes that are approved by the [Planning] board are strictly enforced. This has not always been the case. When the Lake George Campsites and RV Sales on Route 9 were approved, trees along Route 9 were not to be cut down. The trees have since been removed and recreational vehicles are lined up along Route 9."

RESPONSE 515

The Route 9 corridor will not be clear cut. The Route 9 corridor is under the control of the NYSDOT. See also DGEIS pages 4-21 and 4-22 and Cross Sections 4-2A, 4-2B, 4-2C, 4-2D and 4-2E.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 516 **(Mr. Norman Enhorning, 7 Oakwood Drive, Queensbury; written comments dated October 24, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to the proposed project, "I think it will create more traffic on my street [Oakwood Drive] as drivers try to avoid the congestion on Route 9. I also think it will create more traffic along Bay and Quaker Roads. I understand there is a possibility that some housing developments will be built along Meadowbrook Road and I think that this will result in a lot more traffic congestion as well."

RESPONSE 516

See Responses 49 and 50. Traffic generated by Great Escape is not anticipated to use Oakwood Drive, as it will not provide any savings with regard to travel time or travel distance. East-west travel between Route 9 and Country Club Road and points east will be accommodated by collector roads such as Round Pond Road and Sweet Road, not residential roads such as Oakwood Drive.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 1, Page 2; Appendix 4, Chapter III, Sections F and I.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 517 **(Dr. and Mrs. Ronald Van Slooten, 110 Warren Avenue, Ho-Ho-Kus, New Jersey; written comments dated October 24, 2000):**

Commenters, who have lived on Glen Lake for thirteen years, state, "The Great Escape causes the main traffic problems on Route 9 along with excessive noise and threatens the quality of our Lake." Commenters also state with respect to the proposal to remove trees between the Samoset Motel and Coach House Restaurant, "This will further increase the noise levels as well and more importantly affect the water quality due to storm water run off. If the trees are replaced by paved parking, the rainwater will carry with it all the oils, gasoline, etc. into the catch basins, therefore passing into the groundwater entering Glen Lake via the Glen Lake Brook."

RESPONSE 517

Comment noted. See Appendix 4 and DGEIS Section 4 pages 28-34. Improvements are proposed to mitigate traffic problems on Route 9. The DGEIS indicates that there will not be significant stormwater or surface water impacts and that existing vegetation along travel corridors does not function as an effective noise barrier.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 518 **(Mr. Electo P. and Mrs. Eugene D. Choppa, 508 Glen Lake Road, Lake George; written comments dated October 24, 2000):**

Commenters, residents of Glen Lake for 67 years, state their opposition to the proposed expansion of the Park based on their contention that "trees should be preserved for their beauty and effect on clean air...ancient and glorious mountains should not be obscured by steel girders or cement structures,...a sewage disposal system is a must to protect our residential areas,...[an increase in park patronage] would add to highway congestion and parking lots, which pave over wetland and allow oils and chemicals to drain or seep into the waters of the wetlands-streams and lakes should not be encouraged."

RESPONSE 518

The potential impacts to visual and water resources with which Commenters are concerned have been addressed in the DGEIS as SEQR requires, and a "hard look" has been taken at each. See DGEIS Section 4 pages 28-34 and FGEIS Section 4.3, "Visual Analysis 2000-2001."

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 519 (Ms. Susie Washburn; written comments dated October 25, 2000):

Commenter states her opposition to the removal of trees between the Samoset Motel and the Coach House Restaurant based on the "aesthetic impact of this removal [and]...noise impact upon the neighborhoods of Courthouse Estates and Glen Lake from storm-water run-off" and expresses a preference for construction of a "parking structure on the old Animal Land property" instead of additional paved parking lots.

RESPONSE 519

See Responses 6, 105, 427, 428, 435 and 453. Also see DGEIS Section 7.3.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 520 (Mr. Edward Schadwill, Sr.,; written comments received October 25, 2000):

Commenter states, "This man made 200 foot tall monster is going to do nothing more than RAPE, RAPE again, and repeatedly RAPE not only the Glen Lake community which it will be located adjacent to, but will also RAPE all the nearby residents living in the area surrounding the Great Escape. This 200 foot monster will also RAPE those living in Glens Falls and Lake George [by]... [causing the] despoliation of our local and areas environment and beauty,...add[ing to] traffic congestion and tie-ups,...added air and ground pollution,...added noise intrusion,.....add[ing] to the already trashy look and atmosphere of seasonal, tourist oriented and driven community businesses that only offer part time – minimal wage – dead end jobs...seasonal tourist attractions are NOT cornerstones of any community and do NOTHING to promote solid community growth and development,...when the Great Escape closes for the season and the owners go to Florida, Europe or elsewhere – the rest of the poor slobs who live in the area will have to put up with the 200 foot tall monstrosity in their midst on a daily basis, and continue to be RAPED on a daily basis, month in and month out for approximately 8 months plus or minus."

RESPONSE 520

As noted previously, the visual impact analysis has been updated for this FGEIS and identifies many locations within Area "A" where the location of tall rides would not cause significant adverse visual impacts outside the Park. Commenter's other statements regarding economic impacts are statements of opinion which do not refute the "dollars and cents" quantification of regional economic benefits of Park expansion discussed in the GDEIS.

DGEIS Reference: Section 4.3, "Visual Analysis 2000-2001"

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 521 (Mr. Donald P. Sipp; written comments dated October 25, 2000):

Commenter states with respect to tree removal, "remove only enough of the trees and hill in the area of the Samoset to the Coachouse to allow for the ring road and toll plaza...[and] leave the trees and hill in the rear of the Old Animal Land property." Commenter asks, "with the removal of trees and the hill from the area of the Samoset Motel south to the Coachouse, and from the area of the old Animal Land, what will be the increase in sound levels in Courthouse, Twicwood and Glen Lake?"

RESPONSE 521

Audible noise transmission will not be significantly affected by any vegetation clearing associated with the Project. See Responses 6, 105, 427, 428, 435 and 453. See also DGEIS Section 7.3.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 522 (Mr. Donald P. Sipp; written comments dated October 25, 2000):

Commenter states, "Complete all infrastructure at Great Escape cost. This would include Sewer hooked to the Glens Falls sewer plant, all new traffic lanes, traffic lights, overhead walkway. When these items are in place the project would continue with sight [sic] plan review for each new step."

RESPONSE 522

The DGEIS proposed a specific phased mitigation plan to incorporate measures to improve traffic flow on Route 9. The phasing of infrastructure improvement is subject to review by NYS DOT. All on and off site infrastructure proposed in this Project will be undertaken and funded by the Park. SEQR provides for environmental mitigation to be imposed as a condition to project approval, but does not support Commenters' apparent suggestion that only mitigation should be approved and installed before any other Project elements can be approved. SEQR would appear to conflict with Commenter's suggestion.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 523 (Mr. Donald P. Sipp; written comments dated October 25, 2000):

Commenter adds to his earlier comments regarding impacts to noise by suggesting that a parking garage be considered as an alternative stating, "Cost should not be a factor in protecting area from harmful noise." Commenter asks, "What will be the increase in sound levels form a 200 ft roller coaster?" and questions what is meant by "existing baseline noise study" as provided on page 3-40 of the DGEIS? Furthermore, Commenter asks with respect to Table 3 of DGEIS Appendix 7, depicting the determination of the Ldn, "where is the field data? Was the daytime Leq taken during park operation? Oct. 6, 1999 was a Wed., was the park open this day?"

RESPONSE 523

A parking garage will not change the sound environment since any vegetation that might be saved is ineffective as a sound barrier in any event. The baseline noise study was conducted in 1990 and is provided in DGEIS Appendix 7. The field data is provided in the report in Appendix 7 in the back under "Enclosure 2, Field Data Forms." The reference in Table 3 to October 6 should have been to September 6.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 524 (Mr. Donald P. Sipp; written comments dated October 25, 2000):

Commenter states with respect to a statement at the bottom of page 4-23 of the DGEIS wherein the Applicant states that sound levels have remained unchanged, "This statement is completely FALSE when related to Courthouse Estates. Aug. 29, 1990 show Leq of 50.2 and 50.2 dBA for Courthouse, while Sept. 6, 1999 shows Leq of 56.6 dBAs, an increase of 6.3 dB over 1990. A significant increase!"

RESPONSE 524

See Response 212.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 525 (Mr. Donald P. Sipp; written comments dated October 25, 2000):

Commenter states, "The soil under the future Green parking lot is unsuited for a parking area. Will this area receive more fill? Where will the storm water from the Green parking area drain to?"

RESPONSE 525

This area will receive more fill. See DGEIS Figure 2-22, "Conceptual Grading and Drainage Plan (2 of 3)."

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 526 (Mr. Donald P. Sipp; written comments dated October 25, 2000):

Commenter states, "The assessed valuation of Courthouse, Twicwood and Glen Lake is over $72 million dollars. If expansion causes a decrease in real estate values, will the increased sales tax and real estate taxes make up the difference?"

RESPONSE 526

There is no basis to expect the Project will cause any decrease in real property values or assessments or consequent property tax revenues to municipalities. See FGEIS Section 4.7Fiscal projections in the DGEIS predict increases in both real and property tax receipts and sales tax receipts.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 527 (Mr. Donald P. Sipp; written comments dated October 25, 2000):

Commenter states, "If there are not enough workers in the area at present (ads in paper for workers during the season) how much labor will need to be imported from other areas and other countries?"

RESPONSE 527

The Great Escape is a high profile attraction and it has always had a large pool of applications due to the nature of its jobs. The Park's human resource department recruits from all potential applicant sources, both traditional and non-traditional.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 528 (Mr. Donald P. Sipp; written comments dated October 25, 2000):

Commenter states, "The proposed expansion will mean construction projects of $16-18 million. Will all ride contracts go to local business? How much of projects that go out for bid will be done by local contractors?"

RESPONSE 528

As with most businesses, the Park's construction process goes through a competitive bid process. But with all things equal, the Park prefers to use local vendors. See DGEIS Section 4.1.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 529 (Mr. Donald P. Sipp; written comments dated October 25, 2000):

Commenter asks, "Will car parking be allowed on the west side of Route 9, north of Northland Sports Wear?"

RESPONSE 529

In the short-term, this area will continue to be used as overflow parking particularly as the new parking lots are being built and "phased in". With the completion of the new lot system west of Route 9, however, it is expected that the "sand pit" area referred to will be needed for overflow parking only occasionally, if at all.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 530 (Mr. Donald P. Sipp; written comments dated October 25, 2000):

Commenter asks, "Will patrons parking in the area south of Martha's be allowed to walk north on the sidewalk on Route 9 and cross to the park entrance?"

RESPONSE 530

No. Everyone will have to use the pedestrian bridge in order to obtain the desired benefit of improving traffic flow on Route 9. Fencing required by NYS DOT will keep pedestrians from crossing at grade along the Park's Route 9 frontage.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 531 (Mr. Donald P. Sipp; written comments dated October 25, 2000):

Commenter asks, "What will cause the new gates to the parking areas to be opened? Will it be a sudden shower, after a rock concert, at closing time, etc.?"

RESPONSE 531

The operation of the gates on Route 9 has not been determined. The primary means of egress will be the ring road. The gates may be open in the late evening hours when the Route 9 traffic volume is low and turning movements out of the park will not interfere with flow on Route 9. Gates will not be open for mass egress since that would cause significant conflicts on Route 9.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 532 (Mr. Donald P. Sipp; written comments dated October 25, 2000):

Commenter asks, "As has been the practice at other Six Flags Parks, will Rock Concerts be held at the Great Escape? If so, what provisions will be made to control noise, traffic, and behavior of the people attending?"

RESPONSE 532

Rock concerts are held at an open "shed" amphitheater facility at Darien Lake owned by Metropolitan Ogden Entertainment. Like similar amphitheaters such as SPAC, rock concerts at Darien Lakes are separate events which are not associated with the operation of the amusement park, although, they are on adjacent "sites" and part of the same "complex". No stand-alone shed or amphitheater which will book rock concerts is proposed for the Great Escape. However, generally speaking, smaller outdoor music performances are a part of the overall amusement park experience. In the past numerous musical performances have taken place at the Great Escape and it is expected that events will occur in the future. To prevent undue disturbance of the public, music performances will take place at the interior of the park, or music will be focused towards the interior as was done in the past. See DGEIS page 4-43.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 533 (Mr. Donald P. Sipp; written comments dated October 25, 2000):

Commenter asks, "With the increase in attendance, more cars and buses, what will be the [e]ffect on air quality? Will increased omissions have an effect on people with respiratory problems? How will the park monitor these omissions?"

RESPONSE 533

See DGEIS page 4-43. As recognized by the current Town Master Plan (page 34) the primary means to manage air quality is to keep the local road network free of prolonged congestion. The proposed plan for traffic improvements will thus reduce overall air pollution in the future.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 534 (Mr. Donald P. Sipp; written comments dated October 25, 2000):

Commenter asks, "Will the use of ponds as a storm water control method, allow a place for mosquitoes to breed? Will the use of insecticides affect ground water?"

RESPONSE 534

No. The ponds will dry out after a rainfall sufficient to cause stormwater detention in the ponds.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 535 **(Mr. Tor and Ms. Christine Haggblom, 2 Cedarwood Drive, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 25, 2000):**

Commenters state, "we are not opposed to [Great Escape] developing their activities especially if this would benefit the town economy and industry. However, we think this should be done with [a] high degree of consideration to the opinions of the neighborhood as the development will directly affect the quality of life and the value of the properties of the people living in the proximity of [Great Escape]....The expansion of [Great Escape] reportedly will bring a lot of income to the town. It would be very appropriate for the town to use some of the revenues for projects aiming to reduce the negative impacts of the development on the residences directly affected." Commenter cites impacts to noise and traffic as negative impacts of the project.

RESPONSE 535

The Applicant and the Planning Board are attempting in this Project to provide appropriate mitigation to minimize the impact of the anticipated growth in business on the nearby residential communities.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 536 **(Mr. Tor and Ms. Christine Haggblom, 2 Cedarwood Drive, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 25, 2000):**

Commenters state, "Development of several businesses along Route 9 have during the previous decade reduced the natural noise barrier against the Northway in a very significant way by removal of trees. The plans of [Great Escape] includes also removal of trees between Rt. 9 and the Northway. This will indirectly add to the noise level at the Twickwood residences."

RESPONSE 536

See Responses 6 and 39.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 537 **(Mr. Tor and Ms. Christine Haggblom, 2 Cedarwood Drive, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 25, 2000):**

Commenters state, "During peak hours the traffic along Route 9 already at present time is very heavy causing delays and difficulty entering Rt. 9 from sideroads. The planned arrangements by [Great Escape] to improve the traffic from and to the [Great Escape] in the future, when attendance is supposed to be double compared to the present level, does not appear to be satisfactory. More traffic studies and planning is required, also addressing the traffic conditions to the south of [Great Escape]."

RESPONSE 537

The adequacy of the planned improvements will be determined by the permitting agencies, specifically NYSDOT and the Town of Queensbury. The scope of the Traffic Impact Study included the Route 9/Route 254 intersection to the south. No additional studies have been required by those agencies.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 538 **(Dr. Hyung R. and Mrs. Eleonora Kim, 23 Fitzgerald Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 25, 2000):**

Commenters state, "As residents of Glen Lake for the past twelve years and of the Queensbury area for the past three decades, we have witnessed huge growth and change. While much has proven to be for the better, we feel compelled to oppose *this* expansion due to the aggressive and invasive way the development seeks to take over and ultimately damage a valuable part of our community. The addition of the new roller coaster on the back edge of the property will turn what was once an idyllic mountain lake into the audio epicenter of a 'thrill town'. Towers supporting this structure will stand where there were once towering trees and ledges. The marshes of childhood exploration and canoes will lay barren to clear cutting and the run off from crowded parking lots."

RESPONSE 538

Comment noted. With regard to placement of tall rides, the Commenter is referred to FGEIS Section 4.3, "Visual Analysis 2000-2001."

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 539 **(Mr. James G. O'Keeffe, M.D., 45 Hudson Avenue, P.O. Box 144, Glens Falls; written comments dated October 25, 2000):**

Commenter, a summer resident of Glen Lake for over 20 years, states, "For over 20 years, I've canoed in the water basin behind Great Escape and there is no question that it is changing. I'm not an expert, but no matter how careful one is, this has to influence this huge area of wetlands."

RESPONSE 539

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 540 **(Ms. Diane Yagar Hayes, 12 Cherokee Lane, Queensbury; written comments dated October 25, 2000):**

Commenter expanded on comments made at the public hearing, "In 1999 the town adopted the Glen Lake Management Watershed Plan. Does the DGEIS comply with the current town land use plan in the watershed area? Who will look at this? When will an answer come to the public? Queensbury citizens are relying on [the Planning Board] to uphold existing plans."

RESPONSE 540

The DGEIS does provide the data required by the Glen Lake Watershed Management Plan. Under the topic of new development, the project proposes to minimize land clearing by using a festival parking design which allows higher density parking and reduces land clearing by approximately 40 acres(approximately 40 more acres would need to be cleared to produce 20 acres of usable parking, after subtracting roadways, perimeter buffers and non-usable lands). The project avoids impacts to wetlands and provides a comprehensive stormwater management system that controls both quantity and quality of stormwater. The project reduces sewage nutrient loading of the critical nutrient phosphorous by over 99% as compared to existing loadings.

The changes proposed to the wastewater aspect of the project will actually reduce the total pounds of nutrients and other organic components which are presently discharged into the ground. Since the Park is preexisting and the changes are improvements to existing systems, it certainly will provide better protection to the watershed which should be in alignment with the goals of the Watershed Plan.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 541 **(Ms. Betty A. Spadano, 74 Glen Lake Road, Lake George; written comments dated October 25, 2000):**

Commenter states that removing trees between the Samoset Motel and Coachhouse Restaurant could adversely impact Glen Lake through increased run-off and thereby affect the value of her property.

