

APPENDIX B  
SEQRA Documentation

NYS Environmental Conservation Law  
Village of Kiryas Joel

**SEQRA**  
**NOTICE OF INTENT TO ESTABLISH LEAD AGENCY**

TO: *All Involved Agencies (see list below)*

Dated: December 30, 2013

This notice is issued pursuant to 6 NYCRR 617.6 of the implementing regulations pertaining to Article 8 (State Environmental Quality Review Act) of the Environmental Conservation Law.

**PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that the Village of Kiryas Joel Board of Trustees intends that it shall be the lead agency for all environmental review of the proposed action described below pursuant to Article 8 (State Environmental Quality Review Act) of the Environmental Conservation Law. Please confirm your agreement ASAP. In the event no other involved agency indicates a desire to be lead agency within thirty days of this notice, the Board of Trustees will confirm its status as lead agency.

NAME OF ACTION:           Petition for annexation to the Village of Kiryas Joel  
  Town of Monroe 510 acres

SEQR STATUS:   Type 1      X             Annexation of 100+ acres

DESCRIPTION OF ACTION: Annexation of 177 parcels constituting approximately 510 acres to the Village of Kiryas Joel in the Towns of Monroe and Woodbury.

**REASONS SUPPORTING THIS DETERMINATION:**

- (i)    The anticipated impacts of the project are primarily of local Village significance since the properties will be served by the Village if annexed.
- (ii)   This agency has the greatest capability for providing the most thorough environmental assessment of the proposed action.
- (iii)   The Village has requested that the Applicant provide a LEAF.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION:**

Contact Person:    Hon. Gedalye Szegedin, Village Administrator  
Address:            PO Box 566, Monroe, NY 10949  
Telephone Number: (845) 783-8300

**Copies of this Notice Sent to:**

Town of Monroe Town Board, 11 Stage Road, Monroe, NY 10950

Applicants – c/o Steven Barshov, Esq., Sive, Paget & Riesel, PC, 460 Park Ave, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor, New York, NY 10022

New York State  
Department of Environmental Conservation  
Commissioner's Determination  
of Lead Agency  
Under Article 8 of the  
Environmental Conservation Law

**PROJECT:** Request for Designation of Lead Agency, Proposed  
510 Acre Land Annexation, from the Town of Monroe to  
the Village of Kiryas Joel

**DISPUTING AGENCIES:** Town Board of the Town of Monroe, Orange  
County, New York v. the Board of Trustees of  
the Village of Kiryas Joel, Orange County,  
New York

I have been asked to designate a lead agency under the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQR"; codified in Article 8 of the Environmental Conservation Law [ECL] with implementing regulations at Part 617 of Title 6 of the Official, Compilation of Codes, Rules and Regulations of the State of New York ["6 NYCRR Part 617"]) to conduct the environmental review of the proposed annexation of 510 acres<sup>1</sup> from the Town of Monroe, to the Village of Kiryas Joel, both located in Orange County.

The designation of the Board of Trustees of the Village of Kiryas Joel (Village Board) as lead agency for this review is based on my finding that the Village Board has the broadest governmental powers for investigation of the impact(s) of the proposed actions and hence greater capacity to review impacts of development that may be a consequence of annexation.

**ACTION AND SITE**

The action involves a petition to the Village of Kiryas Joel (Village) by landowners in the Town of Monroe (Town) to annex 510 acres of land to the Village from the Town under Article 17 of the General Municipal Law.

The property to be annexed consists of 177 tax lot parcels in the Town of Monroe, scattered over approximately seven clusters (parcel groups), more than half of which appear to be unimproved. Overall, the parcels consist of 507 acres, including

---

<sup>1</sup> This is an approximate amount of land.

33 acres of land in rural residence and 12 acres covered by roads, buildings and other paved or impervious surfaces, with the remaining 462 acres containing forested and agricultural lands, water features and wetlands. Forested lands (409 acres) are the dominate cover type of the proposed annexation parcels.<sup>2</sup>

Although the petition for this action has not identified any planned development specifically related to the proposed annexation, the Village's lead agency dispute papers, dated February 7, 2014, discuss - in a general manner - potential development of the lands to be annexed.

#### REGULATORY SETTING

The role of lead agency may only be assumed by an involved agency with authority to make discretionary decisions on one or more components of the overall plan.

The determination of public interest pursuant to General Municipal Law (GML) §711, which a municipality must make prior to granting or denying an annexation petition, is a discretionary approval subject to SEQRA (*City Council of City of Watervliet v. Town Board of Town of Colonie*, 3 N.Y.3d 508 [2004]).<sup>3</sup> The Village Board and the Town Board of the Town of Monroe (Town Board) must each separately review and grant or deny this annexation petition. They are, therefore, each involved agencies and both have stated their interest in serving as lead agency.

I have also received requests to designate as lead agency the Department of Environmental Conservation, the Monroe - Woodbury Central School District and Orange County. Based on all information received for this annexation proposal none of these agencies fulfill the definition of an involved agency (6 NYCRR Part 617.2[s]) and therefore would not qualify to be a lead agency in this case. In addition, I received many letters of

---

<sup>2</sup> The 507 acre total, which was provided in the Full Environmental Assessment Form, Part 1, does not equal the 510 acres identified in the original lead agency dispute correspondence.

<sup>3</sup> As stated by the Court of Appeals in that case, "[a]nnexations are often the first step toward the development of real property and may involve a change in municipal services or land use regulation. A principal goal of SEQRA is "to incorporate environmental considerations into the decision making process at the earliest opportunity"[citations omitted].*Id.* at 518."

concern requesting that I not select the Town Board or Village Board to serve in the role of lead agency based on the possible motivations of each municipal body. In past lead agency disputes involving annexations, the Commissioner has indicated that a municipality's possible motivation is not relevant to resolution of the dispute (see, e.g., *Commissioner's lead agency decision in Town Board of the Town of North Greenbush v. Common Council of the City of Rensselaer, September 25, 2008*, and *Commissioner's lead agency decision in Town of Queensbury v. City of Glens Falls, April 14, 1997*).<sup>4</sup>

Further, ECL Article 8 and its implementing regulations compel the result here inasmuch as they define the lead agency as the agency with principal responsibility for carrying out or approving an action. In the case of direct actions, this usually means the agency undertaking the action (see ECL §8-111[6] and 6 NYCRR §617.2[u]). Both the Town Board and the Village Board are responsible for approving the annexation.<sup>5</sup>

#### DISCUSSION

In resolving a lead agency dispute, I am guided by the three criteria listed in order of importance in 6 NYCRR Part 617.6(b)(5)(v):

- whether the anticipated impacts of the action being considered are primarily of statewide, regional, or local significance (i.e., if such impacts are of primarily local significance, all other considerations being equal, the local agency involved will be lead agency);
- which agency has the broadest governmental powers for investigation of the impacts of the proposed action; and
- which agency has the greatest capability for providing the most thorough environmental assessment of the proposed action.

