TOWN OF THOMPSON
PLANNING BOARD
Wednesday, July 10, 2019

IN ATTENDANCE:	Chairman Lou Kiefer	Michael Croissant
	Matthew Sush	Kathleen Lara, Alternate
	Jim Barnicle	Arthur Knapp, Alternate
	Michael Hoyt,	Paula Elaine Kay, Attorney
	Debbie Mitchell, Secretary	MaryBeth Bianconii, Planner
	Richard McGoey, Consulting Engineer	

PUBLIC HEARING

Notice is Hearby Given that pursuant to the provisions of §250-55 of the Town Code of the Town of Thompson, public hearing will be held by the Planning Board of the Town of Thompson at the Town Hall, 4052 Route 42, Monticello, New York on July 10, 2019 at 7:00 p.m. to consider the application of the Freeds Bungalow Colony for site plan review in accordance with §250-8 of the Town Code of the Town of Thompson.

The property is located in the RR1 zone at the 506 Old Liberty Road, Monticello, NY S/B/L: 8.-1-47.1
Joel Kohn

Satisfactory proof of mailing was provided to the Board

Mr. Kohn – This is an existing bungalow colony on the corner of Old Liberty Road and Fraser Road. It has 41 units with private water and sewer. We will be demolishing some units and replace them with 3 new duplexes. We are going to combine 8 of the existing units and demolish old deck and replace them with new decks. Total Density will be decreased from 41 units to 36 units. We are also proposing more parking spaces. There is a one-way road going from Old Liberty Road and exiting onto Fraser Road. The proposed parking will be behind the bungalow colony.

Chairman Kiefer - We would like to see parallel parking along Fraser Road instead of cars pointing in. Mr. Kohn – I've had discussion with the town engineer, we are hashing it out. The Town Engineer has suggested that it should be a couple of feet off the road. Richard McGoey – My concern is that you don't have adequate emergency access. I know this is an existing condition but the Board likes to make improvements. I don't think you can get twenty-feet on that side. The Board discussed making a larger parking area on the back of the lot and eliminate parking a long that lane. Mr. Kohn – I believe at our last meeting we discussed leaving that parking area and make the road as wide as it can go. It might just be a couple of feet. We are proposing twelve parking spaces in the back. Richard McGoey – Why not have more? Mr. Kohn - Because people in front will not park in the back. Richard McGoey – They would if it was a Fire Zone with no parking or no standing. And then the town could control it. Mr. Kohn - We will try and make it as wide as possible. Chairman Kiefer – You have a circle in the middle why not parking in there? You said there is a play area but there is one on the end as well. Mr. Kohn – Yes. It's impossible and impracticable to have the parking in the center. Kathleen Lara – Can you take that play ground and put it in the center? Mr. Kohn – No. Chairman Kiefer – Why? Mr. Kohn - We have children

there and everyone likes to sit out there. Chairman Kiefer – No room between the Bungalows? Mr. Kohn - We discussed all those option at the last meeting. We decided on making the road as wide as possible.

Jim Carnell – Did the Fire Department get a revised copy yet? Mr. Kohn - It was sent out on July 2, 2019.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No Public Comment

A motion to close the Public Hearing was made by Michael Croissant and seconded by Michael Hoyt
5 in favor; 0 opposed

PUBLIC COMMENT CLOSED

Chairman Kiefer called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m.

A motion to approve the June 26, 2019 minutes was made by Michael Hoyt and seconded by Matthew Sush
5 in favor, 0 opposed

GIBBER NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT
Gibber Road, Kiamesha Lake, NY S/B/L: 6.-1-9
Glenn Smith, Engineer
MaryBeth Bianconi, Planner

Mr. Smith - I brought a few copies of the Scoping Document. Some Board members got them and some did not. The idea is to setup a Public Scope meeting. This document here was prepared by Kristen O'Donald from Lance and Tully. The read revision was added by Kristen after we talked to MaryBeth Bianconi, if anything else comes up tonight we will insert it.

MaryBeth Bianconi – As of now the Board is taking over the Scoping Document. This is the statutory written process. What has to go into an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is the law. It is written for people not someone with a PHD. The idea is it should be very straightforward, the text should be relatively simple and easy to read. There will be a section for someone who is super technical. But all of this stuff up front talks about the statutory requirements and the way the document is presented an average person should be able to read and understand.

There's a format for these things. It's is standard to having a cover sheet that identifies you guys, the applicants project, the zoning, what phase is in all those kinds of things.