RESPONSE 541

See DGEIS Appendix 3 and Response 315.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 542 **(Mr. John P. Crawford, 98 McCormack Drive, Lake George; written comments dated October 25, 2000):**

Commenter states, "I am not against growth as long as it is done in a well-planned controlled manner held to a standard that will have minimal undesirable effect on the physical environment and the quality of life that we all enjoy. It is unfortunate that [Great Escape is] located in an area that is in a hollow and adjacent to wet lands. But these are the constraints that they were aware of when they purchased Great Escape and now they must live and work through. The wetlands cannot allow to be destroyed. It is a one-way direction, once the wetlands are affected, it will be difficult to return them to their original state."

RESPONSE 542

The only potential direct effect on any wetland will be from rehabilitation of a road crossing which will not have a significant adverse impact on the wetland function and will be reviewed and approved by the NYS DEC. The Stormwater Management Plan has been designed to minimize impacts to the wetland and will be subject to review via a monitoring program.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 543 **(Ms. Anna Fowler, 96 Ash Drive, Lake George; written comments dated October 26, 2000):**

Commenter added to her comments during the public hearing by stating, "...I do not want to be seeing - and therefore most definitely hearing! – huge roller coasters or other rides from the lake, and from the wetland when I (and others) go for a quiet retreat in a canoe or rowboat. Couldn't there be a height restriction to keep rides below the level of the tree line?"

RESPONSE 543

Refer to Response 30.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 544 **(Ms. Anna Fowler, 96 Ash Drive, Lake George; written comments dated October 26, 2000):**

Commenter asks, "...could there be guidelines on lighting of rides after hours to avoid light pollution? – i.e., keeping lighting to a minimum and putting shields on lights to direct light downward and also away from the direction of the wetland and lake."

RESPONSE 544

If lights on a ride were proposed as part of a specific site plan review application, the Town Planning Board would review the potential visual impact of such ride and determine whether it might be significant and need further mitigation or study. In addition, the Applicant has agreed that no lighting other than emergency lighting will be visible above tree line. The Planning Board anticipates making a Finding to this effect.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 545 **(Ms. Anna Fowler, 96 Ash Drive, Lake George; written comments dated October 26, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to the omission of the Osprey on the DGEIS list of species in the Project area, "With a huge omission like that, I can only conclude that there are doubtless many omissions, including endangered species. Have independent biologists checked out this possibility in regards to wildlife and plant life in the study area? In addition, shouldn't the study area be expanded to include the whole of Glen Lake since the entire lake will be impacted by changes in water quality?"

RESPONSE 545

Osprey was not included on the list of observed species because LA Group biologists have not seen that species on (or over) lands of Great Escape, nor does the NY Natural Heritage Program of NYSDEC have any records of such occurrences.

Glen Lake was not included in the study of plants and wildlife because its water quality is not anticipated to be impacted. A new tertiary sewage treatment plant to be built at the Park and the stormwater management system to be constructed as part of the new development in Park Area C will discharge effluent to groundwater and not to surface waters that flow into Glen Lake. The Planning Board intends to require monitoring of stormwater discharge.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 546 **(Mr. & Mrs. Dana S. Bray, Jr., 15 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; written comments dated October 26, 2000):**

Commenters state, "The Great Escape is projecting a million and a half people to visit their park. At Saratoga, during the racing season, approximately 950,000 people attend a huge complex. These numbers at Saratoga have caused all kinds of congestion, traffic problems, and accidents and require a huge police force to monitor the comings and goings of this over 950,000 at the track. The Great Escape wants to increase this people traffic by an additional 600,000 people. It's just too many people to manage in a relatively small area."

RESPONSE 546

See DGEIS Appendix 4 which indicates that traffic capacity and levels of service within the Study Area will be equal to or better than today's conditions, even though overall peak traffic volumes will increase. On-site parking, circulation and a pedestrian bridge will handle crowds better than today's conditions at the Park or at the Saratoga Flat Track mentioned by Commenter where parking is limited on site and inconvenient and there are numerous delays caused by at grade crosswalks for pedestrians and horses.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 547 **(Mr. & Mrs. Dana S. Bray, Jr., 15 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; written comments dated October 26, 2000):**

Commenters state, "The management at the Great Escape has shown time after time, that they cannot adequately manage what they now have. They have made numerous promises to quiet the noise on the Alpine Bobsled Ride. They have not accomplished this. Why would we believe that they would manage the facility any better in the future? This past summer, many people complained after visiting the Great Escape that many rides were not functioning. They were most upset about this and I am sure management had many complaints. If they can't manage what they have now, what assurances do we have that they will be able to manage what they have in the future? The Great Escape's poor management can only intensify the pollution problems in the future."

RESPONSE 547

The Park management decided not to run the Bobsled ride this past summer until the foam sound-dampening insulation could be installed as a noise mitigation measure. Park management received numerous complaints from Park patrons about the ride not being in operation during this time. Once the insulation was added, sound monitoring showed that there was a 6 dB reduction in sound levels.

See Responses 238 and 80.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 548 **(Ms. Karen A. Sabo, 12 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "When I think of the Great Escape wanting to undertake such a large expansion, the first thought that comes to my mind is that they can't handle the problems that the park has now with its current size. I have heard from dozens of people who were extremely disappointed with their visits to Great Escape this past summer...they were disappointed because many of the park's current rides weren't operating. Also, the original Storytown playhouses and statues that we all remember from our childhoods were run down and had peeling paint. I heard that the food prices were outrageous, service was poor and that the Splashwater Kingdom changing rooms were unsanitary. There have been numerous instances of concerts that disturb neighborhoods, and the noise issue from the Alpine Bobsled has still not been resolved...Perhaps the Great Escape should concentrate more on the present quality of their business and their response to their neighbors before they propose to expand so extensively."

RESPONSE 548

Comment noted. Contrary to Commenter's impressions conveyed by unnamed third-persons, the Park reports that it expends substantial effort on maintaining and upgrading its existing attractions. The substantial growth in Park patronage over the last several seasons indicates that many customers do not share the negative impressions alluded to by Commenter.

See Responses 238, 80 and 547.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 549 **(Ms. Karen A. Sabo, 12 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "[The Great Escape is] bound by critical environmental areas and residential neighborhoods. Environmental, social and economic factors must be weighed **evenly** when considering their proposal. It is your job, as planning board members, not to allow any project to proceed that can irreversibly harm our town and its residents. A long range master plan from the Great Escape, with a step by step approach should be submitted, as well as a thorough study and mitigation evaluation of all of the potential negative impacts. Ignoring problems and not evaluating them will only hurt the town in the long run."

RESPONSE 549

The Park has been engaged in precisely the kind of study requested by Commenter and the Planning Board in the form of this SEQR review. The DGEIS and FGEIS are intended to satisfy the Commenters' request for a "long range master plan.... with a step by step approach... as well as a thorough study and mitigation evaluation of all the potential negative impacts".

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 550 **(Ms. Karen A. Sabo, 12 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "I also noted many discrepancies. The most upsetting one to me was the comment made on page v [of the Executive Summary] that 'the Project and the expansion of the Park are entirely consistent with the officially adopted land use decisions and objectives of the Town of Queensbury.' The cutting down of 11.4 acres of mature woods along the Northway, is not consistent with the town's Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) which states on page 8, Neighborhood 7 under recommendations, 'maintain the existing heavily wooded buffer between the properties and the Northway in order to maintain the current quality appearance of Queensbury from the Northway.' The vision for Queensbury as stated in the CLUP, which was prepared with input from citizens and adopted by the town board, lists the following":

- "Planned development with a concern for protection of natural resources, rural character and visual quality of the town."
- "A community comprised of diverse neighborhoods developed in harmony with economic and environmental factors."
- "Government responsive to needs of citizens."
- "Citizens playing an active role in the town's decision-making."

RESPONSE 550

Refer to Response 123 and 609. The northern boundary of Neighborhood 7 ends at Round Pond Road.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 551 **(Ms. Karen A. Sabo, 12 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to impacts to audible noise, "...a residence in Hidden Hills was...evaluated [in the 2000 sound studies performed by Chazen Companies] and shown to have a much higher Leq than the other neighborhoods, not within the federal 'guidelines', decidedly because of the constant Northway noise. Within the last year, both Twicwood and Courthouse Estates residents have noticed a significant increase in the amount of Northway noise audible to them both during the day and the night hours. If you were to compare Table 3 from the DGEIS labeled, 'Day-night Sound Levels The Great Escape Fall 1999,' and Table 5 from the August 2000 Chazen Sound Study labeled, 'Comparison of Leq Values by Location and Time of Day,' it would be obvious that there is an increase in both the day and night time Leqs from Twicwood and Courthouse Estates from 1999 to 2000. The only variable that has changed over the past year is that more mature trees were removed between the neighborhoods and the Northway...the potential impact from additional Northway noise on the three nearby neighborhoods caused by the proposed extensive removal of trees by the Great Escape, should be addressed, evaluated and mitigated."

RESPONSE 551

The sites that are comparable between the Great Escape study and Chazen study is Chazen site 7. The Chazen data for site 7 had Leq of 53.4 while the Great Escape data ranged between 40.1-53.8.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 552 **(Ms. Karen A. Sabo, 12 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "...the loss of the 11.4 acres of trees and removal of the hill near the Northway will eliminate the quality appearance of Queensbury from the Northway. Replacing those woods with acres of pavement and a few shrubs and small trees will certainly take away from the 'Adirondack' atmosphere that is currently so picturesque when driving either on Route 9 or the Northway near the Samoset Motel. This area is striving for an 'Adirondack Theme' with architectural guidelines that have been discussed as part of the upcoming town ordinances."

RESPONSE 552

See Responses 105, 427, 428, 435 and 453.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 553 **(Ms. Karen A. Sabo, 12 Twicwood Lane, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "To ensure that the proposed expansion will not cause any visual impact, the Great Escape should follow the new DEC Visual Assessment Policy titled, 'Assessing and Mitigating Visual Impacts.' This policy was adopted by DEC July 31, 2000 and provides in-depth and up to date guidance for properly evaluating visual and aesthetic impacts generated from proposed development."

RESPONSE 553

The "new" DEC policy mentioned is simply a compilation of the well-known basic principles of visual impact analysis, which were followed in the analyses conducted for the project in this DGEIS and FGEIS.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 554 **(Glen Lake Protective Association, P.O. Box 4135, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states that a 200' high roller coaster would have an "unacceptable" visual impact, "the vision of a mountain is significantly altered when one views it through the gridwork supported a roller coaster...To supply some perspective, the CNA Insurance building in downtown Glens Falls (9 stories) is approximately 96 feet high. This coaster will be over twice as high...Residents, who may not erect homes exceeding 28 feet in height due to their location on waterfront property should not be expected to be burdened with the visual impact of a 200 foot high grid of pipes, etc."

RESPONSE 554

Refer to Responses 29, 30 and 161.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 555 **(Glen Lake Protective Association, P.O. Box 4135, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "[The DGEIS] should only include attractions which do not exceed the 50 foot height of the trees or are placed in a low point in the park which prevents them from being seen from the lake. The document should also specify if existing trees are replaced with shorter trees, then the height of the rides should be reduced to that of the new trees. Currently, none of the rides are visible from the lake. (Note: The comet is located in a low section behind the hill on Birdsall Rd. It has no visual impact and little, if any, noise impact on the neighborhood of Glen Lake.)"

RESPONSE 555

The Park is located in the Town-designated Recreation-Commercial zoning district, intended to "isolate, protect, and encourage expansion of the recreation industry." (Town Zoning Ordinance Section 179.21.B). The nature of the industry is such that limiting the Park to rides that equal tree height is not feasible. Refer to FGEIS Section 4.3, "Visual Analysis 2000-2001," for definition of the areas within the park where tall rides could be sited without creating a significant adverse visual impact.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 556 **(Glen Lake Protective Association, P.O. Box 4135, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "Their analysis of endangered species is superficial and incomplete. Biologists from DEC have identified the Blue Karner butterfly in Park Area [sic] C. Biologists from Adirondack Community College have discovered endangered species in the Fen. They should be contacted and their analyses should be included in [the DGEIS]."

RESPONSE 556

See Responses 344 and 345. NYSDEC has no records of occurrence of Karner Blue butterflies in Park Area C, nor in Park Areas A and B. Wild lupines, the plants on which the larvae of the Karner Blue butterfly must feed, have not been found in Park Area C, only on adjacent lands owned by New York State. NYSDEC has no records of occurrence of Karner Blue butterflies on these adjacent lands.

To the best of the Applicant and Planning Board's knowledge, biologists from Adirondack Community College have not come forth with data on endangered species occurring in the Glen Lake Fen. They are welcome to produce such data. DEC's Endangered Species Unit, which inventories critical habitat as required by the Environmental Conservation Law, has no further information on endangered species than what is set forth in the DGEIS.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 557 **(Glen Lake Protective Association, P.O. Box 4135, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "Section 3.5.1 [of the DGEIS] describing land use and zoning, identifies the Glen Lake neighborhood within the study area as 'a group of six or seven homes located along the southwesterly portion of Glen Lake about one-third of a mile from...the Park.' The project location map, Figure 1-1, shows the primary study area as including not just 6 or 7 properties on Birdsall Rd. (conveniently located behind the hill), but includes all of the properties from the home owned by Touba on the Northwest shore to Powell on the South shore. This includes thirty-four (34) homes. In addition, they should have included all residences on Glen Lake since they are impacted visually, audibly and by the increased nutrient loading of the waters due to sewage and run-off from the Park. [The DGEIS] should include all lakefront homes in its analysis."

RESPONSE 557

All of the homes potentially impacted by sound, visual, traffic, and other aspects of the Project have been considered in the GEIS analyses. Refer to DGEIS Appendices 4 and 7, and DGEIS Section 4.9.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 558 **(Glen Lake Protective Association, P.O. Box 4135, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "...the DGEIS claims that...Storytown pre-dates most residential development and has co-existed with those neighborhoods since their construction...this is patently false. Buildings on Glen Lake which extend from the old Casino building on Ash Drive to the homes on St. Mary's Bay near the intersection of Ivy Loop and Glen Lake Road were almost entirely built prior to 1950....It's true that the residents of Glen Lake have coexisted with the precursor, Storytown. Storytown, by contrast, was a very different park than the present day Great Escape. It featured quiet children's attractions...that did not generate significant environmental impact. There were some conflicts between the neighbors at Glen Lake and the old Storytown Park...involv[ing] water quality issues. Among those issues were filling in of wetlands and the dumping of pollutants into the waters surrounding the Park."

RESPONSE 558

The Great Escape predates the homes in Twicwood and Courthouse Estates. The local zoning ordinance states that residential uses are compatible with the RC zone (Town Zoning Ordinance Section 179.21.B). The proposed project provides specific means to reduce sound level, monitor traffic, improve traffic circulation, treat stormwater for quantity and quality and improve sewage treatment. These measures will be implemented in accordance with the time schedule in the DGEIS. Potential wetland impacts for the proposed project from physical construction activities will involve only upgrades of existing crossings. While the Great Escape may have evolved in its attractions from the original "Story Town" theme, large rides such as roller coasters and similar attractions have existed at the Park for approximately twenty years, since about the time the Park's name was changed to the Great Escape in the early 1980s.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 559 **(Glen Lake Protective Association, P.O. Box 4135, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states that the removal of trees between the Samoset Motel and the Coachhouse Restaurant will adversely impact audible noise, water quality, and the aesthetic value of that area based on "the trees currently absorb enormous quantities of water and the airborne pollutants found in that rainwater...removal of a considerable amount of soil...will reduce the natural berm [which] with the trees..buffer the noise from the Northway."

RESPONSE 559

See Responses 6, 39, 105, 427, 428, 435 and 453.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 560 **(Glen Lake Protective Association, P.O. Box 4135, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "the soils information provided in the DGEIS was based upon general information presented by the Soil Conservation Service publication, *Soil Mapping for the Warren County Soil and Conservation District.* The soils in Park area C were filled in over wetlands to create parking spaces. This fact brings into question the validity of using generalized mapping data for the design of a recharge system...site-specific test borings should be performed to verify the design...since the largest percentage of the management system will rely on the soil's ability to recharge runoff directly into the ground."

RESPONSE 560

See Response 562.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 561 **(Glen Lake Protective Association, P.O. Box 4135, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to the proposed stormwater management system, "Based upon design for dry wells recommended by NYSDEC, the infiltration system described in the DGEIS [is] most probably undersized."

RESPONSE 561

See DGEIS Appendix 3, and Responses 386, 387, 395, 396, 399, 394, 391, 397, 393 and 383.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 562 **(Glen Lake Protective Association, P.O. Box 4135, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "On site testing of the seasonal high water table should be done. The land upon which the existing parking lots in area C are built is filled land upon which gravel was placed over wetlands. The water table in those wetlands is at the level of the Glen Lake Brook, not six feet below the parking lots as alleged in the DGEIS."

RESPONSE 562

Fill will be added to the green, purple, brown, and beige parking lots in order to provide adequate vertical separation between the bottom of the recharge devices and the water table. The water table depth was based both on Warren County soil data and test borings for the pedestrian tunnel crossing alternative. FGEIS Section 4.10 contains the logs of the soil bores made to evaluate structuring/stability for the pedestrian bridge and indicate a water table of 7 feet below grade adjacent to the Rush Pond outlet.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 563 (Glen Lake Protective Association, P.O. Box 4135, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):

Commenter states, "The DGEIS states that the groundwater will not be impacted because no excavation will occur below the water table level. The average depth of the proposed drywells in the plan is nine feet. They are to be placed in the five feet of fill proposed for area C...NYSDEC recommends that a minimum separation of four feet be maintained between the bottom of the drywells and the seasonal high groundwater in order for the infiltration system to function properly...pipes from the catch basins feeding the drywell are placed three to four feet below grade. The effective drywell depth is generally calculated below the invert of the incoming pipes. Thus, the total required depth of the drywell structures should be in the 15 to 18 foot range. Given the grading plan presented for area C, it seems that the existing plan cannot be installed at the depths required to adequately function. It is suggested that on site seasonal high water table be verified and the stormwater plan be redesigned to accommodate actual conditions."