#### A. First Criterion

---

<sup>4</sup> Commissioner lead agency decisions are published by the Department on its website at <http://www.dec.ny.gov/permits/6186.html>.

<sup>5</sup> I understand the concern that a lead agency may not be able to objectively review its own project. However, SEQR provides that the lead agency should be the one that is principally responsible for carrying out the action. The willingness of the courts to scrutinize agencies' compliance with SEQR and to overturn actions where compliance with the law is found wanting serve as safeguards to the process along with the public disclosure aspects of SEQR (see Gerard, Ruzow and Weinberg, *Environmental Impact Review in New York*, §3.03[1] [LexisNexis 2011]).

The first criterion asks whether potential impacts from the proposed action are primarily of statewide, regional, or local significance. Both disputing agencies acknowledge that the annexation proposal would likely cause impacts of only local significance. Local environmental impacts will likely consist of, among other things, increases and changes to traffic patterns, dust, noise, and a demand for sewer and water conveyance.

Based on the Village's Comprehensive Plan (Comprehensive Plan for the Village of Kiryas Joel, December 1999), if the annexation is approved, it is anticipated that environmental impacts that may occur to the properties will be from high density build out. Compact, high density development is more likely to result in a community that is more walk-able, bike-able and more conducive to mass transit while reducing vehicle miles traveled and generation of greenhouse gas emissions from combustion. As a general rule, high density development, appropriately sited, is considered more environmentally sustainable and conserves open space.

The Town of Monroe's Comprehensive Plan (2008 Town of Monroe Master Plan - Comprehensive Update 2005, adopted May 19, 2008) proposes large lot development due primarily to limited on-site water and the lack of public water and sewer. At one time, large lot zoning was considered the way to protect land and preserve the existing character of the community. In many cases, large lot zoning does not preserve the rural character of a community. Further subdivision of land dissects open space and results in clearing of land for lawns while displacing other uses of land that are dependent on open space such as farming, forestry or even recreation.

Given the above, I find the first criterion favors neither agency since the impacts are primarily local. However, I recognize that the Village of Kiryas Joel's comprehensive plan would, if followed, result in a more environmentally sustainable plan for development.

#### B. Second Criterion

The second criterion considers which agency has the broadest governmental powers for investigation of the impact(s) of the proposed actions.

Both the Town Board and the Village Board have the authority to approve or deny the annexation petition. If the annexation is approved by the Town and Village, the Village will have potential land use jurisdiction of future development of the annexed parcels of land through one or more of its boards and officers (Board of Trustees, Planning Board, Zoning Board of Appeals and Building Department). The Village Board has stated its intention to provide public water to the proposed annexed properties. Agreements are already in place for the Village to provide water to two developments within the proposed annexation (the developments of Vintage Vista and Forest Edge). The Town has an adopted zoning law, site plan review authority and subdivision regulations.

As discussed briefly in criterion number one, both municipalities have comprehensive plans in place which describe their goals and objectives for future growth and development.

The Village's Comprehensive Plan discusses the Village's growth rate and anticipated future population. The Village is very dependent on walking and mass transit as a major mode of transportation, with the existing road system basically consisting of local and collector streets.

The Town Comprehensive Plan identifies the unincorporated Town of Monroe as primarily "... a bedroom community, located in an attractive wooded setting in the New York metropolitan commuter-shed" (commuter shed is the southern end of the county and on the NYS Route 17 "Quickway"). The Plan identifies traffic congestion as a major growing regional problem. The Plan also looks at the relationships between land use and sewer or septic use and water consumption and proposes to continue its past zoning for large lot development.

Both the Town's and Village's comprehensive plans recognize the constraints imposed by water and sewer needs. A striking difference between the two plans is how each community chooses to address these constraints.

Public water supply that might be available to the proposed annexed properties, as it currently stands, is operated by and serves the Village. The Village's Comprehensive Plan anticipates adding lands to the territory of the Village and the Village Board plans to provide public water to the proposed annexed properties if annexation is approved. The Town supervisor, on the other hand, has stated that there are no

existing plans to provide water or wastewater services for any future development, although, as mentioned above, the Village is already providing public water to two developments that are the subject of the annexation petition.

The ability to provide public water and sewer is important to the analysis under this criterion because the municipality whose territory contains the property after the petition is decided will possess land use authority to regulate subsequent development or changes on the proposed annexed parcels of land.

Thus, if annexation is not approved, the Town will maintain its land use authority and control over the lands that are the subject of the annexation petition. Land use decisions will continue to be guided by the Comprehensive Plan and land use regulations that implement the plan. It is expected that the lands will remain as described in the Comprehensive Plan "... a bedroom community, located in an attractive wooded setting in the New York metropolitan commuter-shed". It is likely, however, that development will continue to occur in this area and the Village will be called upon to provide water and possibly waste water services, as it is currently doing. Thus, the Village is likely to have a role in future land use of the parcels involved even if annexation does not occur.

If annexation is approved, land use jurisdiction over the annexed parcels of land would fall to the Village. Land use decisions will be guided by the Village's comprehensive Plan and implementing land use regulations. Development will be more dependent on walking and mass transit as a major mode of transportation, with the existing road system basically consisting of local and collector streets.

I conclude that the second criterion favors the Village Board being selected to serve as lead agency for this review. This is based on the fact that the Village has an incrementally greater breadth of authority as the provider of water and sewer services and will continue to have a role in land use decisions effecting properties that are the subject of the annexation petition whether or not the annexation is approved (see *Commissioner's lead agency decision in Town Board of the Town of North Greenbush, supra*). At the same time, both agencies have a similar breadth of jurisdiction as it relates to the annexation decision and zoning.



C. Third Criterion

The third criterion asks which agency has the greatest capability for providing the most thorough environmental assessment of the proposed action.