Table of contents, which will end up reflecting this scoping document. It'll be a traditional table of contents with the title and the page number. It will be the material that's in here.

Executive summary, which is a good thing to have. These documents have a tendency to get really big. It's nice to be able to have something that points out what's going. We find that when the public looks at these as a member of the public, they have a very specific concern. Say traffic or water quality. It's a lot easier for people to understand and identify what's going on when they have a summary.

The description of the project, this is an interesting process when we do any EIS before site plan review, so we have a conceptual plan. We have a sketch plan that's was the basis for declaring the positive declaration. One of the things that will inevitably happen is the SEQRA processes. It's unraveling and coming together and research is done. The way that the plan looks is going to be informed. It's going to change based on this review. The idea is that you go through this environment review, figure out what/how you can minimize or eliminate these environmental impacts through site plan changes. All these different things at the end of this process will have something that will be a very solid plan because you will have given all this consideration to it. That you would often do in a site plan. There will still be some detail's that you will deal with but, that's part of this process. Just one quick example, as we look at the conceptual plan, the wells are identified on the plan, their structures, and all kinds of things very close to those wells. They're probably going to change because you're going to need an area of protection around them as well. That'll be a change that we know will come down the pike but it'll come down as the water supply aspect of this work is done. The project description is going to be the product description of the project that we have today, because we're not going to have a crystal ball, you don't know what those changes will be. That's okay, an EIS is still a point in time document, it'll be based on what we get. At the end of this process we will have a project description, it will be whatever is being approved to through the SEQRA process. This process will also identify the permits and approvals that are required not only by you, but other folks as well. Because this whole process is a coordinated process, all the documentation that's developed, including the Scoping Document will be sent to the Department of Health and all of the other folks who request it. Eventually I need to review this project, an issue a permit or approval. It's a good thing if you think about it, because then everybody has all the same information. When the applicant gets to the end of SEQRA and we have a finding statement it will pave the path for those permits, because a lot of the thought process in the interior it's necessary to go get those permits that have already been done. That's a good thing. Matthew Sush - Then you don't have any surprises with other permits need. MaryBeth Bianconi - No surprises, because in a coordinated review its sort of a speak now and forever hold your piece process. The need of the EIS will end up being a chapter three, which is the identification of existing conditions, potential impacts of proposed mitigation measures. The topics that are in here are topics that we would typically see in a document like this. These should be the minimum topics that we should be looking at if you review this. When the public's reviewing this and they see a topic that isn't covered here one of the things that we have to think about is, what ends up in the document. SEQRA has an underpinning that says that these things should be important, no trivial details are going to come out when you get to the site plan. You're looking at all those kinds of things, but important things. We think about soils and topography, we think about erosion, sediment control, construction, and steep slopes. These topics are kind of the big umbrella topics.

We do have soils and typography; In here there's a discussion about how the existing conditions will be identified and what will be identified. Potential impacts, initially seemed reasonable and should be identified at least and then mitigation measures. Again, we're kind of predicting a little bit about what

those might be and there may be more in the file document, but we have to have something to start with. In this case it would be a storm water prevention plan.

Surface water and stormwater, this is the same thing as streams & wetlands. Those things will be confirmed by other Regulatory Agencies, as a coordination process is happening. This is a little predictive, it's not the end-all to be-all it could very well change.

Ground water in the water supply, they are proposing to use groundwater as a source of potable water so this is really focused very much on wells, pump testing, controls, potential impact on other wells, Wetlands, those kinds of things. Mitigation measures for this may be for different Wells, may be moving things around the site to accommodate protection of wellheads, those kinds of things.

Wastewater Management, this project was originally proposed to have its own waste water treatment plant. That has changed in the current application. There was to be a connection to the town's Kiamesha waste water treatment plant. This section is going to largely deal with determining the demand of the projects. We know that it's a residential use in character and then working with the town to determine the infrastructure would be necessary to convey. Evaluated the treatment plant to determine if there's any mitigation measures that would need to be done to accommodate us.

Vegetation and Wildlife, in this case the focus is largely going to be on Bald Eagles because it's the species of concern. The others are identified during field visits. We will also be looking obviously not only at its both flora and fauna animals as well as vegetation. One of the things that you see noted there is something called a taking permit. I don't know if you guys have had any of those here but, if there is habitat on a site that is considered by the DEC or by the US Fish and Wildlife as being something that is vital to the survival of a species of concern, if that habitat fragmentation would happen or the habitat would be eliminated, in favor of buildings, parking lots and roads. Or maybe you know trees are the habitat for certain kinds of bats and the trees are being removed for those kinds of things, then a state issues a taking permit. In the SEQRA process we want to identify that because taking permits required compensatory mitigation. Meaning if we're going to take some habitats away over here then we have to establish some habitat someplace else. That all needs to be part of our review. Don't get worried we have a biologist on our staff and Richard McGoey probably has access to all of that as well. At the end of the day this is not your permitting authority it's the states. We just need to as the lead agency make sure the state take care of that.