RESPONSE 563

Water table in the lowest portion of the parking lots is seven feet below grade. These areas will be filled and elevation increased from 402 to 405. the ponds will be built in fill and separation between the bottom of the ponds and the water table will be 2-4 feet. Adequate separation between the recharge devices and the water table will be maintained. The deeper excavation will be in the sandy hillsides where there is no evidence of a water table within the top 30 feet or more. If a water table were present, it would be evident by seepages at the Coach House restaurant site.

See also Responses 67 and 68.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 564 **(Glen Lake Protective Association, P.O. Box 4135, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "Since this Park is located in a DEC designated 'Critical Environmental Area,' runoff water quality is a concern. Extended detention basins with the water quality outlets that further enhance the ability of the system to provide treatment of the runoff should be required...extended detention basins can also be designed to provide management for 'first flush' storm events."

RESPONSE 564

A "Critical Environmental Area" is a regulatory designation under SEQR rules for a pre-designated area whose environmental characteristics must be reviewed during a decision as to whether to require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement. A CEA designation has no independent regulatory force outside of the SEQR context. See, 6 NYCRR 617.7 (c)(1)(iii). This Project has met this requirement by determining that the Project may affect the environment, and thus requiring the preparation of an EIS. See specified discussion of stormwater in the DGEIS, Appendix 3.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 565 **(Glen Lake Protective Association, P.O. Box 4135, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "'Festival' style parking should not be permitted in the plan. Sheet flow storm water management in the DGEIS provided for runoff to be directly discharged to existing drainage structures without any type of treatment. Once the parking lots are paved, water will flow across the pavement carrying all surface pollutants with it...it would be beneficial to provide vegetated buffers or grassed strips, prior to discharging the runoff."

RESPONSE 565

See pages 4-27 to 4-34 of the DGEIS Responses 40 and 181. Filter strips are proposed to be used.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 566 **(Glen Lake Protective Association, P.O. Box 4135, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to the stormwater management plan, "the detention and sheet flow portions of the design do not appear to comply with the State and local requirements."

RESPONSE 566

See Responses 386 and 387.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 567 **(Glen Lake Protective Association, P.O. Box 4135, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "Porous paving materials should be used in the construction of the parking lots. Grasspave and Gravelpave from Invisible Structures, Inc. of Aurora Colorado has been successfully used in locations like the University of So. Alabama stadium parking lots. Other similar materials should be considered. They are more suitable from an environmental and aesthetic perspective."

RESPONSE 567

See Response 107.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 568 **(Glen Lake Protective Association, P.O. Box 4135, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "The assessed value of the Park in 1999 was $17,185,500. The assessed value of waterfront homes on Glen Lake was $45 million in 1997. Twicwood properties have already declined in value due to noise from the Park. Due to good recreational water quality, Glen Lake homes have appreciated and are considered desirable. If, due to environmental degradation caused by Great Escape expansion (visual...water pollution...noise) properties on Glen lake decline in value the impact may be considerable. If homes decline in value by 50% then the property tax revenue decline to the Town will exceed the total property tax paid by the Six Flags Corporation."

RESPONSE 568

Comment noted. There is no evidence of which we are aware that Twicwood properties have declined in value, or that the Park has caused a demonstrable impact on any of the three residential neighborhoods within the DGEIS study area. Refer to FGEIS Section 4.7Commenters' assumption of a 50% decline in Glen Lake property values is not supported by regional sales trends which show those properties appreciating at equal or above regional averages.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 569 (Glen Lake Protective Association, P.O. Box 4135, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):

Commenter states, "If all infrastructure improvements such as extension of sewer lines, widening of Route Nine and Gurney Lane, etc. are not paid for by Six Flags, then an economic burden will be borne by the taxpayers."

RESPONSE 569

Most of the improvements related to the Project will be paid directly by the Great Escape assuming that the Park is the primary or sole beneficiary of the improvement. Government assistance in the form of grants may be sought to pay for some improvements on Route 9 that will also benefit the retail areas to the north.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 570 **(Glen Lake Protective Association, P.O. Box 4135, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "Welfare and unemployment benefits paid to temporary workers will create an economic impact on our residents."

RESPONSE 570

Seasonal and part-time workers at the Park have traditionally been drawn from those people such as students and retirees who do not file for unemployment because they are either not seeking full-time employment or are seasonally employed at other area businesses such as ski centers and retail outlets which provide part-time or seasonal employment during times of the year when the Park is not operating. Fewer than 5% of all seasonal Park employees seek to file for unemployment benefits, although they and many more seasonal workers are legally entitled to apply for such compensation based on length of employment. Moreover, contrary to Commenter's assumption, unemployment benefits even if paid have no fiscal impact on local taxpayers, since compensation is paid for by unemployment insurance coverage which is required to be paid by employers.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 571 **(Glen Lake Protective Association, P.O. Box 4135, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "The Warren County Sheriff, Lawrence Cleveland, was never consulted when the authors of the DGEIS claimed that no additional police service would be required due to the expansion plans. He has stated that additional services will be required."

RESPONSE 571

Refer to Response 129.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 572 **(Glen Lake Protective Association, P.O. Box 4135, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "The design parameters for the sewage treatment plant should be recalculated. There are errors in section 2.1.10 which bring into question all the data and conclusions in this section. First, they indicate the volume of sewage from the current theme park as 45,636 GPD. They then estimate that the Park with an expansion will produce only 60,000 GPD. Based upon an increase in visitors from approximately 900,000 to 1.5 million (a factor of 1.5), the volume with expansion of the theme park should be 68,454 GPD. Therefore, their total volume should be 103,454 GPD, not 95,000 GPD."

RESPONSE 572

The actual flow entering the current subsurface treatment systems, as determined by water usage records, is a flow of approx. 19,395 gpd. This average daily flow of 19,395 is received from a population of 900,000 people for the year, with an estimated increase to 1,500,000 people for the year or a 70% increase. The design is extremely conservative based on a multiplier of 3 times the current average daily flow. See also Responses 420 and 406.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 573 **(Glen Lake Protective Association, P.O. Box 4135, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "The DGEIS purports to show that the system proposed will produce effluent quality which is significantly better than DEC standards. However, the proposed level of phosphorous discharge (0.5 mg/l) only just meets DEC potential effluent standards. Glen Lake cannot biologically afford any additional phosphorous loading. Will measures of current phosphorous be taken and analysis of future phosphorous in Glen Lake and the watershed be determined based upon this additional loading?"

RESPONSE 573

NYSDEC will issue the SPDES permit based on the waste assimilative capacity of the receiving waters for the given parameters in the permit. The design however will be based on best available technology which currently will remove phosphorous down to non-detectable levels. The effluent will then be discharged to the soil for further natural filtration. Subsurface discharge is an additional design element not required by the SPDES program but put forth to insure an additional level of protection. The design of the treatment process incorporates the technology that is used in drinking water facilities to insure the integrity of the water quality. The soil conditions will be tested and the design done according to regulatory requirements for the soils. Currently all of the waste is being treated with septic tanks and the effluent is discharged to the ground with no negative impact to Glen Lake as proven by the total phosphorous level in the Lake. The Great Escape proposal is to improve the treatment of this waste with biological treatment, physical/chemical treatment and finally filtration equal to the standards established for microfiltration and then disinfection, an improvement of four additional levels of treatment than is currently being done. So if the current level of treatment is having no impact on Glen Lake an improvement will certainly continue the "no impact" scenario. As stated, the soils will be tested and approved before the final design is completed.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 574 **(Glen Lake Protective Association, P.O. Box 4135, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "A comparison study of the effects of ammonia, phosphorous, and Biological Oxygen Demand on the watershed and waters of Glen Lake should be done which compares the alternative of local sewage treatment versus transfer of the sewage to the Glens Falls treatment plant via a sewer line."

RESPONSE 574

See Responses 66, 85, 172, 198, 233.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 575 **(Glen Lake Protective Association, P.O. Box 4135, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "Due to the location of this property in a NYSDEC designated Critical Environmental Area and its close proximity to residential neighborhoods, its development must be limited. We cannot expect it to expand as other parks such as Six Flags in Darien, which is surrounded by acres of farmland. They must recognize that they purchased a piece of property which [is] not suitable for the purposes they had in mind. Consideration should be given to alternatives which project a more modest expansion which can limit the impacts on the area."

RESPONSE 575

The Applicant believes that the DGEIS establishes that the Park has adequate developable property in Park Areas C and A that the Project can be realized without imposing undue adverse impacts on surrounding lands and residential neighborhoods. The requirement that a DGEIS be prepared satisfies SEQR's mandate to properly consider effects on "Critical Environmental Areas" designated under SEQR's review regulations. An expansion similar to Darien Lakes is not being proposed. See Responses 234 and 564.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 576 **(Glen Lake Protective Association, P.O. Box 4135, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "A comparison and compatibility study of [the DGEIS] with the Glen Lake Watershed Management Plan adopted by the Town of Queensbury in 1999 [should be conducted]. Page 20 of the Management Plan includes a toxic substance Study. Sediment samples taken in 1997 from the Glen Lake Fen at a site adjacent to the Great Escape showed significant levels of toxic substances. The sources of this pollution should be studied, identified and included in this DGEIS."

RESPONSE 576

See Response 540.

Based on the water quality data supplied by NYSDEC collected over the past 13 years, the condition of the Glen Lake Fen ecosystem is healthy and improving. There is nothing which indicates any types of toxic pollution to the wetland or the surrounding environment. Without specific details of the "toxic substance", no further response to this comment can be made.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 577 **(Glen Lake Protective Association, P.O. Box 4135, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "An alternative plan which does not include the removal of all trees from the Northern portions of area C [should be considered]."

RESPONSE 577

It is not possible to accommodate the estimated number of cars on the property without clearing the land as proposed. The Applicant believes that parking structures are prohibitively expensive for this seasonal use.

Refer to DGEIS Sections 7.1, 7.3 and 7.7.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 578 **(Glen Lake Protective Association, P.O. Box 4135, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "A complete analysis (currently missing from the DGEIS) of traffic effects on local collector roads [should be included]."

RESPONSE 578

See Responses 14, 15, 16, 17, 49, and 135.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 1, Page 2; Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section I.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 579 **(Glen Lake Protective Association, P.O. Box 4135, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "The scoping document called for modeling of noise travel over water to determine its effects on all riparian owners at Glen Lake. Many sites on Glen Lake where resident complaints had been registered were not included in the study and should be added to the DGEIS."

RESPONSE 579

See FGEIS Section 4.1, "2000 Sound Studies."

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 580 **(Glen Lake Protective Association, P.O. Box 4135, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states that appropriate governmental agencies should be asked to give their input with respect to "additional services which may be required of them as a result of this proposed expansion. Those agencies should include the local school districts, law enforcement agencies, highway departments and fire departments."

RESPONSE 580

Refer to Response 129, with regard to emergency and law enforcement service providers. No impact to the school district is anticipated as a result of development of the proposed project. The NYSDOT was consulted and has concurred with the GEIS conclusions regarding the proposed roadway and parking improvements.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 581 **(Glen Lake Protective Association, P.O. Box 4135, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "Analysis of storm water run-off from additional traffic on Route 9, Glen Lake Rd., and Round Pond Rd. on the Glen Lake and Round Pond watersheds should be done. If additional traffic from a 70% increase in attendance is expected, then there should be more automotive pollutants dripping from the additional cars using those roads. Those pollutants end up in the watershed."

RESPONSE 581

Comment noted. See DGEIS page 4-28 through 4-34.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 582 **(Glen Lake Protective Association, P.O. Box 4135, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "The impact of special events and night operations should be analyzed. Currently, special events are held which utilize rock bands and fireworks into the late evening. Hours of operation should be limited to those in the past year and limits should be placed upon the noise from special events. Traffic analysis should include the traffic generated when special events end causing a mass exodus of patrons."

RESPONSE 582

The Applicant does not believe the DGEIS record concerning traffic and noise impacts provides support for any condition attempting to limit hours of operation. Park patrons leaving the Park when special events end do not cause traffic congestion, as off-peak traffic volumes on Route 9 at those hours can accommodate those exit flows comfortably. Off-peak exiting traffic analysis at both normal and "special event" closing times was not required in the DGEIS or Traffic Impact Study scope because these conditions would not affect critical peak capacity.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 583 **(The Environmental Design Partnership in a report prepared for the Glen Lake Protective Association, P.O. Box 4135, Queensbury; written comments dated October 2000):**

Commenter states, "The time of concentrations for the individual sub-watersheds were calculated using the Curve Number Lag Method (CNLM). Typically, the CNLM averages the runoff coefficient based on the percentage of impervious area versus open space. The CNLM typically provides slightly longer time of concentrations. The "festival" style parking design creates large areas of impervious ground surface with the open space located around the parking lot perimeters. Based on the proposed design the TR-55 sheet flow method would be a more appropriate choice for determining the time of concentrations. The TR-55 method is typically suggested for parking areas. The TR-55 method would most likely result in shorter time of concentrations and possibly an increase in runoff volumes."

RESPONSE 583

The curve number lag method was used because this method is described as the one developed to allow calculation of the overall time of concentration under a wide range of conditions. The method uses the average land slope and not the slope of the hydraulic path which requires much more detail. The CNLM has the advantage of using a small number of objective parameters to provide a more consistent result. The TR-55 method is more accurate but requires more precise grading plans. This type of detail would be addressed during site plan review. HydroCAD is based on the more accurate TR20 method of the SCS hydrograph procedure based on 301 points. TR55 is based on an average curve number of 75 rather than the calculated hydrograph established by TR20. Therefore an equally precise estimate is obtained by either method. For the conceptual level of detail required at this stage, the CNLM would provide the most consistent results.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 584 **(The Environmental Design Partnership in a report prepared for the Glen Lake Protective Association, P.O. Box 4135, Queensbury; written comments dated October 2000):**

Commenter states, "Experience has shown that drywell structures are both expensive to install and maintain. The DGEIS does not include any discussion on the long-term maintenance plan for the proposed structures (over 100 drywells). The cleaning of these structures once they have silted-in requires sophisticated equipment that is generally expensive to operate. In order for the stormwater system to perform as designed, the structures will require periodic removal of the sediments. If sediments are not removed from the system, the infiltration rate will be compromised and more frequent surface flooding will occur."

RESPONSE 584

The Applicant agrees that periodic maintenance will be required. The majority of structures are in parking lots not subject to winter use and maintenance which typically contributes the greatest amount of sand, salt and other particles which can compromise the effectiveness of dry wells. This will significantly decrease the number and frequency of cleaning of the sumps that will be required. The Planning Board may make a Finding with respect to requirements for drywell maintenance.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 585 **(The Environmental Design Partnership in a report prepared for the Glen Lake Protective Association, P.O. Box 4135, Queensbury; written comments dated October 2000):**

Commenter states, "The stormwater discussions do not provide any information related to storm events in excess of 50 years. Typically, systems are designed to provide a safe overland conveyance of the 100-year event. Assuming that the drywells are sufficient to maintain storm events up to fifty years, it is likely that storms in excess of fifty years will cause temporary flooding within the parking lots. Additional information should be provided regarding the flooding depth and the length of time these conditions may occur."

RESPONSE 585

See Responses 386, 387 and 394.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 586 **(The Environmental Design Partnership in a report prepared for the Glen Lake Protective Association, P.O. Box 4135, Queensbury; written comments dated October 2000):**

Commenter states, "The DGEIS provides discussion related to the treatment of stormwater runoff nutrients. The discussion provides a comparison between predeveloped conditions and post-development conditions. Based on the information provided, it appears that the proposed system will not increase the present pollutant runoff concentrations. Additional discussion should be provided to discuss whether the current levels are acceptable."

RESPONSE 586

The Glen Lake Watershed Plan discusses overall nutrient loading to the lake. The analysis utilized a computer model referred to as Eutromod to predict the inputs and water quality in Glen Lake. Table 3 of Existing Development most closely matches the empirical (real world) water quality indicators, as described by the text on pages 13-15.

The proposal by the Great Escape is to use a comprehensive stormwater management system to cause the quantity and quality of stormwater to remain unchanged even with the increase of impervious surface. No change in water quality is expected as a result of the stormwater discharges. It is expected that there will be a reduction in nutrient loading as a result of changes in sewage treatment. The wastewater system includes advanced tertiary sewage treatment. The system will reduce phosphorus loading from the Park by 90+%, and BOD and nitrogen loadings by a similar proportion. This will contribute towards maintaining stable and balanced water quality at Glen Lake. As noted in many previous responses, based on the long-term sampling of Glen Lake, it appears that current levels of nutrient and pollutant loading are within the buffering capacities of the wetlands and lake, since the lake water quality remains very healthy.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 587 **(The Environmental Design Partnership in a report prepared for the Glen Lake Protective Association, P.O. Box 4135, Queensbury; written comments dated October 2000):**

Commenter states, "The documents lack reference to the control of thermal discharge from the site. Since the area of the proposed parking lots is significant, thermal discharge would appear to be a significant concern. Since asphalt will generally store heat longer than unpaved surfaces, it is possible that the temperature of the runoff will increase significantly over the temperature of the runoff from the unpaved lots."

RESPONSE 587

Thermal discharges are being controlled due to the prevalence of use of recharge for management of stormwater. The recharged stormwater will be moderated by the cool soil to reduce the temperature of stormwater.

The local air temperature is the major determining factor of stream temperature followed by amount of the water course exposure to sunlight (Galli; J. 1990; Thermal Imports Associated with Urbanization and Stormwater Management Best Management Practices Metropolitan Washington Council of Government, 777 North Capitol St. NE Suite 300, Washington DC 20002-4201). The water entering the Rush Pond outlet has been subject to significant thermal loading since Rush Pond is fully exposed to sunlight. The stream corridor of Rush Pond outlet will remain fully shaded since no new clearing is taking place in this location. This will continue to moderate temperature of the stream. Overall, infiltration and dry ponds have the least effect on stream temperature.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 588 **(The Environmental Design Partnership in a report prepared for the Glen Lake Protective Association, P.O. Box 4135, Queensbury; written comments dated October 2000):**

Commenter states, "The [DGEIS] lacks detailed discussion related to the temporary control of sediment runoff during construction. Since the proposed grading of the site requires significant cuts and fills, control of sediments during construction should be of utmost concern."