Both parties to this dispute have argued that they possess the capability to conduct a SEQOR review on large and potentially complicated projects. The Village Board has organized a team of consultants to assist it with the SEQOR review for this annexation. Nonetheless, either party has a similar ability to acquire consultants to assist in an environmental review.

I find, therefore, that this criterion favors neither the Village Board nor the Town Board to serve in the role of lead agency.

FINDING


After considering the relevant criteria under 6 NYCRR Part 617.6(b)(5)(v), I conclude that the Village Board should be designated lead agency for the environmental review of the proposed annexation because the Village Board has the broadest governmental powers for investigation of the impacts of the proposed actions whether annexation occurs or not.

My decision does not change or diminish the jurisdiction of the Town Board in its role as an involved agency. Impacts identified by the Town Board must be considered during the review of this project. Substantive issues raised by interested parties, including the school districts, during this lead agency decision process should also be incorporated into the review of this project. As I pointed out above, where such impacts are fiscal, they would more likely be considered under the GML §711 public interest standard than be considerations in determining the environmental significance of the action under SEQOR.

I remind the Village Board of the commitment made in its February 7, 2014 correspondence, which I was pleased to see, to implement an "enhanced" and transparent coordinated review. This review is to include, along with the expected procedures under SEQOR, the additional procedures of conducting a public scoping session, the establishment of a publicly accessible internet website to make documents available electronically and the intention to conduct a public SEQOR hearing on a Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement.

The record developed during the environmental review must support the decisions of each involved agency. Accordingly, I encourage the Town Board and all interested parties including the school districts to actively participate in all phases of the environmental review of this proposal. I further encourage the Village Board to openly facilitate that participation.

Dated: 1/28/2015  
Albany, New York

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Joseph B. Martens, Commissioner

### **Distribution of Copies**

#### **Agencies/Applicant**

Daniel Ruzow (Whiteman, Osterman and Hanna LLC), representing  
the Board of Trustees of the Village of Kiryas Joel  
Michael Donnelly (Dickover, Donnelly & Donovan, LLP), counsel to  
the Town of Monroe  
Hon. Abraham Wieder, Mayor, Village of Kiryas Joel  
Harley E. Doles III, Supervisor, Town Board of the Town of  
Monroe

#### **Interested Parties**

Daniel Petigrow, Esq. (Thomas, Drohan, Waxman, Petigrow & Maple,  
LLP) representing the Monroe-Woodbury Central School  
District

#### **New York State Department of Environmental Conservation**

Martin D. Brand, Regional Director, Region 3  
Zackary Knaub, Regional Attorney, Region 3  
Daniel Whitehead, Regional Permit Administrator, Region 3  
Lawrence H. Weintraub, Esq., Office of General Counsel, Albany  
Robert L. Ewing, Division of Environmental Permits, Albany

**VILLAGE OF KIRYAS JOEL  
VILLAGE BOARD**

**RESOLUTION**

**ESTABLISHING THE VILLAGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES AS LEAD AGENCY,  
DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE (POSITIVE DECLARATION),  
AND PUBLIC SCOPING UNDER THE NEW YORK STATE ENVIRONMENTAL  
QUALITY REVIEW ACT WITH RESPECT TO ANNEXATION OF 507+/- ACRES  
FROM THE TOWN OF MONROE TO THE VILLAGE OF KIRYAS JOEL**

**February 6, 2015**

WHEREAS, on or about December 23, 2013, certain private property owners (“petitioners”) filed a petition with the Village of Kiryas Joel (“Village”) and Town of Monroe (“Town”) to annex approximately 507+/- acres of territory comprised of 177 tax lots from the Town to the Village (“Annexation Petition”); and

WHEREAS, the petitioners represent a majority in assessed valuation of the real property in the territory proposed to be annexed, according to the 2013 Final Assessment Roll of the Town, dated June 20, 2013; and

WHEREAS, on January 28, 2015, the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation Commissioner designated the Village Board of Trustees (“Village Board”) to serve as Lead Agency for review of the Annexation Petition under provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act and its regulations at 6 NYCRR Part 617 (“SEQRA”); and

WHEREAS, under SEQRA, since the Annexation Petition seeks annexation of 100 or more contiguous acres of land, the Annexation Petition is classified as a Type I action;

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT**, the Village Board has been established as SEQRA Lead Agency and, as SEQRA Lead Agency, hereby issues a positive declaration of environmental significance for the Annexation Petition, finding that there is at

least one potential adverse environmental effect that may result from the Annexation Petition, and incorporating by reference into this resolution the attached Notice of Positive Declaration;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT, the Village Board, as SEQRA Lead Agency, will require the preparation of a Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement (DGEIS) for the review of the proposed Annexation Petition and that public scoping is authorized and will be undertaken as set forth in the attached Notice of Positive Declaration; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT, a draft scope of the DGEIS has been prepared by the Village's environmental consultant for public comment and, together with the Notice of Positive Declaration, should be filed, circulated and published as required by SEQRA; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT, the Village Administrator is directed to arrange for the scheduling and conduct of a public meeting to receive comments on the draft scope in accordance with the provisions of SEQRA.

On the motion of Trustee Landau, seconded by Trustee Goldstein, the foregoing resolution was adopted on a vote of 4 ayes, 0 nays, and 1 abs.

Dated: February 6, 2015

# VILLAGE OF KIRYAS JOEL

## NOTICE OF DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE AND PUBLIC SCOPING (Positive Declaration) for ANNEXATION OF 507 +/- ACRES FROM THE TOWN OF MONROE TO THE VILLAGE OF KIRYAS JOEL

Please take notice that, according to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act (“SEQRA”) and its regulations at 6 NYCRR Part 617, the Village of Kiryas Joel Board of Trustees as lead agency for the review of the action named below finds as follows:

**Action:** Petition for Annexation of 507+/- Acres from the Town of Monroe to the Village of Kiryas Joel.

Pursuant to 6 NYCRR Part 617.6(b)(4), as an annexation of 100 or more contiguous acres of land, this Action is classified as a Type I Action. Consistent with the presumption that Type I actions are more likely to require the preparation of an EIS than Unlisted actions, the Village of Kiryas Joel Board of Trustees, in accordance with 6 NYCRR Part 617.7, has determined that a Positive Declaration of Environmental Impact shall be issued and a Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement (DGEIS) will be prepared for this Action. The Action may include the potential for significant environmental effects including the potential for an increased demand on certain community resources, including water and sewer, and the potential for impacts of future development. Public scoping for the DGEIS will be undertaken by the Village.