Traffic counts are proposed at certain intersections, I would encourage all of you to look at these intersections and see if it's an adequate list of intersections to do traffic count at. Richard McGoey – We should have our Traffic Consultant look at this as well. MaryBeth Bianconi – Yes, to make sure we're not missing something. Paula Kay – Did we have him engaged on this project? Mr. Smith – Yes. MaryBeth Bianconi – A traffic impact analysis will be done, it will look at existing conditions, the addition of this project and any other future growth to determine the function of intersections safety, site distance, stop distance, if a road needs to be widened or a turn lane needs to be added. This section also includes a review of the internal road system as well as the provision of parking. Because that's an important aspect of Transportation.

Land Use Zoning and Community Character, this is a description of Land Use and Zoning. This is currently proposing to evaluate the land use and zoning of the project site as well as land within a half a mile of this site. You will need to determine if a half a mile is enough. Should it be a little bigger or is that too far. Look at the half of Mile and think, will that capture what we need to look at in terms of impacts on Land Use and Zoning. This site is a bit isolated it's not something that's going to be visible to a lot of people. One of the things that is not included in here is a large discussion about visual impacts other than the site design, including Landscaping and building heights. Jim Barnicle – Sidewalks!

MaryBeth Bianconi - Community Services, this section is dealing with Emergency Services, Police and Fire and a review of the ability to serve as well as the site design. Requirements for that and particularly since this is a project that is proposing to have an on-site well system. You have to think about things like tanks, fire pumps and generators, so that if there was a fire there, the Fire Department can actually put out the fire.

Unavoidable Adverse Environmental Impacts. This one's a little interesting so whenever we do anything on the land, we're changing. It's not about just changes, it's about an Unavoidable Adverse Environmental Impact. I will tell you that it's hard to find Unavoidable Adverse Environmental Impacts on most projects. If you think about it, most of the time through site design you can mitigate. So yes, it's an Unavoidable Adverse Environmental Impacts but it has a mitigation measure associated with it.

We have alternatives, since SEQRA required to look at alternatives. On a minimum you have to look at the no action alternative, meaning, leave it the way it is. We have two alternatives listed here; these are definitely something to think about. One of them is a lower impact development alternative to take the site plan and come up with one that reduces the scope to reduce the impacts. The other one is Alternative Road access; this project is proposing on Entrance Road on a parcel actually in an adjacent town. There is another road opportunity there. There are positives and negatives to look at evaluating that and there is also the Emergency Services aspect. This is to be considered an analysis of alternative roads. No Action Alternative means that these are the only Alternatives that should be considered. Use this as a starting point, so think about if there should be other alternatives considered in this.

Other statutory areas are Energy Use and Solid Waste Management requirement of the SEQRA statute. This is a residential project so it will generate residential garbage. Remember SEQRA is written for everything.

Irreversible and Irritable Commitment of Resources, this is a lot like an adverse impact. Example, if I'm going to go and buy an acre of land and then build a house. I am committed to the building materials for the house. I suppose I could tear the whole house apart and send the material back to where they came from, and have them recycled into other things but that's not tremendously realistic. This is another section that we have to think about, what that means in this context. One of the examples I would give you which does apply but is not in this project. Let's say you have Hi class agricultural soils and you're taking land out of agricultural production that's could be highly productive and turning it into houses. That is your reversible irretrievable commitment of an important resource. That's not the case here.

Gross Inducing Impacts, is another requirement that has to be looked at, this has a tendency with housing to not be as much of an issue. But say we were building some kind of a manufacturing facility it was going to employ 400 people who don't live here today. That would have a substantial growth impact. We would need to build more housing for these people and there would be more traffic.