RESPONSE 588

See Response 385.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 589 **(The Environmental Design Partnership in a report prepared for the Glen Lake Protective Association, P.O. Box 4135, Queensbury; written comments dated October 2000):**

Commenter states, "There is also the potential for the project to protect and perhaps improve existing critical environmental areas. Utilization of recognized stormwater management techniques and incorporation of water quality treatment methods has historically helped to prevent degradation of water quality in receiving water bodies. Since the park doesn't have a formal stormwater management plan in effect, the proposed improvements/enlargement could have positive impacts on critical environmental areas if the proper means of stormwater management are used."

RESPONSE 589

The applicant completely agrees with the statement. The goal of the Great Escape is to restrict export of nutrients by improving the on-site wastewater system, constructing comprehensive stormwater management facilities in Area C and building improved stormwater facilities in Area A as part of other upgrades.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 590 (Mr. Richard Nicholson; written comments dated October 27, 2000):

Commenter states, "I hate the idea of having massive parking lots bordering the Lake George road, or any road, for that matter. In this case, the risk of pollution to the input stream into Glen Lake seems absolutely counter to the efforts everyone has made to keep the lake clean."

RESPONSE 590

See DGEIS Section 4, pages 28-34.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 591 (Mr. Richard Nicholson; written comments dated October 27, 2000):

Commenter states, "I can't believe that movement of the quantity of soil needed in this plan would be allowed in an environmentally sound environment. Folks in California, whose property slides away on them are testament to the result of this kind of thing."

RESPONSE 591

See Response 385.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 592 (Mr. Richard Nicholson; written comments dated October 27, 2000):

Commenter states, "As far as the impact being 'minimal compared to the economic benefits of the expansion,' it seems to me that the 'economic benefits' are mostly slated for the Great Escape, or else they wouldn't be doing this in the first place."

RESPONSE 592

Applicant's business purpose is admittedly to grow its attendance, revenues and profits, like most successful businesses. However, the "economic benefits" which are discussed in the DGEIS do not refer to applicant's earnings but rather the positive impacts applicant's business has on the regional economy through a substantial growth in payroll, taxes paid, the Park's role as a substantial regional purchaser of goods and services, and the Park's role as a primary tourist attraction in an area in which tourism and entertainment is a significant industry sector.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 593 **(Mr. Ben Fowler, 96 Ash Drive, Lake George; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter asks, "what will our water in the wetland look like [after expansion of the park]?"

RESPONSE 593

Based on the data in the DEIS, water quality in Glen Lake should not be changed by the project. The Planning Board intends to require monitoring to ensure that this is the case.

See Response 586.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 594 **(Mr. Ben Fowler, 96 Ash Drive, Lake George; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter asks, "Just why does Great Escape need to expand any more?"

RESPONSE 594

The Park does not need to "expand" in terms of its land size devoted to rides, attractions and other public facilities located in Park Area A. Public misconceptions to the contrary, the 90 acres devoted to amusements is not going to expand into its approximately 250 acre surrounding buffer which is mostly wetlands ("Glen Lake Fen"). The Park has purchased additional property on the west side of Route 9 for enhanced support functions such as increased parking, a hotel, ring road, etc. The brief answer to Commenters' question as to "why" the Park needs to "expand any more" is that current parking capacity and function is not adequate to provide efficient, quick access to Park patrons. In other words, the Park needs to "expand" its facilities to adequately provide expected facilities to today's customers and hopefully to "grow" that customer base. Additionally, the Planning Board essentially required the Applicant to develop additional parking and the "long range plan" which is contained in this EIS to insure that local highways and nearby neighborhoods are not adversely impacted by the Park's business and the growth in that business.

See Response 93.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 595 **(Mr. Ben Fowler, 96 Ash Drive, Lake George; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter asks, "Why does Great Escape do the [visual impact testing with] balloons on windy days?"

RESPONSE 595

The testing is ideally performed in the morning hours, before wind conditions can affect the balloons. Wind conditions are noted throughout the field analysis period and are taken into account in the final analysis.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 596 **(Mr. Thomas W. Hall, Environmental Analyst 2, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Diviosn of Environmental Permits, Region 5, 232 Hudson Street, P.O. Box 220, Warrensburg; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter, a SEQR "involved agency", states, "staff generally found the DGEIS to be adequate in terms of its scope and content."

RESPONSE 596

Comment noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 597 **(Mr. Thomas W. Hall, Environmental Analyst 2, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Division of Environmental Permits, Region 5, 232 Hudson Street, P.O. Box 220, Warrensburg; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "At page 2-15 under Project Description, the DGEIS provides a summary of existing conditions (Table 2-3). To enable a comparative assessment, DEC recommends Table 2-3 be revised to include a summary of post-expansion conditions."

RESPONSE 597

Below is a revised Table 2-3 which breaks down lands pre- and post-development for those lands in Park Area C where all physical construction related to the Project will occur.

Table 2-3
Existing Condition Summary

	Existing	Proposed	Existing	Proposed
Land Characteristic	**Acres**	**Acres**	**%**	**%**
Forest	20.0	8.5	29	12.4
Paved or Impervious	18.6	35.5	27	51.5
Wetlands	3.5	3.5	5	5.0
Landscape (lawns)	26.8	21.4	39	31.1
Total	**68.9***	**68.9**	**100**	**100**

* The stormwater analysis includes lands not under the control of the Great Escape.

DGEIS Reference: DGEIS pages 2-15

Impact to DGEIS: Modify with additional data

COMMENT 598 **(Mr. Thomas W. Hall, Environmental Analyst 2, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Division of Environmental Permits, Region 5, 232 Hudson Street, P.O. Box 220, Warrensburg; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "At page 2-16, the DGEIS indicates the stormwater management system will be 'designed to control and treat the first flush of runoff.' Please explain how stormwater will be treated."

RESPONSE 598

See Response 390(B) and DGEIS pages 4-10-11 and DGEIS Appendix 3, "Stormwater Management Report".

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 599 **(Mr. Thomas W. Hall, Environmental Analyst 2, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Division of Environmental Permits, Region 5, 232 Hudson Street, P.O. Box 220, Warrensburg; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "Compared to the existing (pre-expansion) condition, how many acres of parking area will be paved following completion of the expansion?"

RESPONSE 599

Existing parking on compacted soil is 18.6 acres, and proposed paved parking will be 35.5 acres.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 600 **(Mr. Thomas W. Hall, Environmental Analyst 2, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Division of Environmental Permits, Region 5, 232 Hudson Street, P.O. Box 220, Warrensburg; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "The DGEIS indicates the Great Escape is planning to replace existing subsurface wastewater disposal systems consisting of 27 separate outfalls with a single, tertiary-grade treatment system that would discharge to a small on site lagoon. Generally, NYS DEC prefers centralized wastewater collection and treatment systems over a multitude of individual systems and outfalls. In this case, a centralized system appears to have advantages over the existing arrangement of individual systems. However, the DGEIS does not discuss construction-related impacts associated with this option. Presumably, sewer pipe will have to be installed across streams and, perhaps, through wetlands. The EIS should make it clear that an effort will be made to minimize the number of crossings and that existing bridges will be used as much as possible."

RESPONSE 600

Minimizing number and length of any stream crossings will be a primary goal of the engineers during the design phase. Use of small bore horizontal drilling equipment will be a preferred method for installation of sleeves to accommodate pipe crossing whenever possible. Much of the sewage collection system will be pressurized which will allow use of a horizontal bore. Some trunk gravity collection systems will be built in Park Area A which may require an open cut of the Rush Pond outlet. The stream will be diverted into culverts and construction will be in dry condition.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 601 **(Mr. Thomas W. Hall, Environmental Analyst 2, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Division of Environmental Permits, Region 5, 232 Hudson Street, P.O. Box 220, Warrensburg; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "Regarding Section 3.7 (Cultural Environmental Resources), has the Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (Parks) been consulted? If so, has Parks provided any findings or conclusions relative to cultural resource impacts?"

RESPONSE 601

The New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (NYS OPRHP) has been consulted for each phase of the archeological and cultural resources mitigation evaluation work at The Great Escape. Hartgen Archeological Associates, Inc. and The Great Escape have worked closely with the NYS OPRHP to address issues that may concern cultural resources and the proposed expansion. NYS OPRHP is currently reviewing the Project and is providing comment and consultations.

The OPRHP has been contacted and approved a proposed recovery plan for the Holtz Terrace, the single area found to have important archaeological resources. The remaining issue with OPRHP is providing an appropriate method of preserving a tourist cabin experience at this location to mitigate development impacts to potential historic-era resources (e.g., Samoset Motel). The letters and necessary report will be provided to NYSDEC with any permit application in accordance with the applicable State Historic Preservation Act ("SHPA") requirements.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 602 **(Mr. Thomas W. Hall, Environmental Analyst 2, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Division of Environmental Permits, Region 5, 232 Hudson Street, P.O. Box 220, Warrensburg; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "Regarding 'Park Area B' (Rush Pond and portions of its associated wetlands), staff understands the current expansion project includes no plans to develop this area. However, given that Area B is delineated in the DGEIS and given the fact the DGEIS is intended to be a comprehensive planning tool, the EIS should at least discuss how this area will be conserved during construction and subsequent operation of the new facilities."

RESPONSE 602

The areas west of the Northway around Rush Pond will not be involved in or affected by the Project. In the future, Premier Parks would be willing to grant this property to a conservancy or land trust organization provided that appropriate access can be preserved for the proposed local bike trail.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 603 **(Mr. Thomas W. Hall, Environmental Analyst 2, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Division of Environmental Permits, Region 5, 232 Hudson Street, P.O. Box 220, Warrensburg; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "At page 3-5, rare bryophytes are discussed. Are these actually on lands owned by Great Escape? Please reconcile with related statements on page 4-13."

RESPONSE 603

According to information obtained from Dr. Norton G. Miller, the rare bryophytes occur in the northeastern part of the Glen Lake Fen, in an area south-southeast of the intersection of Glen Lake Road and Ash Road. This portion of the fen does belong to Great Escape, as shown on Drawing 1-2, "Park Area A Lot." Unfortunately, this area was not shown as part of Park Area A on Figure 1-1, "Site Location Map." A revised version of Figure 1-1 is included in this document as in FGEIS Section 5.0, "Errata".

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 604 **(Mr. Thomas W. Hall, Environmental Analyst 2, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Division of Environmental Permits, Region 5, 232 Hudson Street, P.O. Box 220, Warrensburg; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "DEC appreciates efforts to minimize/mitigate loss of shrubs and trees (Fig. 4-1) particularly around streams. In addition, DEC appreciates the effort that will be taken to replant in certain areas where vegetation will be removed. Staff notes that shrubs would be particularly effective in screening the visibility of the site and providing wildlife habitat."

RESPONSE 604

The replantings mentioned by Commenter will include replanting of the buffer areas in between the stream corridors and parking lots. This will largely remediate past clearing or earlier disturbances in those areas.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 605 **(Mr. Thomas W. Hall, Environmental Analyst 2, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Division of Environmental Permits, Region 5, 232 Hudson Street, P.O. Box 220, Warrensburg; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "Section 4, page 4-1 is entitled 'Potentially Significant Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures.' In fact, this section is a discussion of economic impacts. This requires correction."

RESPONSE 605

With reference to the DGEIS Table of Contents, note that Section 4 is properly titled. Section 4.1 discusses Economic Direct and Cumulative Impacts, Section 4.2 discusses Topography and Soils, etc.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 606 **(Mr. Thomas W. Hall, Environmental Analyst 2, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Division of Environmental Permits, Region 5, 232 Hudson Street, P.O. Box 220, Warrensburg; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "Staff notes that bulk storage provisions for pesticides appear reasonable. In particular, staff notes quantities of stored chemical are modest and the types of chemicals stored pose no particular concern."

RESPONSE 606

The comment is noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 607 **(Mr. Thomas W. Hall, Environmental Analyst 2, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Division of Environmental Permits, Region 5, 232 Hudson Street, P.O. Box 220, Warrensburg; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "At subsection 4.4 on page 4-8, DEC recommends that the Great Escape consider a habitat improvement project to mitigate loss of habitat due to installation of culverts."

RESPONSE 607

Only one new culvert is proposed, on an intermittent stream. Plantings within the stream corridors will improve the habitat as noted in Response 604.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 608 **(Mr. Thomas W. Hall, Environmental Analyst 2, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Division of Environmental Permits, Region 5, 232 Hudson Street, P.O. Box 220, Warrensburg; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "At page 4-9, the DGEIS states the groundwater will not be impacted 'because no excavation will occur at or below water table.' If infiltration galleys will be used to manage stormwater flows, groundwater could be impacted. Also, in Park Area C, the groundwater table must be very near the surface, i.e., significantly closer than the 6' that is referenced in the EIS as typical. This requires correction."

RESPONSE 608

See Response 67.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 609 (Ms. Joanne Bramley; written comments dated October 27, 2000):

Commenter states, "Section 1-9, 1.4.1 [of the DGEIS] states 'need variance or creation of new category of parking applicable to this facility and similar amusement or recreational areas. Creation of a new category of parking will require Town Board action.' [This is contradicted by] page 1-2, 1.3.1 of Project and Need, 'all existing or proposed uses, which are the subject of this document, are permitted uses in conformance with existing zoning and consistent with the Town of Queensbury Comprehensive Land Use Plan.'"

RESPONSE 609

Parking is an allowed use, subject to site plan review for area and design standards. The current Queensbury Zoning Ordinance provides only for the typical commercial parking lot design with landscaped internal islands for large lots in those instances where off-street parking is required as an accessory to a permitted use. The applicant can request an area variance or apply to the Town Board for a new category of parking lot design standards. As contemplated by Applicant, these alternative standards would apply only to seasonal facilities that manage parking lots by use of attendants.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 610 **(Ms. Joanne Bramley; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states, "Section 2-2 [of the DGEIS] states, 'Additional parking lots may be modified to accommodate shuttle stops or other pedestrian facilities that may be desired.' Who determines the modification and when and what specifically are these other facilities?"

RESPONSE 610

The modification would be to add signage and shuttle stop structures at the perimeter of the parking lot in the detailed design and engineering of the parking lots which will be reviewed during site plan review.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 611 (Ms. Joanne Bramley; written comments dated October 27, 2000):

Commenter states, "Section 2-7 [of the DGEIS] states, 'As a result of the pedestrian bridge and fencing, the flow of cars along US Rte. 9 will not slow or stop for large numbers of pedestrians crossing the Park. This will lead to fewer interruptions of movement along the entire US Rte. 9 corridor.' The back up will now occur not in front of the Great Escape as it currently does, but closer to the round Pond and Glen Lake Road intersections."

RESPONSE 611

The existing queues on Route 9 during the days of peak attendance at Great Escape are caused predominantly by the significant delays in traffic flow as a result of dedicated green time assigned to pedestrians crossing Route 9. Pedestrians crossing at mid-block locations and against the signal cause additional delays. The provision of a pedestrian bridge will eliminate delays caused by pedestrians. In addition, the highway improvements at the Round Pond Road and Glen Lake Road intersections will improve traffic flow through the corridor.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section G.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 612 (Ms. Joanne Bramley; written comments dated October 27, 2000):

Commenter states with respect to DGEIS Section 2-18, which describes the possible sequence of construction, "my concern is the ramification on the community if the timetable changes for these specific developments. There needs to be a more detailed, structured plan of development than what is proposed."

RESPONSE 612

The Applicant does not agree that, except for traffic mitigation, changing the sequence of construction will have any independent impacts or "ramifications on the community" as Commenter suggests. Each phase of the proposed development will incorporate short-term mitigation to avoid the impacts of construction. The schedule of matching proposed transportation-related improvements to the Park's anticipated traffic growth is being reviewed and approved by the Planning Board and NYS DOT as part of this process.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 613 (Ms. Joanne Bramley; written comments dated October 27, 2000):

Commenter states, "Section 3-34 [of the DGEIS] states, 'existing intervening topography such as a hill is very effective in limiting noise propagation. Vegetative screening alone, while it will soften or block visual impacts is a much less effective noise barrier than intervening land forms.' The study continues by stating in section 2-1 that perimeter planting proposed in parking lots will not 'mitigate noise when hills are removed.' The residents of the bordering neighborhoods certainly agree with this statement. Parking garage alternatives were not considered thoroughly in [the DGEIS], other than to state they were too expensive. I request serious consideration be given to requiring a garage at the former Animal Lane site to prevent the loss of vegetation which serves as a visual screen and a noise deterrent for the surrounding area."

RESPONSE 613

See Response 6 regarding sound. See Response 428 regarding a parking garage.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 614 (Ms. Joanne Bramley; written comments dated October 27, 2000):

Commenter states, "Section 2-18 [of the DGEIS] states, 'As part of past special events, musical entertainment has been provided. This has occurred on numerous occasions annually since 1995 with virtually no noise complaints.' As a resident who has complained to the Park and the Warren County Sheriff Department in the past, I am outraged by this blatant misrepresentation of the public's response to these events. These events are not acceptable just because notice is given that they will occur."

RESPONSE 614

The only event that caused complaints was the "Christian" music concert. This event was also the only special event where the Great Escape had given notice to adjoining residential neighborhoods that a concert was going to occur. Prior to that, music performances occurred annually without complaint.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 615 (Ms. Joanne Bramley; written comments dated October 27, 2000):

Commenter states, "Section 3-24 [of the DGEIS provides that] '80% of the traffic approaches from the north.' That is because they have exited the I-87 at exit 20 and have to travel south to arrive at the Park."

RESPONSE 615

This quoted statement is correct and is explained in the DGEIS and Traffic Impact Study. See Response 10.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter III, Section D, Page 19.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 616 (Ms. Joanne Bramley; written comments dated October 27, 2000):

Commenter states, "Section 3-40 [of the DGEIS] states, 'acoustical environment or residential neighborhoods studied have not significantly changed even though Park activities have increased over the decade that noise levels have been monitored.' If you refer to chart 3-9, it indicates that in 1990 the Leq was 48.1 and in 1999 it was 53.8. You do the math!"