**Contact Person:** Gedalye Szegedin, Administrator

**Address:** Village of Kiryas Joel  
P.O. Box 566  
Monroe, New York 10949

**Name of Project:** Petition for Annexation of 507+/- Acres from the Town of Monroe to the Village of Kiryas Joel

**Location:** Village of Kiryas Joel / Town of Monroe

**Tax Map Parcel:** 177 tax lots located in the Town of Monroe, Orange County

**Project Description:** This action involves a petition by 116 private property owner petitioners to annex approximately 507+/- acres of territory comprised of 177 tax lots from the Town of Monroe to the Village. Although no specific plans for development have been submitted, it is anticipated that the undeveloped properties will be developed over time consistent with Village Zoning should annexation be approved.

**Scoping Session:** Public scoping will take place for the project and a public scoping meeting will be held on March 3, 2015 from 7:00-9:30 P.M. at the following location: “Bais Rachel Paradise Hall,” 5 Israel Zupnick Dr., Monroe, NY 10950. In the event there are a large number of people wishing to provide verbal comments, a time limit of 3 minutes per person will apply.

Written comments on the draft scope of the DGEIS will be accepted through close of business March 10, 2015 and directed to: Tim Miller Associates, Inc., 10 North Street, Cold Spring, NY 10516.

A Draft Scoping Outline is available online at: [KJ-SEQRA.com/507Acres](http://KJ-SEQRA.com/507Acres) or upon request to the Contact Person listed above.

**SEQRA Status:** Type I, coordinated

**Date of Action:** February 6, 2015

**VILLAGE OF KIRYAS JOEL  
VILLAGE BOARD**

**RESOLUTION**

**ACCEPTANCE OF FINAL WRITTEN SCOPE FOR THE DRAFT GENERIC  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT UNDER THE NEW YORK STATE  
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW ACT WITH RESPECT TO A PETITION FOR  
ANNEXATION OF 507 +/- ACRES FROM THE TOWN OF MONROE TO THE  
VILLAGE OF KIRYAS JOEL**

**March 20, 2015**

WHEREAS, on or about December 27, 2013, certain private property owners (“petitioners”) filed a petition with the Village of Kiryas Joel (“Village”) and Town of Monroe (“Town”) to annex approximately 507 +/- acres of territory comprised of 177 tax lots from the Town to the Village (“Annexation Petition”); and

WHEREAS, the petitioners represent a majority in assessed valuation of the real property in the territory proposed to be annexed, according to the 2014 Final Assessment Roll of the Town, dated June 20, 2013; and

WHEREAS, on December 31, 2013, the Village Board of Trustees (“Village Board”) sent a Notice of Intent to Establish itself as Lead Agency for review of the Annexation Petition under provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act and its regulations at 6 NYCRR Part 617 (“SEQRA”) to the Town of Monroe Town Board; and

WHEREAS, on or about January 28, 2015, the Commissioner of the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation issued a determination designating the Village Board as SEQRA lead agency; and

WHEREAS, on or about February 6, 2015, the Village Board adopted a resolution issuing a positive declaration under SEQRA and commencing a voluntary public scoping process for a Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement (“DGEIS”) by publishing and circulating a draft scope for public review and comment in accordance with the provisions of SEQRA; and



WHEREAS, on or about March 3, 2015, the Village Board conducted a voluntary scoping meeting on the draft scope at the Bais Rachel Paradise Hall, 5 Israel Zupnick Dr., Monroe, NY, to receive public comments on the draft scope in accordance with the provisions of SEQRA; and

WHEREAS, the Village Board accepted additional written public comment on the draft scope for the DGEIS through March 10, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the Village Board has posted the transcript of the public scoping meeting and all of the written comments received on a dedicated public website managed by its consultant Tim Miller Associates; and

WHEREAS, the Village Board carefully reviewed and considered all of the public comments on the draft scope and conferred with its consultant Tim Miller Associates to produce a final scope for the DGEIS.

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT**, the Village Board hereby accepts and issues the attached final scope for the DGEIS on the Annexation Petition and instructs its consultant Tim Miller Associates to file, publish and circulate the final scope in accordance with the provisions of SEQRA; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT**, the Village Board hereby instructs its consultant Tim Miller Associates to proceed with the preparation of the DGEIS consistent with the final scope in accordance with the provisions of SEQRA.

On the motion of Trustee Moshe Goldstein, seconded by Trustee Jacob Reisman, the foregoing resolution was adopted on a vote of 4 ayes, 0 nays, and 1 abs.

Dated: March 20, 2015

**SCOPING OUTLINE**  
**FOR**  
**PROPOSED 507-ACRE ANNEXATION to VILLAGE OF KIRYAS JOEL**  
**DRAFT GENERIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**  
**VILLAGE OF KIRYAS JOEL & TOWN OF MONROE**  
**ORANGE COUNTY, NEW YORK**

March 17, 2015  
*Date Adopted: March 20, 2015*

*Lead Agency and Contact Person:*  
Village of Kiryas Joel Board of Trustees  
51 Forest Road, Monroe, New York 10950  
Contact: Mr. Gedalye Szegedin, Village Administrator  
(845) 783-8300

*Petitioner:*  
Monroe KJ Consulting LLC  
P. O. Box 51, Monroe, New York 10949  
Contact: Steven Barshov, Esq.  
c/o Sive, Paget & Riesel, PC  
460 Park Avenue, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor, New York, N.Y. 10022  
(646) 378-7229

*Involved Agency:*  
Town of Monroe Town Board  
Town Hall  
11 Stage Road, Monroe, New York 10950  
Contact: Harley E. Doles III, Town Supervisor  
(845) 783-1900 Ext 227

**DRAFT GENERIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT  
for the Proposed 507-Acre Annexation to the Village of Kiryas Joel**

GENERAL GUIDELINES

The Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement (DGEIS) will cover all items in this Scoping document. Each impact issue will be presented as it relates to existing conditions, future conditions without the annexation and future conditions with the annexation as presently planned, and mitigation measures available to minimize the identified impacts.

Narrative discussions will be accompanied by appropriate tables, charts, graphs, and figures whenever possible. If a particular subject can be most effectively described in graphic format or separate report, the narrative discussion may merely summarize and highlight the information presented graphically or in the report. All plans and maps showing the site of the action will include the adjacent properties.