The last one we didn't include and I forgot to note to Mr. Smith is in the new Statue. Measures to avoid to reduce both and actions impact on climate change and Associated impacts due to the effects of climate change such as, sea level rise & flooding. You need to include that one and then we're going to have to talk about how we address that. You're not in a flood plan. The reality is this is brand new. In terms of what you would actually put in your document, I'll guarantee you that the first 200 EIS done are all going to address this question differently. This is brand-new, we don't know a lot so we're going to do our level best in this case. We are kind of fortunate because we are not in a flood plain or not in a flood zone. We're not proposing to build a power plant where we are going to be pumping out CO2 and NOx and SOx until the cows come home. We would have to figure out what is the impact on the climate. Here we're building housing. Now all of our housing has a demand for utilities so that does have a spine off carbon compact. We're going to have some degree of vehicles coming here that are probably fueled by fossil fuels. We're going to cover a bunch of these in different place. My sense is that this section can be pulling some of those other pieces of information in and describe what they are. Jim Barnicle – Will solar lessen the carbon impact with solar panels or solar farms? MaryBeth Bianconi – Yes. The only other thing is at the bottom there will be the appendices. We won't know the appendices until the DEIS is prepared because it'll be all the reports that will back up what goes in the DEIS. They are generally items like the traffic report, the well, pump tests report and the regulatory correspondence.

Michael Croissant – So this is incomplete right now? MaryBeth Bianconi – You as the Board will think on this. We are going to clean this up so we can put it out for the public. We will add a couple of thing and then that is what will be published and the public will see.

Mr. Smith - That is what the lead agency does.

Paula Kay – Are we ready to set a date for the Public Scoping? Mr. Smith – Will that be at a Planning Board meeting? Paula Kay - Yes. Matthew Sush – Do we need to discuss this to add our comments or can that be at the same meeting? MaryBeth Bianconi – Same meeting. Mr. Smith - Correct me if I'm wrong but there will be a final Scoping Document that will be done because of that meeting? Paula Kay – Yes. Matthew Sush – Then will you need our influence from what the public input is? And then we will need another meeting after that Public Scoping Meeting? MaryBeth Bianconi - Exactly. What I'll do is be here for the meeting and take notes and then send you a memo and it will show the comments and I'll tell you wither or not they were already addressed or need to be addressed.

Paula Kay – Someone from the Public might come in and ask about another intersection that is not there and then you can decide if we should add it or not. Matthew Sush – Do you have an easel or white board to write thing down so people know that we address a topic and then someone else doesn't mention it again? MaryBeth Bianconi – What I usually do it before the meeting I'll let the public know what we have already addressed, example traffic or sewer. And if they have a specific concern, they can

address it that night. Paula Kay – Jim Barnicle suggest that MaryBeth Bianconi hook into the TV and then type as we go. Mr. Smith – The draft document will be on line before the meeting.

MaryBeth Bianconi – We need to have a list of people who want a paper copy of this documents. Mr. Smith – We don't send out any mailing like we do with a typical public hearing. MaryBeth Bianconi – We will do a public notice in the paper still.

A motion to set a Public Scope meeting on August 14, 2019 at 7:00 pm was made by Matthew Sush and seconded by Jim Barnicle
5 in favor; 0 opposed

ICHUD FOUNDATION INC
240 Forestburgh Road, Monticello, NY S/B/L: 28.-1-22
Tim Gottlieb, P.E.
Rabbi Schwartz
John Cappello
James Gironda, P.G, Hanson Van Vleet, PLLC

Richard McGoey –I briefed the Board during the work session. The biggest issue right now is the water study. The water study was complete. I got an e-mail today and didn't get a change to really look it over. I did notice that there were some impacts on some of the neighboring wells.

Mr. Gironda – We performed three consecutive 72 hours pumping test of the three existing production wells at ICHUD property. All testing was done with preapproved work plan from the DOH. This was done in order to get a water withdrawal permit and a permit from the DOH for public water supply. Everything was done in accordance with New York State DEC. Each well was pumped at its maximum capacity for the existing pumps. They were throttled back slightly for task adjustment. If it was a 50 gallon per minute pump, we ran the well at 45 gallons. It would probably make less water than that when it's put into the system. As long as the existing pump is maintained. We found that each well had a water quality that was in compliance with all New York State Parks by drinking water requirements. We found that the yield of each well was adequate for the demands as I was told of the ICHUD property. With adequate redundancy at their peak demands. We also did an evaluation of off-site impacts to surrounding homeowner wells, we reached out to anyone who had expressed concerns at prior Board meetings. We wound up with seven homeowners who wanted to participate in the first test, and eight in the second. Paula Kay – Do you have the names of those neighbors? Mr. Gironda – Yes, it's in the report. Paula Kay – Can your read them out loud? Mr. Gironda – McAuliffe; 3 Jacob Drive, Fleishman; 4 Jacob Drive, Fielding; 18 Jacob Drive, Simen; 6 Jacob Drive, Schachnovsky; 2 Dora Drive; Leidner; 36 Jacob Drive, Leszczynsha; 21 Hamilton Road, and Indig; 17 Hamilton Road. The closest well was on Hamilton. There was one resident at 3 Hamilton who expressed concern at the Board meetings but chose not to participate with the testing. While the pumps were being tested for 72 hours all the residential wells were being used as normal. We did an ultrasonic flow meter test on all the homeowners wells during testing. This is a non-invasive test to the pumps/wells. We are trying to induce a cone of depression from the pumping well. The wells have to meet a stabilized drawn down in order to meet the DEC requirement.