RESPONSE 616

The 53.8 dBA occurred when the Park was not open. Reviewing all the data indicates that the sound environment has not changed significantly. At least a 3 dBA increase must occur in order to be detectable.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 617 (Ms. Joanne Bramley; written comments dated October 27, 2000):

Commenter states, "Section 3-39 [of the DGEIS] states, 'During the PMK sampling, noise identified as the Alpine Bobsled was heard at about 9 dBA above background noise of 41 dBA at Courthouse Estates, and at about 12 dBA above background at Twicwood Estates.' The human ear perceives these increases as double."

RESPONSE 617

As discussed in Responses 3 and 6, the Applicant has agreed to a noise threshold designed to limit noise to existing baseline levels and is also committed to further reducing the sound levels of the Alpine Bobsled which is the cause of the elevated noise levels referred to by Commenter.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 618 (Ms. Joanne Bramley; written comments dated October 27, 2000):

Commenter states, "Section 2-18 [of the DGEIS provides that] 'The size, shape, configuration, attendee queue areas and overall park circulation have to be considered for each new attraction and are the primary consideration for selecting an attraction to be added.' Considering the public outcry over the noise level of the Alpine Bobsled, it is beyond my comprehension that nothing would be included in this section regarding decibel levels of rides to be installed. It certainly does not lend credibility to their claim that they will and are attempting to mitigate the current problem with that ride. All that considered, I would have considerable skepticism regarding the Great Escape's claim to still be attempting to solve the problem with the Bobsled. It is imperative that they be required to address the current problems before any addition expansion is approved."

RESPONSE 618

Given that location of new rides within Area A will require site plan review and comparisons to impact thresholds adopted in this FGEIS process, potential noise impacts will be an important siting consideration. Given that newer rides tend to have better noise reduction engineering, it is the applicant's expectation that it will be able to demonstrate that a proposed new ride will not exceed a threshold where a significant adverse noise impact might be created.

See Response 3.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 619 (Ms. Joanne Bramley; written comments dated October 27, 2000):

Commenter states, "All other existing Six Flags properties remain open beyond the current closing times of Great Escape. It is requested that the Planning Board not approve extended hours for this location given its current problems with noise, proximity to residential areas, and its inability to mitigate to date."

RESPONSE 619

Commentor is incorrect in her statement. Almost all Six Flags Parks have a general closing time of 10 p.m., the same as Great Escape's peak season closing time. No extended hours are contemplated or requested as part of this Project, nor are hours of operation regulated under the Town Zoning Ordinance. See Response 32.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 620 (Ms. Joanne Bramley; written comments dated October 27, 2000):

Commenter states, "The determined maximum allowable height for additional rides should follow the guidelines established in the new zoning ordinance. This would require zoning approval for additional rides and allow for evaluation to be made as to visual pollution on a ride-by-ride basis. Perhaps a requirement that the ride not exceed the tree line would be an alternative."

RESPONSE 620

The Town Zoning Ordinance specified a maximum height of 50 feet for "buildings". Rides do not come within the Town's specific definition of "building". The thresholds identified for development of a tall ride are specified in FGEIS Section 4.3, "Visual Analysis 2000-2001."

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 621 **(Town of Queensbury Planning Staff; 742 Bay Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to Land Use, "A map of the Great Escape project area with zoning districts overlay would be helpful for use by the Planning Board, staff and public during hearings/meetings. This should be inserted within the DGEIS."

RESPONSE 621

Refer to DGEIS Figure 3-4, "Zoning."

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 622 **(Town of Queensbury Planning Staff; 742 Bay Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to Traffic and Parking, "Should a queuing analysis be done to consider traffic volumes on the access roads within the park? The applicant ascertains that festival parking is needed to accommodate the volumes of traffic expected. How much traffic will the access roads within the park hold? Stacking numbers should be done considering the paved and unpaved areas in the parking lot. The impact of landscaped islands on stacking as per the Town of Queensbury code should also be noted. The DGEIS notes in the Executive Summary that the ring road is 'integrally related' to the design of the parking lots system and entry design, but does not show supporting analysis or direct connection to the traffic impact study."

RESPONSE 622

A queuing analysis was conducted for the access roads to determine the appropriate location for the potential parking tollbooths. The emphasis of the queue analysis was to ensure that the operation of the parking lots and tollbooths would not adversely impact Route 9. The design of the ring road, including the location, geometry and traffic control of intersections created by the access road on Route 9, are all part of the access plan for accommodating increased Park attendance while minimizing impacts to through traffic.

DGEIS Reference: Appendix 4, Chapter IV, Section D.

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 623 **(Town of Queensbury Planning Staff; 742 Bay Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to Traffic and Parking, "Pedestrian circulation is not addressed within the parking areas. This is important considering the proposal for festival parking and emphasis on quick parking and direction of vehicles by attendants. Parking is proposed to be significantly increased, also increasing the number of attendees and opportunity for vehicular/pedestrian conflicts. Concurrent with each vehicle are pedestrians who will also need direction for safety purposes."

RESPONSE 623

Pedestrian access and pathways will be provided these areas will be designed once the extent and type of patron shuttle has been selected.

See Response 291.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 624 **(Town of Queensbury Planning Staff; 742 Bay Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to Noise, "Concerning neighborhood sound levels, Figure 3-7 shows June readings but Table 3-7 does not for monitoring locations and times. What accounts for the discrepancy?"

RESPONSE 624

The June data is from the PMK study of the Bobsled noise profile. Attached as FGEIS Appendix 4.1 is the raw data from the PMK study.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 625 **(Town of Queensbury Planning Staff; 742 Bay Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to Noise, "Will there be an increase in the number of evening hours the park is in operation? The DGEIS notes that evening hours occur 25 days out of 128 +/- days of operation from May 20 to September 25. Are evening hours for the month of October considered since the park is also in operation at this time?"

RESPONSE 625

The operation of the Great Escape until 10 PM currently occurs on weekends during the core summer months. In the fall for Oktoberfest and Frightfest, extended hours on weekends occur. The Oktoberfest has hours up to 11 PM on two weekends and Frightfest operates until 10 PM on Friday and Saturday nights. These events are centered in the core area of the park or indoors. The opportunities for additional weekend events is limited by the length of the season. Additional special events are feasible but would be on weeknights and therefore limited primarily to special groups.

Refer to Response 3 regarding noise.

The Applicant's position is that it is not a viable approach on a case-by-case basis to request that a business restrict its hours of operation without a clear public issue that can be defined by recognized standards.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 626 **(Town of Queensbury Planning Staff; 742 Bay Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to Stormwater and Wastewater Management and Wetlands, "Was the Glen Lake Watershed Management Plan (December 1998) consulted for use in the DGEIS? The Plan study indicates a greater amount of toxic substances at the sampling site (#5) adjacent to the Great Escape, which is significant as compared to other sample sites. The greater concentration could be attributed to more organic soils here and to Route 9 runoff. Continued testing and monitoring to determine causes and impacts was advised in the Plan."

RESPONSE 626

See Responses 576 and 540.

The Glen Lake Watershed Management Plan was consulted during preparation of the DGEIS. The site is adjacent to the low point of Route 9 (approximately 1 mile of road drains to this point) while all the other sites are further removed from pavement. At stormwater control site 5, pavement terminates at the stream, while at the other sites some small amount of buffer green space occurs between the road and the stream. The parking lots are old wetland fills which could contribute to the organic loading as noted in the Glen Lake Watershed Plan. The Planning Board will require a monitoring plan as part of this project.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 627 **(Town of Queensbury Planning Staff; 742 Bay Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to Stormwater and Wastewater Management and Wetlands, "Glen Lake Fen is in the project area. This wetland area is a significant habitat area, containing rare plant species. Changes in water chemistry are to be avoided according to the biologist who discovered the plants. The DGEIS concludes that groundwater discharges that reach the wetland would be thoroughly mixed with large volumes of water from other sources before reaching the rare plant area (p. 3-6). Is there hydrogeologic analysis to support this statement? What are the sources and volumes of water that would dilute contaminants?"

RESPONSE 627

The Glen Lake Fen is supported by both surface and groundwater recharge. The stormwater quality from the Project is not anticipated to differ significantly as a result of development, as noted in the DGEIS on pages 3-3 and 3-4.

Two streams enter the Glen Lake Fen wetland, one from the north and one from the south, as shown on Figure 3-3, "Surface Water Resources." The Glen Lake Brook originates on the west side of the Northway in the Rush Pond wetland and flows into the southern portion of the Glen Lake Fen wetland. The Rush Pond watershed includes Butler Pond.

The Rush Pond watershed is approximately 3,515 acres. This is 45.7% of the larger Glen Lake watershed. The lands in the Glen Lake watershed which are under the control of the Great Escape are comprised of 377.4 acres, 77.0 acres of which are in the Rush Pond watershed. Therefore, the Great Escape owns 2.2% of the Rush Pond watershed and 4.9% of the larger Glen Lake watershed.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 628 **(Town of Queensbury Planning Staff; 742 Bay Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to Stormwater and Wastewater Management and Wetlands, "The Glen Lake Watershed Management Plan (page 21) indicates that the Glen Lake wetlands is an important contaminant buffer, preventing toxic and other compounds from reaching severe contamination levels in the lake. The [DGEIS] does note some low and low-medium effects on living organisms and biota. The control of future contamination inputs from Route 9 runoff is therefore a concern. Further investigation is needed to determine the types and amounts of chemicals that would negatively impact the rare plant species."

RESPONSE 628

The pollution load from the proposed project has been controlled to the level that is readily achievable by common stormwater treatment technologies. The total loading to the Glen Lake watershed is not anticipated to change significantly due to the implementation of the stormwater management plan.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 629 **(Town of Queensbury Planning Staff; 742 Bay Road, Queensbury; written comments dated October 27, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to Stormwater and Wastewater Management and Wetlands, "Page 4-9 [of the DGEIS] indicates ground water will not be impacted due to no excavation below groundwater levels. Wastewater disposal is an activity that can impact groundwater and its quality. Phosphorous loading information needs to be quantified, along with information on groundwater and soil conditions to demonstrate capability of the soils to remove total phosphorous."

RESPONSE 629

See Responses 315, 254 and 198.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 630 **(Warren County Planning Board; written comments dated November 8, 2000):**

Commenter states that "The Warren County Planning Board is pleased that the management of The Great Escape has, in this Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement (DGEIS), developed a phased scheme for infrastructure investments necessary to accommodate the desired increase in annual visitor events from 900,000 to 1,500,000. The DGEIS represents a step away from individually scrutinized incremental projects toward a coherent development policy based upon impact thresholds that the Board believes will better serve the public interest and the applicant alike."

RESPONSE 630

The comment is noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 631 **(Warren County Planning Board; written comments dated November 8, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to potential impacts to State Route 9 and Interstate 87, "State Route 9 and Interstate 87 are the spine of eastern New York State and critical transportation routes for County residents and visitors alike. The Board places a high priority on the smooth operation of both transportation corridors."

Furthermore, with respect to Pedestrian Crossing Improvements, "The Board has long advocated a pedestrian bridge across State Route 9 between The Great Escape to the east and its parking areas on the west to reduce the danger of the existing at-grade crossing and to minimize vehicular traffic congestion caused by pedestrians crossing at grade. Of the two options presented in the DGEIS, a pedestrian bridge or a tunnel, the Board prefers a bridge. It is our belief that a highly visible crossing structure will assist visitors in perceiving the path from the parking area to the amusement park, reducing the numbers of visitors seeking to cross at grade."

Moreover, "The other elements essential to the smooth functioning of this separated grade crossing are a continuous fence of a design that discourages climbing and an easily-understood and frequently-circulating shuttle system. Given the critical nature of parking area fencing to funnel pedestrians to the separated-graded crossing, the Board requests that the type and location of the fencing, as well as the intended time of installation relative to project phases, be clearly articulated in the FGEIS."

In addition, "Scott Sopezyk, Director of the Adirondack-Glens Falls Transportation Council, expressed concerns with the internal circulation system in his comments dated August 31, 2000. In light of Mr. Sopczyk's comments and the importance of the shuttle system to efficiently transport visitors from their vehicles to the separated-grade crossing, the Board urges the Great Escape management and its consultants to devote additional thought and attention to internal circulation within the parking areas."

RESPONSE 631

The NYSDOT and Park management both currently support the pedestrian bridge crossing alternative as well.

With regard to the proposed fence, it is anticipated at this time that a decorative iron fence about 5-8 feet tall will be utilized. The fence will be constructed concurrently with the pedestrian bridge.

With regard to comments made by the Director of the Adirondack-Glens Falls Transportation Council, refer to Responses 289 through 298.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 632 **(Warren County Planning Board; written comments dated November 8, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to the Parking Access Road, "The Board believes that creating a parking access road is a good means to the desired end of reducing the number of ingress/egress points and removing Great Escape traffic from State Route 9. The Board supports creating two signalized, four-way intersections with Route 9, one at Round Pond Road and the other at Glen Lake Road. We believe that these actions will dramatically improve the functioning and reduce the danger of these two intersections, which are currently controlled by stop signs. The Board also believes that shifting vehicular access to and parking for Martha's to the rear of the building via the access road is an improvement to the current arrangement."

RESPONSE 632

The comments are noted.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 633 **(Warren County Planning Board; written comments dated November 8, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to Interstate 87 Interchanges, "It is generally accepted that the majority of the additional visitors to The Great Escape will be coming from the south via Interstate 87. Given this, the impact of the projected increase in visitors in the Exit 20 interchanges is a matter of concern. The Board supports the transportation engineering consultant's solution to accommodate greater volumes of northbound Interstate 87 traffic exiting at Exit 20. While it may be possible to physically extend the ramp south parallel to the interstate by constructing a retaining wall, the proposed solution to add another lane to the ramp and to Route 9 south to the proposed parking access road achieves the goal of clearing exiting vehicles off the interstate."

Furthermore, "The Board is concerned with the impact of the increased Great Escape traffic to the southbound entrance and exit ramps via the Gurney Lane overpass. While the southbound entrance ramp has apparently adequate space for additional vehicular flow at this interchange, there are extremely limited sight distances for southbound vehicles exiting and turning east toward State Route 9. An increase in the southbound traffic entering Interstate 87 at this point will exacerbate the existing potential for conflict. The Board requests that The Great Escape address this issue in the Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement."

RESPONSE 633

See Response 46.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 634 **(Warren County Planning Board; written comments dated November 8, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to Rush Pond and the Glen Lake Fen, "The Board recognizes that the project evaluated in the Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement will not directly impact Rush Pond, the Glen Lake Fen, or surrounding wetlands. However, the park sites proposed for development are within the localized watersheds for these resources, and effluent from the sewage treatment plant or stormwater runoff from the proposed parking could potentially have a negative impact."

Furthermore, with respect to sewage treatment, "While the Board understands that there are practical impediments to extending municipal sewer service to the site within the project timeframe, a sewer connection that would entirely remove sewage from these sensitive environmental areas for treatment at a municipal plant is the Board's preferred method of sewage treatment and disposal. Of the practical alternatives at this time – numerous scattered site septic systems (current situation) or a consolidated dual sand filter treatment plant (proposed) – the Board certainly prefers the proposed treatment plant as the method of lesser potential environmental impact. The Board does request, however, that the Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement clearly state, as the applicants did in the workshop meeting with members of the Board, that Park management is committed to establishing a sewer connection when sewer service is extended to the site, despite this investment in a sewage treatment plant."

RESPONSE 634

The Applicant believes that the DGEIS and FGEIS establish that there will not be significant adverse environmental impacts from stormwater or wastewater with the proposed mitigation. The Planning Board intends to require monitoring of stormwater improvements, and the NYSDEC will require monitoring of the wastewater discharge. As applicant stated to the County Planning Board at its workship meeting and has also discussed with regional municipal leaders, if a sewer main connection to the Glens Falls City Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTW) is built, the Park will connect to the public sewer system.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 635 **(Warren County Planning Board; written comments dated November 8, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to Rush Pond and the Glen Lake Fen and Parking Area Stormwater, "The Stormwater Management Report (Appendix 3) indicates that the proposed actions will slightly reduce the peak runoff from a 50 year storm event, by directing stormwater to a number of detention basins and drywells. The proposal does appear to meet the minimum standards. However, the Board believes that the sensitive environmental nature of the park's location generally and the specific siting of the proposed parking areas between and amongst wetlands requires a concerted effort to extend these minimum standards."

"The Board believes that this could be achieved in ways not addressed in the DGEIS. Essentially, the stormwater could be better managed if less of it were generated. Large swaths of conventionally-paved surface parking generates enormous amounts of polluted stormwater. The amount of pavement proposed seems excessive for a seasonal use. The Board requests that The Great Escape's consultants investigate utilizing porous paving materials now available."

"The Board is disappointed with the cursory nature of the assessment of a parking structure as an alternative (page 7-3 [of the DGEIS]). Merely stating that a structure is cost prohibitive does not assess its environmental impacts as a true alternative. While a parking structure to accommodate over 4,000 vehicles may indeed be undesirable for many reasons, a mixture of surface lots and a parking structure is quite possibly a viable alternative that could significantly reduce stormwater runoff volumes, permit the retention of natural vegetation and unpaved surfaces that could absorb and filter some of the stormwater that is generated without unappealing swales and catch basins. The Board requests that the consultants investigate a parking scheme that utilizes porous materials and reduces the amount of surface parking by incorporating a parking structure."

RESPONSE 635

Refer to Responses 87 and 428.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 636 **(Warren County Planning Board; written comments dated November 8, 2000):**

Commenter states with respect to the Warren County Bikeway, "The Warren County Bikeway is an essential County recreational resource, and the most spectacular vista enjoyed by residents and visitors on the Bikeway is the Glen Lake Fen framed by a semicircle of hills. On the other side of those hills is the developed amusements and rides area of the Great Escape. The Board is concerned about the potential visual impact to the Bikeway caused by structures visible from that area, and requests that visibility from the Bikeway be included in impact thresholds triggering additional environmental review. The Board also requests that Great Escape management locate tall rides of the park where they will not be visible from the Glen Lake Fen section of the Bikeway."