Information will be presented in a manner which can be readily understood by the public. Efforts will be made to avoid the use of technical jargon in the narrative text; technical subject matter should be placed in a technical appendix.

The DGEIS will address only those potential significant adverse environmental impacts that can be reasonably anticipated and/or have been identified in the scoping process associated with the proposed action.

Discussions of mitigation measures will indicate which measures could be incorporated into future site specific project plans. Mitigation will include consideration of avoidance and minimization of impacts.

The document and any appendices or technical reports will be written in the third person (i.e., the terms "we" and "our" should not be used). Any assumptions incorporated into assessments of impact will be clearly identified. In such cases, the reasonable "worst case" scenario analysis may also be identified and discussed.

## CONTENTS of the DGEIS

### COVER SHEET

- A. State it is a draft generic statement.
- B. Title/name of the action.
- C. Location (county and municipality) of the action.
- D. Name and address of the lead agency; name and telephone number of the person to contact at the lead agency for information.
- E. Date of acceptance of the document.
- F. Date of public hearing
- G. Deadline date by which comments are due.
- H. List names of individuals or organizations that prepared any portion of the statement.

### SUMMARIES

- A. Table of Contents.
- B. Brief description of the Proposed Action.
- C. Outline significant beneficial and adverse impacts.
- D. Issues of controversy.
- E. Proposed mitigation measures.
- F. Adverse impacts that cannot be avoided.
- G. Alternatives considered.
- H. Irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources.
- I. Growth inducing aspects.
- J. Use and conservation of resources.
- K. Approvals necessary to implement the action.

#### I. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

The proposed action involves the review and determination under the Municipal Annexation Law, Article 17 of the General Municipal Law, of the petition of December 23, 2013, by the private property owners to annex approximately 507 acres of territory comprised of 177 tax lots from the Town of Monroe to the Village of Kiryas Joel.<sup>1</sup> The proposed action does not involve any particular development project. Nonetheless, the DGEIS will evaluate reasonable hypothetical build-out alternatives.

#### A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The 507-acre territory proposed to be annexed to the Village of Kiryas Joel is located in the Town of Monroe and abuts the existing Village boundaries. The Village, likewise, is

---

<sup>1</sup> The December 2013 Annexation Petition indicates an area of approximately 510 acres proposed for annexation. Subsequent calculation of the area has refined that number to approximately 507 acres.

located entirely within the Town. The petitioners are the landowners and persons who have petitioned for annexation to the Village. The annexation is proposed so that petitioners' properties will be within the Village and provided with Village services, including central water and sewer services, public schools, public safety and fire protection services, full-time paid EMS, daily sanitation pick-up, day care and head start services, pedestrian friendly communities with access to sidewalks and public transportation, use of Village parks, streetlights, municipal water supply for fire protection (hydrants), and affordable housing and health care services with specialty care to accommodate larger families, among other services.

The determination by the Town and Village is whether the petition for annexation complies with the provisions of Article 17 of the General Municipal Law (the "Municipal Annexation Law"), and "whether, on the basis of considerations including but not limited to those relating to the effects upon (a) the territory proposed to be annexed, (b) the local government to which the territory is proposed to be annexed, (c) the remaining area of the local government in which the territory is situated and (d) any school district, fire district or other district corporation, public benefit corporation, fire protection district, fire alarm district or town or county improvement district, situated wholly or partly in such territory, it is in the over-all public interest to approve such proposed annexation."

A separate Annexation Petition was filed by some of the same property owners in August 20, 2014 proposing a smaller annexation to the Village (approximately 164 acres), all lands which are proposed to be annexed in this current action. To assure a full and complete environmental review, the potential environmental impacts of the August 2014 Annexation Petition will be identified and assessed in the Alternatives chapter.

The 507-acre Annexation Petition was filed with the Village and Town of Monroe on or about December 23, 2013. On or about December 30, 2013, the Village issued a notice to the Town of the Village's intent to serve as the lead agency of a coordinated SEQRA review in accordance with SEQRA section 617.6(b)(3). The Town objected to the Village's lead agency role and pursuant to section 617.6(b)(5)(i) of the SEQRA regulations, several requests were filed with the Commissioner of the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation ("NYSDEC") to designate a lead agency for the SEQRA review of the December 2013 petition. Designation of the Board of Trustees of the Village of Kiryas Joel as the lead agency was made by the NYSDEC Commissioner on January 28, 2015. As it had intended for the December 2013 Annexation Petition, on February 6, 2015, the Village issued a positive declaration, determining to prepare a Generic Environmental Impact Statement ("GEIS"). A GEIS is the appropriate vehicle to assess this Annexation action since no specific development project has been identified or applied for.

The GEIS will assess the potential impacts from both the December 2013 Annexation Petition and the August 2014 Annexation Petition undertaking the same quantitative analyses for both, thereby addressing concerns raised in comments on the draft scoping

document for the 2014 Petition that anything other than such an analysis could yield an impermissibly segmented SEQRA review.

## 1. Background

The Village of Kiryas Joel was incorporated as a village in 1977, and expanded through annexation in the 1980s. The Village presently consists of approximately 700 acres of land located north of New York State Route 17 within the Town of Monroe.

The Village since its inception has been almost entirely comprised of members of the Satmar Hasidic Jewish community. For purposes of preparing the DGEIS, the demographic characteristics of the Village are significant in order to accurately project its future population growth with and without the proposed action. A cultural norm of the Satmar Hasidic community is that practically all women marry and raise their families in the community where they have been raised. Men choosing to marry Kiryas Joel women are either living in the community already or move into the community when married. The DGEIS will analyze recent rates of in-migration and out-migration and apply them in the growth projection.

The Village's demographic characteristics were last comprehensively analyzed in the 2009 demographic study that is part of the Amended FEIS developed for the Village in support of its NYC Aqueduct connection and pipeline project.<sup>2</sup> The 2009 study projected an average annual population growth rate in the Village of approximately 4.52 percent. The DGEIS will provide a new projection using a methodology based on the number of new families that are created by the recently graduated females from the Kiryas Joel schools and other relevant demographic factors.