RESPONSE 636

Refer to Responses 54, 73, 82, 246 and 255.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 637 **(Warren County Planning Board; written comments dated November 8, 2000):**

Commenter states, "The Board formally endorses the comments of the Adirondack-Glens Falls Transportation Council regarding the Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement."

RESPONSE 637

The comment is noted. Refer to Responses 289 through 298 to the Transportation Council's comments.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 638 **(Warren County Planning Board; written comments dated November 8, 2000):**

Commenter states, "Noise from The Great Escape amusements and visitors has been the focus of a great deal of study and comment during this environmental impact review. Excessively loud noise can be physically damaging to humans and animals; constant or frequently-repeated noise can be psychologically damaging. Noise can have a profound effect on people living near a source, and can affect the level of enjoyment for visitors...The Board recognizes that the management of The Great Escape has made efforts to mitigate the noise impacts of the amusement park, and believes that park management, the Town, and this Board should fairly consider the noise impacts of future amusements in park planning efforts. The Board requests that The Great Escape continue to collect noise data and to evaluate the potential noise impacts of proposed new amusements. The Board recommends that any increase or projected increase in current noise levels from the park should trigger additional environmental review to assess true alternatives for park development, and requests that the Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement identify an increase or projected increase in noise from the park as a threshold for additional environmental review."

RESPONSE 638

See Responses 343 and 344.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 639 **(Warren County Planning Board; written comments dated November 8, 2000):**

Commenter states, "The DGEIS states in Section 4: Potentially Significant Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures that 'approximately 11.5 acres of woods and approximately 5.4 acres of lawn will be disturbed by the Project' (page 4-6, point 4.3.1). The mitigation measure for this action is landscaping to screen the parking areas from State Route 9 and Interstate 87 that will 'increase the diversity of plant species on the site' (page 4-6, point 4.3.2). Increasing species diversity within a considerably smaller number of plants is hardly mitigation for destroying 11.5 acres of woodland. The Board requests that The Great Escape's consultants inventory the existing trees and identify methods to preserve certain trees, particularly at the perimeter of proposed lots. Further, the Board urges The Great Escape to utilize native species in its landscaping endeavors."

RESPONSE 639

Much of the vegetation seen on site is within the riparian wetlands or in the NYSDOT right of way. Vegetation in these areas will not be disturbed. The major area of wood lot removal will be around the Samoset and on the former Kenny and Holtz properties. The Samoset is a pine plantation which provides limited habitat value as it is a monoculture.

DEIS Figure 4-1 illustrates the clearing limits. Frequently the vegetation that is readily visible from the roadways are trees that have developed in the NYSDOT ROW. These trees will not be disturbed by the Project.

The clearing at the south end of the project to the east of the Northway ROW may not change the views into the parcel, since the riparian wetlands will not be cleared. On the north end of Park Area C, the Route 9 ROW will not be cleared, therefore, trees will remain in a portion of that east view. This view will include the new parking lots which will be surrounded by hedgerows of trees with the ground hillside of the NYSDOT ROW trees.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

COMMENT 640 **(Warren County Planning Board; written comments dated November 8, 2000):**

Commenter states, "Finally, the Board requests that the management of The Great Escape remain mindful that the park is sited in the midst of sensitive environmental areas that could be dramatically impacted by activities within the park. The natural beauty of this area is an asset to The Great Escape, just as it is a precious County and State resource. The wetlands, trees and mountains, as much as new and exciting rides are what differentiate this park from other amusement parks in the region, and draw visitors back year after year."

RESPONSE 640

The comment is noted, and the applicant concurs. We believe the mitigation measures and project design as documented in the Draft and Final EIS's here allow for the Park's uses to grow while not significantly affecting environmental resources in the region.

DGEIS Reference:

Impact to DGEIS:

SECTION 2.2

INDEX BY COMMENTER

INDEX BY COMMENTER

Commenter	Comment Number
Ace, Bernard	115-117
Angleson, Karen	36-44, 212, 452
Angleson, Lisa	300-302
Bartwitz, Barbara and Dave Harrington	78
Berg, James	284
Boor, Roger	8-26, 506-511
Bramley, Joanne	27-35, 609-620
Bray, Dana	546, 547
Buchanan, John	464
Carlson, Richard	257-270
Choppa, Electo & Eugene	518
Clark, Robert & Anne	512
Cornell, Marian	497
Crawford, John	542
Dansbury, Michael	359-366
Davison, Patricia	228-235
Delman, Suzanne	486
Derby, Paul	106-113, 465-485
Didio, Robert	499
Dimartino, Kathi	172, 173
Dineen, Kevin	89-93, 214
Enhorning, Norman	516
Environmental Design Partnership	583-589
Eppich, Carol	215-217
Erb, Raymond	167, 168
Erb, Raymond & Joan	453
Etu, Virginia	251-254
Fowler, Anna	79-85, 543-545
Fowler, Ben	593-595
Fox, Jack	188
Funk, Erwin & Virginia	208-211
Galloway, Elizabeth	459

Topic | Comment Number

Gilbert, Eric 192
Glen Lake Protective Association 554-582
Gowen, Kathleen 105
Graves, Lorrie 144,145
Greene, Robert 447-451
Guido, Michael 455-457
Haggblom, Tor & Christine 535-537
Hall, Thomas 596-608
Halliday, Hal 189, 190
Harubin, Donna 213
Hayes, Diane 146-149, 540
Hilliard, Mary 487
Hoffman, Mark 183-187
Hoffman, Michael 285-287
Hopper, Kenneth 249
Horwitz, James 277-281
Howe, Karen 169, 170
Hughes, Robert 150-155
Hunt, Dorothy 513
Hunt, E.P. 514
Johnson, Stephen 199-207, 313-324
Kane, Aileen 444-446
Kim, Hyung & Eleanora 538
Law, Walter 276
Levin, Herb 140-143
Lewi, Ed 94, 95
Malpin, Scott 193
Marshall, E. Peter 218, 219
Mayer, Thomas & Michele 255
McGowan, David 99-104
McGowan, Marianne 303-312
McNeil, Mary Ann 131-136
McNulty, Chuck 47-53
McNulty, Linda 45, 46

Topic | Comment Number

Merrigan, James 250
Messinger, Stuart 236, 367-419
Meyers, Rosanne 325-334
Miller, Marie 179
Milne, Donald 54-76
Moore, William 352-358
Nemer, Dale 118-130
Nicholson, Richard 590-592
Nicpon, Sharon 237, 238
O'Connor, Michael 156-163
O'Keefe, James 539
Paddock, David 502-505
Paddock, Denise 271-275
Patenaude, Andrew 138, 139
Patten, Dayrene 191
Petroski, Douglas 220-227
Powell, Glen & Regina 454
Prendeville, Mark 239-243
Queensbury Environmental Issues Advisory Committee 424-443
Roberts, Deborah 194-198
Rosenthal, Warren 171
Ryan, Roger 494, 495
Ryba, Marilyn 299
Sabo, Karen 164-166, 548-553
Schadwill, Edward 520
Schultz, Robert 174-178
Sheehan, Paul 496
Sipp, Donald 1-7, 521-534
Sopczyk, Scott 288-298
Spadano, Betty 541
Stark, George 77
Stec, George 96-98, 335-351
Stein, Lorraine 114, 460-463
Stern, Helen 500, 501

Topic | Comment Number

Sullivan, Jeanne 515
Sullivan, Robert 498
Talley, June 180-182
Town of Queensbury Planning Staff 621-629
Trombley, Joseph 282, 283
Underwood, James 86-88
Van Slooten, Ronald 517
Vannier, Robert 458
Warren County Planning 630-640
Washburn, Susie 519
Westcott, Robert 244-248
Whittle, Linda 420-423
Whitty, Linda 137, 488-491
Wood, J. Scott 256
York, Charles & Lee 492, 493

SECTION 2.3

INDEX BY TOPIC

INDEX BY TOPIC

Topic	Comment Number
Administrative, Will Stenographic Transcript Be Available?	174
Adverse Effects From Park Over Past 10 Years Increased	089
Air Quality, Increased Traffic Impact? Will Park Monitor?	533
Changes In Park Over Past 20 Years, Particularly Last 2 Years, Negative Impact	208
Character Of Town, Gaudy Commercial Or Protect Residential	053
Character Of Town, Will Planning Board Preserve Rural Nature?	248
Code Violations In Past, Shows Not Responsible To Environment	076
Community Services Impact? Police, Ambulance, Road Maintenance	489
Comparison To Other Six Flags Parks	452
Comparison To Other Parks, Various Factors	044
Convention Center, Included?	342
Cultural Resources, Area C, Proper Care	182
Cultural Resources, Response Of Office Parks, Recreation?	601
Cultural Resources, Phase II, Next Steps?	443
Current Park Impacts Vs. "Storytown"	008
Decline In Park Upkeep Shows Park Is Not Responsible Owner	213
Decline In Park Upkeep Shows Park Is Not Responsible Owner	238
DGEIS Does Not Address Substantial Issues Relevant To Indigenous Population	313
DGEIS, Include Map Of Project Area With Zoning Districts Overlay	621
DGEIS, Rename Section 4 "Environmental Impacts"	605
Disapproves Project, Planning Board Must Enforce Visual, Height, Sound Restrictions	155
Economic Impact Biased, SEQR Alternatives Left Out, Traffic, Wildlife	490
Economic Impact, Number Of Workers From Outside The Area?	527
Economic Impact, Board Should Approve Expansion In Timely Manner	287
Economic Impact, Board Should Encourage Year-Around Investments	464
Economic Impact, Big Business Exploits, Drains Local Economy	151
Economic Impact, Comparison To Small Medical Practice	185
Economic Impact, Consider Impact To Local Tourist Industry?	042
Economic Impact, DGEIS Exaggerates, Property Values Negative Impact	339
Economic Impact, Growth Of Park Affects Residents	283
Economic Impact, If Water Quality Declines, Lowering Property Values, Park $	568
Economic Impact, Increased Costs In Traffic Control, Pollution Outweigh	458

Topic	Comment Number
Economic Impact, Increase Sales Tax On Park - Taxes Pay For Municipal Sewer?	341
Economic Impact, Increased Visitors To Area In Past Two Years	285
Economic Impact, More Money Invested In Area The Better	217
Economic Impact, Negative Effect On Property Values, Recalculate Lower Residential Taxes	227
Economic Impact, No Need For More Low-Paying Seasonal Jobs	331
Economic Impact, Not Great, Hold Park Responsible For Property Value	485
Economic Impact, Only Park Benefits	502
Economic Impact, Only Park Benefits	592
Economic Impact, Park Has Positive Effect On Employment	138
Economic Impact, Park Has Positive Effect On Employment	139
Economic Impact, Park Must Pay For Infrastructure Improvements	569
Economic Impact, Park Not A Draw, Visitors Don't Spend Money Local	271
Economic Impact, Park Not Contributor Economic Growth Of Area	300
Economic Impact, Park Patrons Don't Spend Outside Park	332
Economic Impact, Park Popular With Local Residents	077
Economic Impact, Park Positive Impact Overall	157
Economic Impact, Positive Economic Growth And Quality Of Life	284
Economic Impact, Positive For Industry, Employment, Job Creation	256
Economic Impact, Positive Impact On Employment	169
Economic Impact, Positive Impact On Employment	188
Economic Impact, Positive Impact On Employment And Seniors	192
Economic Impact, Positive Impact On Local Providers Good Services	170
Economic Impact, Positive Impact On Tourism	189
Economic Impact, Positive Impacts To Local Tourism	095
Economic Impact, Positive, Non Toxic Land Uses, Good For Area	218
Economic Impact, Positive, Property Values, Municipal Sewer	219
Economic Impact, Positive, Route 9 Commercial Area Suitable For Park	215
Economic Impact, Problem Is Under Employment Not Unemployment	184
Economic Impact, Project Will Increase Demand On Public Needs	206
Economic Impact, Property Values	168
Economic Impact, Property Values, How Will Board Protect?	102
Economic Impact, Six Flags Losing Money, No Taxpayer Money	136
Economic Impact, Supports Project, Positive Impact On Local Economy	171
Economic Impact, Tax Revenues To Queensbury Insufficient	173

Topic	Comment Number
Economic Impact, Welfare & Unemployment Benefits Negative Impact	570
Economic Impact, What Benefit To Queensbury School District?	340
Economic Impact, Who Pays Wear And Tear Of Roads, Traffic, Noise	329
Economic Impact, Will Park Compensate For Lower Property Values?	526
Economic, Construction Contracts Go To Local Business?	528
Economic, Need Another Convention Center With Lake George?	440
Economic, Residential Property Values, School Taxes, Sales Tax	439
Emergency Services, Response To DGEIS?	129
Executive Summary, Conclusion Of Negligible Impact "Absurd"	228
Executive Summary, Questions Conclusion Of Improved Environment	034
Existing Conditions, Table 2-3 Should Show Post-Expansion Conditions	597
General Concerns, Noise, Visual, Water Quality, Storm Water	096
Glens Falls Country Club Disapproves Project	277
Glens Falls Country Club Requests Planning Board Disapprove Project	281
Great Escape Not Like Other Parks, Near Lake, Residents	275
Ground Water, Water Table Greater Than Six Feet In Area C	254
Groundwater, Filling Parking Lot, Increased Soil Pressure Negative Impact	495
Hours Of Operation, Board Should Restrict Hours	033
Hours Of Operation, Extension Over Past 10 Years Not Considered?	032
Hours Of Operation, Place Limit On	619
Hours Of Operation, Increase In Evening Hours?	625
Infrastructure Improvements Park Should Pay, Site Plan Review	522
Infrastructure Improvements Should All Be Paid For By Park	506
Land Area Of Park Not Big Enough, Compares To Darien Lake	234
Land Area Of Park Not Large Enough For Expansion	446
Land Area, Residential Buyers Knew Park Was There At Purchase	451
Land Use, Project Not Consistent With Comprehensive Land Use Plan	550
Location Of Park In Sensitive Environmental Area	640
Location Not Suitable For Expansion, Damage Glen Lake	305
Location Not Suitable For Large Amusement Park	303
Map Of Project Area With Overlay Of Zoning District Requested	299
Municipal Sewer, City Glens Falls & Town, Cooperate, Provide	356
Municipal Sewer, Municipalities Should Cooperate, No Plant On Lake	444
Municipal Sewer, No Project Approval Until Town Sewer Study Done	435

Topic	Comment Number
Municipal Sewer, Opposes Sewer Extension, Impermissible Segmentation	178
Municipal Sewer, Park Pay, Increase Sales Tax On Ticket Price	098
Municipal Sewer, Park In Warren County Sewer District	175
Municipal Sewer, Require Tie In To Ensure Maintenance, Water Q	505
Municipal Sewer, Type/ Volume, Growth, Route 9 If Sewer Extended To Park?	415
Municipal Sewer, Unwillingness, Lack Of Community Spirit	153
Municipal Sewer, Water Quality, Discharge To Lake Intolerable	498
Municipal Sewer, Why Not Connect To Municipal Sewer?	337
Need For Project? No Need, Just "Big Business", "Big Money"	093
Noise, Visual Impact Of 200' Ride, Vegetation Removal, Traffic	144
Noise Bobsled, Visual Parking Lots, Economy, Minimum Wage Jobs	486
Noise From Park, Not Loud But Intrusive, Frequency, Repetitive	493
Noise Studies Flawed, Traffic Secondary Roads, Hours Of Operation	491
Noise, 200' Ride Produce Unhealthy, Annoying Noise	361
Noise, 200' Ride, Accelerate Noise Over Water	167
Noise, Additional Monitoring Station Locations On Glen Lake?	109
Noise, Additional Testing Before Approval Of DGEIS?	480
Noise, Amplified Noise Mitigation Used In 2000? Any Complaints?	375
Noise, Auditory Pollution More Damaging Than Visual	154
Noise, Board Should Consider Ordinance, No Building Code Variances	104
Noise, Berm Alternative	007
Noise, Bobsled, Water Quality Of Glen Lake To Decline Without Sewer	179
Noise, Bobsled Not Running, Study Flawed	209
Noise, Bobsled Running During Oct 29, 1999 Sound Measurement?	370
Noise, Bobsled Running During Oct 6, 1999 Sound Measurement?	371
Noise, Bobsled, Are Other Bobsled Rides Quieter?	132
Noise, Bobsled, Remove?	080
Noise, Bobsled, Compares To "Roar Of A Jet"	131
Noise, Bobsled, Disturbs Peace Of Fishing Glen Lake, Residents	360
Noise, Bobsled, Human Ear Perceives Greater Increase Than Sound Measures	617
Noise, Bobsled, No Reduction In Noise, Consider Noise Ordinance	118
Noise, Bobsled, Noise Damages Hearing Of Children	133
Noise, Bobsled, Property Values, Board Should Shut It Down	311
Noise, Bobsled, Shows Lack Of Sensitivity To Community	152