## B. PROJECT PURPOSE, NEED AND BENEFITS

1. Background and history of the Village of Kiryas Joel and annexation lands, historic growth and anticipated trends.
2. Needs and benefits to private annexation petitioners for services provided by Village of Kiryas Joel, Town of Monroe, County of Orange and school districts.
3. Degree of consistency of the proposed annexation with local and regional plans for accommodating need for services by the future population.
4. Economic benefits of the action as relates to infrastructure and other services.

## C. APPROVALS NEEDED

The only approvals required for the Annexation action are Annexation Approval Resolutions by both the Town Board of the Town of Monroe and Board of Trustees of

---

<sup>2</sup> AKRF, Inc., "Growth Study for Village of Kiryas Joel Amended FEIS for the Proposed Connection to the New York City Catskill Aqueduct", January 2009. [Appendix B of VKJ Oct. 2013]

the Village of Kiryas Joel pursuant to the Municipal Annexation Law, Article 17 of the General Municipal Law.

- a. List of Involved Agencies with jurisdiction by law to fund, approve or directly undertake the action:
  - Town Board, Town of Monroe
  - Board of Trustees, Village of Kiryas Joel
- b. List of Interested Agencies that lack jurisdiction to fund, approve or directly undertake an action but wish to participate in the SEQRA review process. A listing of agencies that have requested to participate to date is appended hereto.

## II. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, ANTICIPATED IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES

### A. LAND USE AND ZONING

#### 1. Existing Conditions

- a. This section will describe the existing land uses and residential densities of the Village of Kiryas Joel and the Town of Monroe as well as any adjacent lands.
- b. The existing zoning of the Village of Kiryas Joel and Town of Monroe will be presented.
- c. Local and Orange County land use plans, zoning codes and other local land use laws applicable to Kiryas Joel and the Town of Monroe will be summarized.
- d. Relevant provisions from the Orange County Comprehensive Plan (including its 2010 amendments) and other identified regional land use plans and reports will be summarized.

#### 2. Potential Impacts - Without and With Annexation

- a. Evaluate and discuss reasonable development scenarios based upon historic development patterns in the Village and Town.
- b. Potential development activities and densities as relates to the applicable zoning codes, and timeframes, will be evaluated and discussed.
- c. Relationship between annexation territory and adjoining land uses will be discussed, including compatibility of land uses on adjacent parcels within the T. Monroe, T/V Woodbury, V. South Blooming Grove and T. Blooming Grove.
- d. Consistency with County or other regional land use plans and municipal comprehensive plans will be reviewed and evaluated.
- e. Impacts associated with adjacent parcels remaining in the Town of Monroe.

- f. Identify potential impacts to remaining Town of Monroe parcels affected by Village/Town boundary adjustment.
- g. Effect of removing approximately 184 acres of UR-M zoned land from the Town of Monroe.
- h. Effect on pre-existing undeveloped land use approvals issued by the Town (if any) in the annexation territory as well as any other identified zoning conflicts created by annexation.

3. Mitigation Measures

B. DEMOGRAPHICS AND FISCAL RESOURCES

1. Existing Conditions - Demographic and Fiscal

In this section, the following topics will be presented:

- a. Existing population and housing types in Kiryas Joel and the annexation lands in Monroe
- b. Existing household size
- c. Existing and projected population growth
- d. Existing tax revenue sources, other revenue sources, and budgets for Town of Monroe, Village of Kiryas Joel, Monroe-Woodbury School District, Kiryas Joel School District and Orange County
- e. Sources of funding for municipal services
- f. Socioeconomic characteristics that relate to social services needs

2. Potential Impacts - Demographic and Fiscal - Without and With Annexation

The following topics will be reviewed in both scenarios as relates to the Town of Monroe and Village of Kiryas Joel:

- a. Projected population using services
- b. Projected increase/decrease in tax revenues
- c. Projected increase/decrease in school populations and school tax revenues for Kiryas Joel and Monroe-Woodbury school districts
- d. Future assessed property values of annexation lands, including relative affordability
- e. Fiscal implications of annexation on the Orange County Sewer District #1 and Monroe Joint Fire District
- f. Projected County expenditures for social services

3. Mitigation Measures



## C. COMMUNITY SERVICES AND FACILITIES

### 1. Existing Conditions

Staffing, equipment and service levels for Kiryas Joel and the annexation lands in Monroe will be presented based on available information and interviews with service providers in the following areas:

- a. Police Services
- b. Fire Protection of the Monroe and Kiryas Joel fire departments and Emergency Medical (Ambulance) Services
  - 1) Description of the capabilities and limitations
  - 2) Number of responses
  - 3) Equipment
  - 4) Number of firefighters, volunteer or paid status, work shifts, qualifications and training, SCBA qualified firefighters
  - 5) Mutual aid
- c. Health Care Services
- d. Schools in Kiryas Joel and Monroe
- e. Water - discussed in section E
- f. Sewer - discussed in section E
- g. Electric Services
- h. Other Services available to residents of Kiryas Joel and Monroe (including sanitation, public works, recreation, postal services, library)
- i. Road infrastructure and maintenance

### 2. Potential Impacts - Without and With Annexation

- a. Demands on each service listed above and its facilities based on projected population growth, location and timing
- b. Anticipated costs of services versus future tax revenues in Village and Town
- c. Analyze impacts to County facilities, infrastructure and services, including:
  - 1) Social services, including transit systems
  - 2) Emergency services
  - 3) OC Sewer District #1 - discussed in section E
  - 4) County Routes 44 and 105 - discussed in section D
- d. Potential changes in social service characteristics based on annexation, such as displacement of population, employment or businesses; changes in employment; changes in number of persons receiving public assistance.
- e. Expectations of any service decisions or adjustments the County may need to make as a result of the annexation and annexation alternatives.
- f. Effect on Kiryas Joel and Monroe-Woodbury school districts without and with the same change in school district boundaries.
- g. Changes in responsibility for road infrastructure (maintenance and repair).

3. Mitigation Measures

D. TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION

1. Existing Conditions

- a. Describe the roadway network serving Kiryas Joel and the annexation parcels.
- b. Describe public and private transportation services and existing sidewalk network.
- c. Describe the size and capacity (i.e., number of lanes) of the following key locations:
  - Northeast of Forest Avenue/Schunneunk Road Bridge over Route 17
  - Bakertown Road north of CR 105
  - Acres Road west of CR 105
  - CR 44 (Seven Springs Mountain Road) east of Seven Springs Road
  - Route 208 at Route 17 Exit 130
  - CR 64 (Dunderberg Rd & Nininger Road)
  - Larkin Drive
- d. Document existing weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hour traffic on the four link locations with actual counts.
- e. Discuss weekend traffic.
- f. Document existing transportation network including bus routes, Park & Ride lots.
- g. Discuss projects in the project area that NYSDOT has identified relative to areas of existing congestion or safety issues under the NYS Transportation Improvement Program.

2. Potential Impacts - Without and With Annexation

- a. Identify trip generation and distribution of future development activities based on density of both development scenarios.
- b. Identify other major development activities in the vicinity which will affect the roadway network including currently approved projects that are pending development that will add traffic to the network.
- c. Identify overall traffic growth rates for the area.
- d. Compare project's relative effect on traffic volumes in areas of existing or potential congestion.
- e. Qualitative analyses for existing conditions, future conditions without the action and future conditions with the action, including impacts to County Routes 44 and 105.
- f. Conceptual discussion of long term traffic growth.
- g. Noise and air quality related to traffic.

3. Mitigation Measures

- a. Discuss availability of transportation services, extension of sidewalk network, or other transportation management tools to accommodate annexation area.

E. COMMUNITY WATER AND SEWER

1. Existing Conditions

- a. Discuss environmental setting, watersheds, and general groundwater conditions.
- b. Discuss existing water supply capacity and infrastructure in Kiryas Joel and in the annexation territory. Discuss plans for future capacity and infrastructure including status of the connection to NYC water supply. Map of annexation parcels that currently have public water infrastructure and which municipality if any is providing said service.
- c. Status of the Village's and Town's ability to provide water service for any future development.
- d. Discuss opportunities/limitations to establishing private wells in annexation area.
- e. Discuss sewer service capacity and infrastructure for the municipal plant in Kiryas Joel and the Harriman Plant and anticipated expansions or infrastructure improvements. Map of annexation parcels that currently have sewer infrastructure and which municipality if any is providing said service.
- f. Proximate location of Village infrastructure for water and sewer transmission in vicinity of annexation lands.
- g. Status of the Village's, Town's or County's ability to provide sewer service for any future development. Data will be sought from Orange County Sewer District #1.
- h. Discuss opportunities/limitations to establishing private septic in annexation lands.

2. Potential Impacts - Without and With Annexation

- a. Demand for water, impact on existing systems, and ability of facilities and groundwater aquifer to accommodate same with or without annexation.
- b. Demand for sewer, impact on existing systems, and ability of facilities to accommodate same with or without annexation.
- c. Impact on Orange County Sewer District #1, including estimates on volumes of additional sewage that will enter the District's wastewater system over time.
- d. Potential effect on the Ramapo River.
- e. Responsibilities for implementation and costs to provide water and sewer services.

- f. Water supply and capacity for fire-fighting.

3. Mitigation Measures

- a. Provision of public water and sewer to annexation lands.
- b. Potential conditions to both Water Supply Permits and WWTP SPDES discharge permits.
- c. NYC Aqueduct connection.
- d. Potential conservation measures for both water and sewer use.

## F. NATURAL RESOURCES

1. Existing Conditions

- a. Discuss existing characteristics in and around Kiryas Joel and the annexation lands as they apply to any unusual or constraining condition relative to development in the following subject areas. General identification of natural resources (e.g. regulated wetlands) will be based on existing maps and records. The GEIS will not include property-specific wetlands delineations or flora and fauna studies which will remain the obligation of future development proposals.

- Geology, soils, topography
- Unique or unusual habitats, Designated Significant Natural Communities and protected species
- Town, State and Federal regulated wetlands, protected streams and other surface water resources
- Stormwater management
- Local aquifers

2. Potential Impacts - Without and With Annexation

- a. Estimate future development disturbance and potential implications for natural resources in annexation lands.
- b. Impacts to water resources, habitats, and land resources with land development including impervious surfaces and management of stormwater.
- c. Cumulative impacts to natural resources, including cumulative effects to groundwater and watersheds.

3. Mitigation Measures

- a. Avoidance; mitigation; timing.

## G. CULTURAL RESOURCES

1. Existing Conditions
  - a. General description of the visual and scenic resources of the study area
  - b. General description of historic/cultural resources
  - c. Recreational resources
2. Potential Impacts - Without and With Annexation
  - a. Impact on viewsheds, ridgelines and designated scenic resources of the study area
  - b. Impact on community character
  - c. Impact on existing local recreational resources, including Crane Park, the Highlands Trail/Long Path and Gonzaga Park.
3. Mitigation Measures
  - a. Preserve recreational access to the Highlands Trail/Long Path and Gonzaga Park.

## III. THRESHOLDS FOR FUTURE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS

This section will set forth specific conditions or criteria under which future site-specific actions in the annexation territory may be undertaken or approved, including requirements for any subsequent SEQRA compliance.

In accordance with 617.10(d), when a final generic EIS has been filed under this part:

- (1) No further SEQR compliance is required if a subsequent proposed action will be carried out in conformance with the conditions and thresholds established for such actions in the generic EIS or its findings statement;
- (2) An amended findings statement must be prepared if the subsequent proposed action was adequately addressed in the generic EIS but was not addressed or was not adequately addressed in the findings statement for the generic EIS;
- (3) A negative declaration must be prepared if a subsequent proposed action was not addressed or was not adequately addressed in the generic EIS and the subsequent action will not result in any significant environmental impacts;

(4) A supplement to the final generic EIS must be prepared if the subsequent proposed action was not addressed or was not adequately addressed in the generic EIS and the subsequent action may have one or more significant adverse environmental impacts.

#### IV. ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS WHICH CANNOT BE AVOIDED IF THE PROJECT IS IMPLEMENTED

List those potential adverse environmental effects identified in Section II that can be expected to occur regardless of the mitigation measures considered.

#### V. ALTERNATIVES

This section will describe and evaluate a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed annexation action that are feasible, considering the objectives and capabilities of the project sponsor (Annexation Petitioners). Discussion of each alternative will be at a level sufficient to permit a comparative assessment of the alternative in relation to the proposed action.

Discussion of each alternative will include the utilization of water, sewer and social services, and impacts on aquifers and surface waters including cumulative effects of increased groundwater withdrawals and wastewater discharges in the watershed.

1. No Action (No Annexation).
2. Annexation of smaller land area in the Town of Monroe identified in the pending August 2014 164-Acre Annexation Petition.