Topic	Comment Number
Noise, Bobsled, Special Events, Elvis Impersonator, Berms	164
Noise, Bobsled, Special Events, Limit Hours Of Operation	423
Noise, Bobsled, Was Noise Reduced 6 dBA? Additional Mitigation?	377
Noise, Carrying Over Water On Glen Lake, Modeling	057
Noise, Chazen 2000 Data Shows Increase In Impact To Neighborhoods	551
Noise, Concert Noise Mitigation? Concerts In 2000? Complaints?	376
Noise, Continue Sections To Actual Resident Locations	379
Noise, Courthouse Estate Has Experienced Increase	524
Noise, dBA Level Threshold Future Rides? Compared To Existing?	373
Noise, Described Proposed Noise Monitoring Program	374
Noise, Do DNL Noise Calculations For Route 9 Traffic As 87	380
Noise, Establish 60 dBA Limitation, Limit Hours Of Operation	508
Noise, Fails To Address Human Aspect, Off-Site Noises	051
Noise, Federal Noise Guidelines	003
Noise, Federal Noise Guidelines	004
Noise, Further Mitigation Of Bobsled?	037
Noise, Glen Lake Monitoring	001
Noise, Glen Lake Monitoring Location Not Representative Of All 300 Homes	253
Noise, Glen Lake Monitoring, Bobsled Running?	002
Noise, Hears Park In Summer, Water Quality, Impact To Watershed?	229
Noise, Hotel, Vegetation Removal, Increase Traffic Noise	306
Noise, Hours Of Operation, Noise Problem At Night	221
Noise, How Are "Audibility", "Noise", "Significant" Defined?	205
Noise, Hours Of Operation Should Be Shorter Day And Season	338
Noise, Hours Of Operation, Noise Ordinance? Nuisance Laws?	481
Noise, Impact To Human Health	043
Noise, Impacts Subjective, Inaudible From Outside Park Standard?	322
Noise, Impacts To Glen Lake Receptors In Line Of Site Of Park?	372
Noise, Levels Have Increased Based On Sound Studies	616
Noise, Bobsled Park Noise, "Live With It" Mentality	252
Noise, Limit Height Of Rides, Below Tree Line, Screaming	143
Noise, Limit Hours Of Operation, Length Of Season	438
Noise, Make Approval Dependent On Bobsled Removal	482
Noise, Model Noise On Water, Project Area Include All Riparian	579

Topic	Comment Number
Noise, Must Be Relationship Between Noise Level And Park Attendance	212
Noise, Neighbor Concerns And Complaints Dismissed In DGEIS	511
Noise, Barriers By DOT On 87? Town Study Solutions?	357
Noise, Barriers Considered?	036
Noise, Barriers Not Considered?	031
Noise, Not Significant, Any Limitations Should Be Fair To Park	352
Noise, Other Parks Use Berms, Barrier Walls Considered?	121
Noise, Park Considered Virtual Reality Rides With No Noise?	119
Noise, Park Noise Excessive, "Ears Don't Lie"	091
Noise, Park Open During Noise Sampling?	005
Noise, Park Continue To Collect Data, Set Threshold	638
Noise, Park Buy John Whalen's Hill As Buffer	422
Noise, Questions Location Of Monitoring Stations, Especially Glen Lake	058
Noise, Questions Relationship Between Park Attendance And Noise	041
Noise, Rides And Riders Audible At Country Club	279
Noise, Rides, PA Systems, Bands Should Not Be Heard In Home	052
Noise, Rules Concerning Concerts? Future Rides May Be Problem	210
Noise, Scoping Document Requires Modeling Of Noise Over Glen Lake	110
Noise, Scream Machines, How Do They Compare To Bobsled?	028
Noise, Scream Machines Trend For Parks	027
Noise, Sound Consideration For New Rides	618
Noise, Special Events Should Be Studied	165
Noise, Special Events, Residents Have Complained, It's A Problem	614
Noise, Study Flawed Because Bobsled Not Running, Can Hear In Home	220
Noise, Town Should Adopt Nuisance Law To Control Park Noise	211
Noise, Traffic And Tourist Amusements, Effect On People?	501
Noise, Traffic Impacts From Special Events	582
Noise, Traffic, Vegetation Removal	006
Noise, Traffic, Vegetation Removal In Area C, Is Additional Parking Necessary	122
Noise, Traffic, Vegetation Removal Will Inc Noise From 87	134
Noise, Vegetation Removal, Consider Parking Garage Alternative	613
Noise, Vegetation Removal, Consider Parking Garage Alternative?	124
Noise, Vegetation Removal, Increase From Park And 87	326
Noise, Vegetation Removal, Increase Sounds From 87	222

Topic	Comment Number
Noise, Vegetation Removal, Residential Development Contributing Factor?	216
Noise, Vegetation Removal, Negative Impact On Twicwood	536
Noise, Vegetation Removal, Northway Above Glen Lake Line Site, Impact?	378
Noise, Vegetation Removal, Parking Lots Cannot Negative Impact Traffic Noise	421
Noise, Vegetation Removal, Questions Aspects Of Data, Pro Garage	523
Noise, Vegetation Removal, Removal Of Hill On Route 9 Impact To Noise?	038
Noise, Vegetation Removal, Traffic On Northway West Of 87	180
Noise, Vegetation Removal, Vegetation Needed To Reduce Noise Impact	039
Noise, Where Are June Readings In Table 3-7?	624
Oppose Expansion, But Support Existing Park	099
Opposes Project, More Noise, Traffic, Lower Quality Of Life	325
Opposes Project, Stormwater, Noise, Previously Stated Issues	487
Park Access, Circumstances For Opening New Gates?	531
Park Access, Pedestrian Crossing South Of Martha's Allowed?	530
Park Area B, Methods To Conserve During Construction & Operation?	602
Park Area Not Suitable To Support Project, Preserve Character	334
Park Area Not Suitable To Support Project, Preserve Wetlands	542
Park Area Not Suited To Large Attendance, Compares Saratoga	546
Park Can Work With Environmental Guidelines	193
Park Hours, Open In Evening 25 Days Per Season A Policy?	418
Park Not Big Enough For Large Amusement Park	366
Park Not Big Enough For Project	115
Park Not Only Attraction In Area	323
Park Poor Environmental Management, Filling Of Wetlands Should Be Reversed	140
Park Sewage Plant, Criticizes Location	160
Park Should Update Current Rides Before Expanding	333
Park Will Act Responsible To Resolve Residents' Concerns	286
Parking Lots, Amount Fill To Be Used? Stormwater Detention/Retention?	412
Parking Lots, Better Explanation, Opposition To Gravel Lots	416
Parking Lots, Bus Entry, Inadequate For Transit Buses/ Trolleys	293
Parking Lots, Clarify Hillside Grades – 10 Foot Reduction In Hill?	413
Parking Lots, Consider Bronx Zoo Design?	141
Parking Lots, Consider Permeable Block "Gravel Pave Two"?	107
Parking Lots, Handicapped Parking In Bus Area Cause Conflict	294

Topic	Comment Number
Parking Lots, Maximum Grade Reduction Proposed?	411
Parking Lots, Provide Full Size Grading Plans	409
Parking Lots, Provide Total Amount Cut And Fill Proposed	410
Parking Lots, Shuttle Circulation Inadequate	290
Parking Lots, Shuttle Service, Provide Info Regarding Hours, Type, Numbers	292
Parking Lots, Shuttle Service, Stops Inadequate Size Location	291
Parking Lots, Toll Booths Interrupt Traffic Flow, Route 9 Access Road	431
Parking, Address Pedestrian Circulation	623
Parking, Allowed On West Side Route 9?	529
Parking, Amount Of Soil To Be Moved Unsound	591
Parking, Consider Alternatives To Paving	477
Parking, Consider Natural State? Blacktop Not Necessary	087
Parking, Describe Type Location Of Fencing And Shuttle System	631
Parking, Explain Possible Modifications To Pedestrian Facilities	610
Parking, Festival Parking Not Addressed	223
Parking, Festival Style Not Approved	040
Parking, Garage Better Than Lots	428
Parking, How Many Acres Paved?	599
Parking, Paving Consistent With Watershed Management Plan? Phosphorus Model?	470
Parking, Seasonal Business No Need For Paving	503
Parking, Use Of Fill Negative Impact, Wetland, Stormwater Management	427
Parking, Zoning, Paving Consistent With Watershed Management Plan?	467
Paved Parking, Research Porous Paving/ Garage Alternatives	635
Pedestrian Bridge, Design Must Ensure No Grade Shortcuts Cross Route 9	289
Pedestrian Bridge, Mandated By Warren County Planning Board, Separate From Project	492
Planning Board Should Require Park To Remove Asphalt Dumped In Pit	142
Poor Management Of Park Now, Not Responsible Enough	547
Poor Management Of Park Now, Not Responsible Enough	548
Positive Impacts, Support Local Events	078
Project Area, Inaccurate Definition Glen Lake Neighborhoods	466
Project Area, Inaccurate Definition Glen Lake Neighborhoods	557
Project Need, Must Invest To Survive And Prosper	094
Project Need, Must Invest To Survive And Prosper	191
Project Need, Project Just Ploy To Get Tax Breaks	214

Topic	Comment Number
Project Need, Why Does Park Need To Expand?	594
Project Should Not Affect Natural Charm Of Area, Bobsled	130
Project Timetable, Need More Detailed Plan	612
Public Services Impact? Input From School District, Law Enforcement, Roads	580
Public Services Impact? More Police Needed	571
Quality Of Life In Town Lower, Traffic Route 9, Vegetative Removal, Bobsled	103
Queesnbury, Comparison To Kissimee – St. Cloud, Florida	282
Residents Should Have Known Park Would Expand, Makes Noise	190
SEQR Related, Appropriate Review With Lack Of Concept Detail?	163
SEQR Related, Board Consider Impacts Irreversible	114
SEQR Related, Comment Period, No Extension Necessary	236
SEQR Related, Consider Dismantling Moving From Critical Environmental Area	176
SEQR Related, DGEIS Should Address Concerns Expressed	354
SEQR Related, Directs Board Carefully Listen To Community	302
SEQR Related, Expansion Must Be Scrutinized, Controlled	145
SEQR Related, Lacks No Action Alternative	177
SEQR Related, Level Of Review In Future When More Specific?	156
SEQR Related, Level Of Specificity Required For Review	288
SEQR Related, Park Obligated To Residents Not To Negative Impact	324
SEQR Related, Planning Board Should Be Unbiased, Consider Park's Needs	355
SEQR Related, Questions Independence Of Town Review	183
SEQR Related, Town, City, Park Form Committee For Cooperation	358
SEQR Related, What Incremental Controls Will Board Have?	116
SEQR, Concerns Of Neighbors Should Be Considered	535
SEQR, Critical Environmental Area, Development Must Be Limited	575
SEQR, DGEIS Generally Adequate In Scope, Content	596
SEQR, Level Of Public Review After Approval? Enforcement?	479
SEQR, Park Should Submit Long Range Master Plan	549
SEQR, Will Board Require Removal Of Sewage No Action Alternative?	476
Sewage, Discrepancy, 70% Increased Attendance, 33% Increased Park Sewage	406
Sewage, Discuss Alternative Sites To Discharge Effluent	405
Sewage, Distance Between Leach Field And Wetland, Wetland And…	404
Soil Analysis Inaccurate, Recommend Test Borings	560
Soil Analysis, Water Table Inaccurate	562

Topic	Comment Number
Special Events, Rock Concerts Allowed? Noise, Traffic?	532
Stormwater Management, Additional Parking Will Have Negative Impact	079
Stormwater Management, Impact From Vegetation Removal	055
Stormwater Management, Oil, Antifreeze Leaking From Parked Cars	056
Stormwater Management, Omission Of Park Area A	059
Stormwater, Address Heat From Cement Parking Lots?	126
Stormwater, Auto Fluids Dripping Out Of Cars	088
Stormwater, How Will Park Continue To Monitor?	101
Stormwater, Hydrocarbons 4,500 Cars, Common Sense Says No	075
Stormwater, Hydrocarbons Antifreeze Parked Cars, Trap Or Filter	069
Stormwater, Hydrocarbons From Route 9, Increased Traffic	070
Stormwater, Noise, Town Should Retain Residential Nature	250
Stormwater, Park Drain Valve Dumps Chlorinated Water In Lake	242
Stormwater, Pollution From Cars In Parking Lots	100
Stormwater, Rush Pond, Negative Impact Of Parking Lots	181
Stormwater, Should Include Area A In Analysis Of Area C	106
Stormwater -Erroneous Data, Water Quality - No Consideration Watershed Management	488
Stormwater Management, Additional Paved Parking Lots, Vegetation Removal, Negative	315
Stormwater Management, Paving Parking Lots - Catch Basins, Route 9 Traffic	309
Stormwater Management, Vegetation Removal Route 9 Increased Runoff To Glen Lake	307
Stormwater Management, Water Quality, Residents Use Glen Lake For Drinking	308
Stormwater, Additional Parking Lots & Cars Negative Impact Glen Lake	336
Stormwater, Analyze Greater 50 Year Storm Events	585
Stormwater, Analyze For 1, 2, 10, 100 Year Storms Of 24 Hour Duration	386
Stormwater, Analyze Impact From Porous Material e.g. Gravel	402
Stormwater, Animal Activity Like Ducks May Be Contributors	449
Stormwater, Consider Thermal Discharge Impacts	587
Stormwater, Dec Parking Needed, More Info Regarding Drywells	432
Stormwater, Demonstrate Compliance With DEC Design Criteria	387
Stormwater, Detention & Sheet Flow Don't Comply Government Regulations	566
Stormwater, Discuss Control Of Sediments During Construction	588
Stormwater, Discuss HydroCAD Model, How Software Works	382
Stormwater, Discuss Hydrologic Hydraulic Analysis On Cad	383
Stormwater, Discuss Whether Current Nutrient Levels Ok	586

Topic	Comment Number
Stormwater, Effect On Aquatic Ecology?	429
Stormwater, Evaluate Impacts On Wetlands	397
Stormwater, Existing Stream Base Flow Not Accounted For	392
Stormwater, Extended Detention Basins Necessary, First Flush	564
Stormwater, Festival Parking Negative Impact, Need Vegetation Buffers	565
Stormwater, Filling Of Parking Lots, Green Lot Not Suited	525
Stormwater, How Will Drainage System Convey Runoff With No Negative Impact?	399
Stormwater, How Will Storm Water Be Treated?	598
Stormwater, Included Existing Stream, Existing & Proposed Condition	391
Stormwater, Include Design Details Of Stormwater Management Plan	384
Stormwater, Infiltration Galleys May Impact Groundwater	608
Stormwater, Larger Traffic Volume Must Cause Negative Impact?	363
Stormwater, Maintenance Plan For Dry-Wells	584
Stormwater, Modify To Reflect Presence Wareham Type Soil	389
Stormwater, More Detail Regarding Erosion & Sediment Control	385
Stormwater, More Info Regarding Drywells, Detention Basins	390
Stormwater, Need Independent Expert Review, Additional Time?	468
Stormwater, Paved Parking Near Glen Lake, Negative Impact Water Quality	590
Stormwater, Ponds Facilitate Mosquitoes Breeding? Insecticide?	534
Stormwater, Porous Paving Materials Should Be Used	567
Stormwater, Project May Improve Water Quality	589
Stormwater, Proposed Infiltration System Too Small	561
Stormwater, Provide Design Info For Pond 4 From Part C	401
Stormwater, Show Detailed Discussion Specific Site Character	388
Stormwater, Show Detailed Info Regarding Pre-Development Model	395
Stormwater, Study Type/ Amount Chemicals Impact Rare Plants	628
Stormwater, Summarize Findings Regarding "Like Existing Condition"	393
Stormwater, Summarize Stormwater Events	394
Stormwater, SUNOM Model Include Runoff Park Area A?	403
Stormwater, Traffic, Route 9, Glen Lake Rd, Round Pond Rd	581
Stormwater, Use TR-55 Method To Calculate Time Concentration	583
Stormwater, Validate Exfiltration Rates Used	398
Stormwater, Vegetation Removal Considered? Describe Plantings	469
Stormwater, Vegetation Removal, Increase Pollutants In Runoff	456

Topic	Comment Number
Stormwater, Verify Onsite Seasonal High Water Table	563
Stormwater, Were Lake George Standards Used?	473
Stormwater, Which Part C Post Development Model, Correct One?	400
Stormwater, Why Difference In Pre/Post Watershed Acreage?	396
Storytown To Great Escape Negative Impact, Quality Of Life	359
Storytown To Great Escape, Residents There First	558
Supports Expansion, Calls For Cooperation With Town & City Of Glens Falls	353
Traffic Will Increase With Or Without Park, Approves Project	447
Traffic, Address Potential Problem, Increased Southbound Route 9 Traffic	633
Traffic, Analyze Impacts On Local Collector Roads	578
Traffic, Approach From North Is Misleading	615
Traffic, Board Endorses Comments Of Adirondack-Glens Falls Transportation Council	637
Traffic, Board In Favor Of Access Road, Four-Way Intersection	632
Traffic, Changing Traffic Signal Timing, No Benefit	047
Traffic, Compares Park To 600,000 People Leaving Hockey Event	092
Traffic, Consider Pedestrian Traffic, Route 9, Ability To Cross	264
Traffic, Dangerous Left-Hand Turn At I-87, Gurney Lane	046
Traffic, Determine Decline In Levels Of Service Collateral Roads	455
Traffic, Doesn't Want More Traffic Lights	327
Traffic, DOT Route 9 Improvements Complete, No Additional Benefits	297
Traffic, Existing Left Hand Turn Rt9 Glen Lake Rd Impossible	135
Traffic, Exit 30 Signal Timing, Level of Service, Northbound Movement Not Included	298
Traffic, Expand On Traffic Volume Of Collector Roads	369
Traffic, Fencing Strong Enough To Prevent Park Pedestrian Cross Route 9?	265
Traffic, Glen Lake Road Exit To Route 9 Worsens Every Year Because Of Park	364
Traffic, Glen Lake Road, Require Light At Road Entrance	241
Traffic, Gurney Lane Bridge Safety For Pedestrians, Cyclists	018
Traffic, Gurney Lane Bridge, Capacity?	013
Traffic, Gurney Lane Bridge, Counts Exiting From North	011
Traffic, Gurney Lane Bridge, Not Considered?	012
Traffic, Gurney Lane, How Will Pedestrian, Cycles Safely Cross?	186
Traffic, Has Direct Access From 87 Been Considered?	201
Traffic, Highway Is Overtaxed Now, Fix Before More Development	494
Traffic, Impact From Extension Of Sewer	021

Topic	Comment Number
Traffic, Impact To Local Roads When Park Attendance Doubles	050
Traffic, Impact To Route 149 Corridor, Exit 20	024
Traffic, Impact To Route 9/ Exit 20 Intersection	022
Traffic, Increase On Oakwood Drive, Bay, Quaker Roads	516
Traffic, Internal Changes No Benefit To Residential Roads	335
Traffic, Local Collector Road Data	020
Traffic, Local Collector Road Impact Conclusions	017
Traffic, Local Collector Road Impact Conclusions	019
Traffic, Local Collector Road Impact From Park Employees	016
Traffic, Local Collector Roads Already Congested, Park Employees Use	224
Traffic, Local Collector Road Definition, Gurney Lane	015
Traffic, Local Collector Road Impact	014
Traffic, Levels Of Service For Special Events?	368
Traffic, Mitigation Inadequate, Need More Study Of Situation	537
Traffic, Mitigation Will Not Support Traffic Volume From Project	199
Traffic, Must Show Park Hour Factors Uses	268
Traffic, Need Expert Review, Consider Pedestrian, Bike Traffic, Noise	510
Traffic, Need More Empirical Evidence, Traffic Volumes, Local Roadways	314
Traffic, New Dedicated Route 9 Lane Negative Impact	026
Traffic, Noise, Emergency Services, "Another Orlando", Common Sense	237
Traffic, Not Adequately Address Impacts To Area Roads	049
Traffic, On-Site Changes Inadequate For External Park Roads	025
Traffic, Parking, Park Did Not Do Its Homework "Sugar…5 Pound Bag"	097
Traffic, Peak Departure "At Once" Impact?	009
Traffic, Pedestrian Bridge, Back Up At Round Pond/ Glen Lake	611
Traffic, Pedestrian Bridge, In Favor Of It	328
Traffic, Pedestrian Bridge, Strongly Prefer Bridge To Tunnel	263
Traffic, Phasing Of Improvements, Carry South Route 9 Lane Further	259
Traffic, Phasing Of Improvements, Demonstrate Control Of Land	257
Traffic, Phasing Of Improvements, Don't Eliminate Exclusive North Lane	262
Traffic, Phasing Of Improvements, Don't Tie To Annual Park Attendance	258
Traffic, Phasing Of Improvements, Interconnected Traffic Signals	261
Traffic, Phasing Of Improvements, Parking Lots Before Access Rd?	266
Traffic, Phasing Of Improvements, Route 9 Light Signals Revert Yellow	260

Topic	Comment Number
Traffic, Poor Planning, Additional Time On Road, Road Rage On The Rise?	500
Traffic, Questions DGEIS No Meaningful Park Traffic In AM Peak	295
Traffic, Questions Eliminating Left Turn At Route 9/ Exit 20	048
Traffic, Queuing Analysis For Park Access Roads, Ring Road Integrated	622
Traffic, Result In Increase Traffic Glen Lake Road Dangerous	312
Traffic, Round Pond Road Unsafe For Golfers, Noise, 200 Foot Ride	278
Traffic, Route 9 Can't Handle More, Park Not Storytown Anymore	276
Traffic, Route 9 Handle 500,000 Cars Per Day?	045
Traffic, Route 9 Problems Due To Park, Oppose Vegetation Removal/ Paving	517
Traffic, Route 9/ Gurney Lane Route 9/ Exit 20 Analysis Must Include Red	267
Traffic, Route 9/ Route 149 Analysis Wrong, Side Roads Are Split Phase	270
Traffic, Route 9/ Route 254 Analysis Wrong, Use Left-Turn Arrows Route 9	269
Traffic, Safety On Route 9 Compromised By Cars Dropping Off Kids	232
Traffic, Secondary Impacts And Ripple Effect On Secondary Roads	128
Traffic, Secondary Roads, Level Of Service Won't Improve	251
Traffic, Signal Timing, Reflect Additional Park Employees	296
Traffic, South/North Entrance Distribution Correct?	010
Traffic, Tie Improvements To Traffic Volumes Instead Attendance	367
Traffic, Traffic On Public Roadways Will Slow	200
Traffic, Warren County Municipal Road Not Considered? Impact Emergency	023
Traffic, Water Quality, Visual, Noise, Need Unbiased Measures Of	207
Vegetation Removal Mitigation, Shrubs Good For Visual Screening	604
Vegetation Removal, Noise, Mitigate Vegetation Removal	509
Vegetation Removal, Consider Alternative With No Removal Area C	577
Vegetation Removal, Consider Parking Garage To Reduce Impact?	035
Vegetation Removal, Impact On Noise And Water Quality	081
Vegetation Removal, Inventory Trees, Identify Ways To Preserve, Use Native	639
Vegetation Removal, Leave Some Mature Trees, More Info Regarding Plantings	426
Vegetation Removal, Mitigate, All Approvals Must Be Enforced	515
Vegetation Removal, Negative Impact, Noise, Erosion, Nutrient Runoff	149
Vegetation Removal, Negative Impact, Noise, Erosion, Nutrient Runoff	453
Vegetation Removal, Noise, Increased Noise On Bike Trail Since 1970s	454
Vegetation Removal, Noise, Water Quality, Traffic Noise	559
Vegetation Removal, Noise, Stormwater, Visual Negative Impact, Garage	459

Topic	Comment Number
Vegetation Removal, Noise, Visual, Stormwater Negative Impacts	497
Vegetation Removal, Park Area C, Impact To Ground Water	061
Vegetation Removal, Remove For Ring Road But Not Other, Noise Impacts	521
Vegetation Removal, Route 9 & 87, Increased Noise, Unattractive Entrance	272
Vegetation Removal, Route 9, Conflict With Town Master Plan, Noise Issue	166
Vegetation Removal, Samoset To Coachhouse, Water Quality, Noise	105
Vegetation Removal, Stormwater, Negative Impact Property Values	541
Vegetation Removal, Stormwater, Noise, Visual, Prefers Park Garage	499
Vegetation Removal, Visual, Noise, Stormwater, Prefers Garage	513
Vegetation Removal, Visual, Noise, Stormwater, Prefers Garage	514
Vegetation Removal, Visual, Noise, Stormwater, Prefers Garage	519
Vegetation Removal, Visual, Water Quality, Wetlands Impacts	518
Vegetation Removal, Where Is Spoil From Clear Cut Going?	127
Vegetation, Plantings, What Kind, Size	060
Visual Impact, Has Board Examined New Ride Proposed For Park?	120
Visual, 10 Foot Buffers Along 87 Little Meaningful Screening	417
Visual, 200 Foot Ride, Number Of Affected Persons?	030
Visual, 200 Foot Ride Compared To Two CNA Buildings	029
Visual, 200 Foot Ride, Inconsistent With Single Family Height Restrictions	161
Visual, 200 Foot Ride, Impair View Of West Mountain	054
Visual, 200 Foot Ride, Significant Impact, Noise, No Generic Approval	381
Visual, 200 Foot Ride, Constant Disturbance To Country Club	244
Visual, 200 Foot Ride, 20 Story Coaster, Noise, Traffic "Disaster"	249
Visual, 200 Foot Ride, Three Times Height Of Existing Tree Line, Negative Impact Lake	462
Visual, 200 Foot Ride, Alternatives? Tree Line Standard, Noise Standard	483
Visual, 200 Foot Ride, Big Impact To Glen Lake, Bike Trail	082
Visual, 200 Foot Ride, Common Sense Says Big Impact	073
Visual, 200 Foot Ride, Impact On Glen Lake Residents	226
Visual, 200 Foot Ride, Impact To First Tee, 18 Green, Start/Finish Holes	280
Visual, 200 Foot Ride, Not Appropriate So Near Adirondack Park	310
Visual, 200 Foot Ride, Not Consistent With Beauty Of Mountains	117
Visual, 200 Foot Ride, Rides Should Not Exceed 50 Foot Tree Line	555
Visual, 200 Foot Ride, Significant Impact 90% Glen Lake	362
Visual, 200 Foot Ride, Site At Park Not Visible To Neighbors?	247

Topic	Comment Number
Visual, 200 Foot Ride, Twice As High As CNA Building, Don't Exceed 28 Feet	554
Visual, 200 Foot Ride, Vegetation Removal, Project Too Aggressive, Invasive	538
Visual, 200 Foot Ride, Visible From Country Club, Launch Balloon	246
Visual, 200 Foot Ride, Visible To 90% Glen Lake, Stormwater, Not Fit	255
Visual, 200 Foot Ride, Were Site Contour Maps Prepared?	204
Visual, 200 Foot Ride, What Is Elevation Of Land Relative To Surround?	245
Visual, 200 Foot, Trashy Look, Aggravate Other Problems Of Area	520
Visual, 250 Foot Ride Will Have Substantially Impact	274
Visual, Additional Parking Lots Area C, Negative Impact To Route 9, Etc.	125
Visual, Additional Parking Lots, Inconsistent With Town Zoning	187
Visual, Board Should Require All Rides Be Below Tree Line	147
Visual, Bike Path, Set Threshold, Site Rides Where Not Visible	636
Visual, Electric Lines, Ash Drive, Consider Putting Underground?	113
Visual, Electric Lines, Impact To Bike Trail, Photo Simulation?	083
Visual, Electric Lines, Impacts To Visual Character Ash Drive	112
Visual, Electric Lines, Negative Impact Bike Path, Wetland Bridge View	148
Visual, Electric Lines, Tree Trimming On Ash Drive, Impacts?	111
Visual, Electric Upgrades, Vegetation Removal, Alternatives?	478
Visual, Employ New DEC Visual Assessment Policy	553
Visual, Establish Height Guidelines Of 40 Feet In RC-15 Zone	507
Visual, Existing Park Has Negative Impact On Residence Two Miles Away	343
Visual, Guidelines For Night Lighting Of Rides?	544
Visual, High Structures No Harm, Compares To Glens Falls	450
Visual, Height Restriction For New Rides, Require Ride-By-Ride Approval	620
Visual, Impacts From Areas B & C? Use "Invisible From Outside" Standard?	320
Visual, Impacts Of Existing Rides Up To Two Miles Should Be Studied	424
Visual, Lighting, Tall Parking Lot Lights Significant Impact - Lower?	414
Visual, Night Lighting, Topographic Differences Between Park & Other Commercial?	319
Visual, Noise, 200 Foot Ride, Height Restriction To Tree Line?	543
Visual, Noise, Negative Impact Of Project On Lake's Views	496
Visual, Noise, Traffic, Existing Park & Expansion Negative Impact	301
Visual, Noise, Water Quality, Air Pollution, Compares To Darien Lake	231
Visual, Parking In Area C, Need For Additional Parking Unclear	194
Visual, Paved Parking Has Impact, Questions Need For More Lots	425

INDEX BY TOPIC

Topic	Comment Number
Visual, Provide Large USGS Topographic Map With Location Line Of Sites	419
Visual, Rides Above Tree Line Have Impact, Invisible From Outside?	321
Visual, Vegetation Removal For Parking Negative Impact, 200 Foot Ride, Negative, Lake	445
Visual, Vegetation Removal, Consistent With Town Master Plan Review?	123
Visual, Vegetation Removal, Detract From Adirondack Theme Of Area	552
Visual, Vegetation Removal, Future Rides, Maintain Rural Character	484
Visual, Vegetation Removal, I-87 More Visible, Use Public Ideal Standard	318
Visual, Vegetation Removal, Seems Unnecessary, Uncovers 87 Views	195
Visual, Vegetation Removal, Simulation Photos, Country Club, Lake	162
Visual, Why Were Balloons Sent Up On Windy Days?	595
Warren County Planning Board Pleased With DGEIS Approach	630
Water Quality, 90,000 GPD Effluent, Common Sense Says Big Impact	074
Water Quality, Address Issue Of Discharge Of Effluent Out Of Basin	437
Water Quality, Compare Impacts With Glen Lake Watershed Management Plan	576
Water Quality, Compare Impacts With Plant Vs Municipal Sewer	574
Water Quality, Concerned Packing Plants Often Fail	158
Water Quality, Consider Effects Of Pesticides, Herbicides & Fertilizers	471
Water Quality, Consider Short-Term Impacts From Operational Issues	436
Water Quality, Current Levels Of Phosphorous? With Project?	573
Water Quality, Current Levels Runoff, Nutrient Loading Acceptable?	460
Water Quality, Dam At End Jungle Land, Have DEC Permit?	243
Water Quality, Glen Lake Fen, Additional Testing, Hold Park Responsible	465
Water Quality, Glen Lake Fen, Will Water Chemistry Be Affected?	627
Water Quality, Glen Lake Has Worsened Over Years	150
Water Quality, Glen Lake Quality Decreased Over Last 20 Years	539
Water Quality, Glen Lake Watershed Management Plan Considered? Monitoring	626
Water Quality, Glen Lake, Contribution Of Park To Phosphorus Levels?	072
Water Quality, Glen Lake, Decline Over Last 35 Years, No Paved Parking	239
Water Quality, Glen Lake, Filling Of Wetland Caused Turbidity Increase	146
Water Quality, Glen Lake, Impact Of Large Sewer Treat Facility?	225
Water Quality, Glen Lake, Impact Of Parking Lots On Route 9	086
Water Quality, Glen Lake, Impact To Phosphorous Levels	064
Water Quality, Glen Lake, Municipal Sewer Tie In Necessary, Stormwater	512
Water Quality, Glen Lake, Municipal Sewer, Phosphorous Levels	065

Topic	Comment Number
Water Quality, Glen Lake, Municipal Sewer, Ammonia, Phosphorus, Biological Oxygen	066
Water Quality, Glen Lake, Nutrient Loading, Stormwater Runoff	071
Water Quality, Glen Lake, Park Responsible For Worsening Quality?	090
Water Quality, Glen Lake, Phosphate Loading, Require Municipal Sewer	240
Water Quality, Glen Lake, Vegetation Removal, Property Value, Noise Berms	172
Water Quality, Glen Lake, Worsened, Noise From 200 Foot Ride Bad	137
Water Quality, Ground Water, Discharge To Sandy Soil, Need More Info	198
Water Quality, Has Municipal Sewer Been Considered?	203
Water Quality, Have Sewage Plant SPDES Permit Limited To Three to Five Years	434
Water Quality, How Will Wetland Water Look After Expansion?	593
Water Quality, In Favor Of Municipal Sewer As Future Option	159
Water Quality, Minimize Number Of Stream Crossings For Sewer Pipe	600
Water Quality, Municipal Sewer, Town Should Manage Sewage Disposal	233
Water Quality, Municipal Sewer, Use Funds For Plant To Connect To Sewer	317
Water Quality, Need Evidence That Ground, Surface Water Not Impacted	433
Water Quality, Need Mitigation Of Effects From Water Fowl	430
Water Quality, Noise, Vegetation Removal, New Rides, List Concerns	463
Water Quality, On-Site Sewage, Impact Glen Lake? Park's Water Source	330
Water Quality, Park At Peak Development, Expansion Negative Impact Watershed	460
Water Quality, Pesticides, Chemicals Pose No Concern	606
Water Quality, Phosphorus, Show Modeling No Impact From Sewage Plant	407
Water Quality, Plant Near Lake, Wetland Too Risky	457
Water Quality, Praises Proposed Sewage Plant	202
Water Quality, Proposed Plant, Not Better Than DEC Standards, Phosphorus	063
Water Quality, Protection Of Surface , Ground Water Important	420
Water Quality, Quantify Phosphorus Loading Capability Of Soils	629
Water Quality, Questions Data Regarding Sewage Effluent	062
Water Quality, Recalculate Design Parameters Plant, Data Errors	572
Water Quality, Refer To Glen Lake Watershed Management Plan, Intermodel	108
Water Quality, Regulations Oppose Robbing Of Watershed By Pumping Out	448
Water Quality, Sewage Data Inaccurate, Alternatives For Effluent?	475
Water Quality, Sewage, Discuss Alternative Treatment Tech	408
Water Quality, Sewage, Glen Lake, Negative Impact Lake, Property Values	365
Water Quality, Sewage, Residents Use Glen Lake Drinking Water	316

Topic	Comment Number
Water Quality, State Intent To Use Municipal Sewer When Its Available	634
Water Quality, Stormwater, Fails To Address Stormwater Quality	196
Water Quality, Town Must Protect Glen Lake, Expansion Inappropriate	235
Water Quality, Water Fowl Degrade, Recommend Mitigation	197
Water Quality, Why Not Recycle Effluent If So Good? Municipal Sewer Better	273
Water Quality, Will Park Perform Long-Term Monitoring?	474
Water Quality, Zoning, Need Ordinance Protect Glen Lake	230
Water Table, Groundwater, Questions Park Area C Conclusions	067
Water Table, Park Area C More Than Six Feet	068
Wetland, Impact Too Great	085
Wetlands, Donate To Open Space Institute? Particularly Given Karner Blue	472
Wetlands, DGEIS Comply With Glen Lake Watershed Management Plan?	540
Wetlands, Don't Allow Park To Further Damage Wetlands	504
Wildlife, DGEIS Incomplete, Inadequate, Economic Benefits Irrelevant	351
Wildlife, Disagrees Page 3-11 "No Rare...Species On Site"	348
Wildlife, Habitat Improvement Project Mitigate Habitat Loss	607
Wildlife, Have Independent Biologists Verified? Expand Study Area	545
Wildlife, Inadequate Analysis Endangered Species, Karner Blue	556
Wildlife, Karner Blue Butterfly, Wild Lupines, Protected Species	344
Wildlife, Karner Blue Butterfly, Wild Lupines, Protected Species	441
Wildlife, Malluses, Amphibians, Fish, Impact From Earth Moving?	349
Wildlife, Park Area C, Omissions To Bird Life Inventory	084
Wildlife, Park Land, Re-survey For Wild Lupine	345
Wildlife, Protected Species On Site, Salamanders, Owls...	442
Wildlife, Rare Bryophytes? Are They Actually On Park Land?	603
Wildlife, Suggests Survey, Inventory Aquatic Plants, Animals	350
Wildlife, Table 3-3 Lists Species Of Special Concern, Environmental Conservation Law	347
Wildlife, What Species Did LA Group Observe? No Visits To Site?	346
Zoning, DGEIS Contradiction, Festival Parking Requires Variance	609
Zoning, Town Zoning Restricts Such Development Near Residents	304