#### VI. IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES

Identify those natural and human resources that will be consumed, converted or otherwise made unavailable for future use.

#### VII. GROWTH INDUCING ASPECTS AND CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

1. Growth inducing impacts of the proposed action.
2. Cumulative environmental impacts related to the development of the annexed lands will be identified and assessed.
3. Effect on overall quality of life and community character in local area

#### VIII. EFFECTS ON THE USE AND CONSERVATION OF ENERGY RESOURCES

1. Discuss potential use and conservation of energy related to the action.
2. Discuss greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions as affect climate change.
3. Discuss sustainability, including consistency with the Mid-Hudson Regional Sustainability Plan, the Mid-Hudson Regional Economic Development Strategy and Progress Reports.

#### APPENDICES

- A. List underlying studies, reports and information considered and relied on in preparing the document.
- B. List all federal, state, regional or local agencies, contacted in preparing the document.
- C. Technical exhibits including technical computations and analyses.
- D. Relevant correspondence regarding the proposed action.
- E. SEQRA documentation.

INVOLVED AGENCIES:

Village of Kiryas Joel Board of Trustees

Town of Monroe Town Board

INTERESTED AGENCIES that lack jurisdiction to fund, approve or directly undertake the action but which have notified the Lead Agency of their wish to participate in the SEQRA review process:

Kiryas Joel Union Free School District

Monroe-Woodbury Central School District

Monroe Conservation Commission

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation - Albany

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation - Region 3

Orange County - County Executive

Orange County Department of Planning

Village of Harriman

Village of Monroe

Village of Woodbury

Village of South Blooming Grove

Town of Woodbury

Town of Blooming Grove

Monroe Joint Fire District Board of Joint Fire Commissioners

New York-New Jersey Trail Conference



NYS Environmental Conservation Law  
Village of Kiryas Joel

**SEQRA**  
**NOTICE OF INTENT TO ESTABLISH LEAD AGENCY**

TO: *All Involved Agencies (see list below)*

Dated: December 30, 2013

This notice is issued pursuant to 6 NYCRR 617.6 of the implementing regulations pertaining to Article 8 (State Environmental Quality Review Act) of the Environmental Conservation Law.

**PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that the Village of Kiryas Joel Board of Trustees intends that it shall be the lead agency for all environmental review of the proposed action described below pursuant to Article 8 (State Environmental Quality Review Act) of the Environmental Conservation Law. Please confirm your agreement ASAP. In the event no other involved agency indicates a desire to be lead agency within thirty days of this notice, the Board of Trustees will confirm its status as lead agency.

NAME OF ACTION:       Petition for annexation to the Village of Kiryas Joel  
  Town of Monroe 510 acres

SEQR STATUS:    Type 1               Annexation of 100+ acres

DESCRIPTION OF ACTION: Annexation of 177 parcels constituting approximately 510 acres to the Village of Kiryas Joel in the Towns of Monroe and Woodbury.

**REASONS SUPPORTING THIS DETERMINATION:**

- (i)     The anticipated impacts of the project are primarily of local Village significance since the properties will be served by the Village if annexed.
- (ii)    This agency has the greatest capability for providing the most thorough environmental assessment of the proposed action.
- (iii)   The Village has requested that the Applicant provide a LEAF.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION:**

Contact Person:    Hon. Gedalye Szegedin, Village Administrator  
Address:             PO Box 566, Monroe, NY 10949  
Telephone Number: (845) 783-8300

**Copies of this Notice Sent to:**

Town of Monroe Town Board, 11 Stage Road, Monroe, NY 10950

Applicants – c/o Steven Barshov, Esq., Sive, Paget & Riesel, PC, 460 Park Ave, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor, New York, NY 10022

# VILLAGE OF KIRYAS JOEL

## NOTICE OF DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE AND PUBLIC SCOPING (Positive Declaration)

for

## ANNEXATION OF 164 ACRES FROM THE TOWN OF MONROE TO THE VILLAGE OF KIRYAS JOEL

Please take notice that, according to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act (“SEQRA”) and its regulations at 6 NYCRR Part 617, the Village of Kiryas Joel Board of Trustees as lead agency for the review of the action named below finds as follows:

**Action:** Petition for Annexation of 164 Acres from the Town of Monroe to the Village of Kiryas Joel

Pursuant to 6 NYCRR Section 617.6(b)(4), while the action involves the annexation of 164 total acres, it does not involve an annexation of 100 or more *contiguous* acres of land by a local agency and, therefore, this action is classified as an Unlisted action. Nevertheless, the Village of Kiryas Joel Board of Trustees, in accordance with 6 NYCRR Section 617.7 has determined that a Positive Declaration of Environmental Impact will be issued and a Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement (DGEIS) will be prepared for this action. Public scoping for the DGEIS will be undertaken by the Village.

**Contact Person:** Gedalye Szegedin, Administrator

**Address:** Village of Kiryas Joel, 51 Forest Road, Suite 340, Monroe, New York 10950

**Name of Project:** Petition for Annexation of 164 Acres from the Town of Monroe to the Village of Kiryas Joel

**Location:** Village of Kiryas Joel / Town of Monroe

**Tax Map Parcel:** 71 tax lots located in the Town of Monroe, Orange County

**Project Description:** This action involves a petition by the owners of a majority in assessed valuation of the real property in the territory proposed to be annexed according to the 2014 Final Assessment Roll of the Town of Monroe, dated June 26, 2014. The territory proposed to be annexed to the Village consists of approximately 164 acres comprised of 71 tax lots in the Town of Monroe. No specific plans for development have been submitted.

**Scoping Session:** Public scoping will take place for the project and a public scoping meeting will be held on September 22, 2014 from 7:00-9:30 P.M. at the following location: “Bais Rachel Paradise Hall,” 5 Israel Zupnick Dr., Monroe, NY 10950. In the event there are a large number of people wishing to provide verbal comments, a time limit of 3 minutes per person will apply.

Written comments on the draft scope of the DGEIS will be accepted through close of business September 30, 2014 and directed to: Tim Miller Associates, Inc., 10 North Street, Cold Spring, NY 10516.

A Draft Scoping Outline is available online at: [KJ-SEQRA.com/164Acres](http://KJ-SEQRA.com/164Acres) or upon request to the Contact Person listed above.

**SEQRA Status:** Unlisted, coordinated

**Date of Action:** September 5, 2014