The well can pump and sustain without any drawn down over the final 6 hours of the test. The well will drop in the beginning to test and will reach a level in the well where it can maintain that pumping rate and maintain that pumping levels basically indefinitely. All of our modeling and projections are out to 180 days of constant pumping. In order to meet the safe yield, they would have to be able to maintain a pumping rate for 180 days, while still remaining adequate water level in the well. That's one of the reasons that the 72-hour duration is used by the DEC. Typically at the end of the 72-hour the draw down curve is fully formed, the wells are pumping at a static equilibrium and we're not going to see much more drawdown from that point on even if the walls were to be run indefinitely. Our conclusion on the Homeowners wells are that we have about 0 to 12% impact to the surrounding wells that were monitored. There are two wells in particular that had the most impact. Chairman Kiefer - How much was that? Mr. Gironda - The maximum that we saw and this is a global trend from all of the pumping going on, there was a draw down of 16 feet at one of the wells. Chairman Kiefer - How deep was the well? Mr. Gironda - Because we did a non-invasive study, we didn't do any work to remove a pump, inspect the well, putting sound at the bottom of the well, so we had to relied on the information provided by the homeowner. Chairman Kiefer - The reason I asked is, if the wells 150 feet deep and you got 30 feet of water in it a then it goes down 16 feet, you will have a major draw, Mr. Gironda - That's why I say 12%, because the depth is unknown. The minimum depth of a well is 200 feet so we are assuming they are 200 feet. If further investigation is required then we could find out more information about the wells.

Richard McGoey – How do you compensate for dry weather? Mr. Gironda – These are all accepted industry standard methods that we use in our pumping test and they were pre-approved by DOH. We restarted background monitoring of the on-site wells on March 5th. That's when we still had frozen ground conditions, we were not experiencing liquid precipitation and meltwater. Between March 5th and April 15th there was a rise of 3 feet in the production. The most that we saw was 3 feet rise. We use a number called specific capacity as an estimate of wells capability. The specific capacity is the gallons per foot per minute that the well can drawdown. The specific capacity calculated at the wells site is approximately one. One gallon per foot per draw down. The rise of three feet represents a gain of three gallons per minute per foot of specific capacity. That would equate to that wells are incapable of 48 gallons per minute versus 45 gallons per minute, due to that rising water level. That is not going to cause a significant change to the data. Richard McGoey – How do you coordinate that calculation to the individual household? Mr. Gironda – The whole water table comes up, not just at one person's house. Richard McGoey – True, but you drew it down at one home 13 feet and that was in May. What happens when that static water level in that well is significantly lower? Mr. Gironda – The whole thing moves down; your static water level would move down 3 feet and your draw down would be the same. Richard McGoey – And you don't know where the pump is? Mr. Gironda – Correct, we could find out. We also know they have not reported any issues with there well. Richard McGoey – Two of them did, Fielding and Leidner. Mr. Gironda – Fielding reported issues. Michael Hoyt – Fielding went down 16 feet? Mr. Gironda – No just three feet. Fielding static water at the start of the test was 51 feet. If you add three feet of static water level then its 54 feet. If their wells are 200 feet deep that means they still have 150 feet left in the well. When Fielding raised concern, they said they were having issue for 40 years. Forty years is beyond life expectance for a bedrock well. The Leidner residence had problems with their previous well and they have since drilled a new well. We did not test the old well just the new one. They experienced 7.50 feet of drawdown with a static level of 96.60 feet. They have 600 feet deep

well. We can pick out the global drawdown from surrounding wells pumping. You can also see a steeper slope that occurred when the pump turns on in that individual well that's being monitored. The typical pumping Cycles we were seeing were ten-foot max. Except for one well that I believe was contributing a lot of draw down to the surrounding wells. The well at 2 Dora Drive was pumping during the test for up to twelve hours at a time with over six feet of drawdown occurring during its pumping Cycles. The well at 26 Jacob was experienced the most drawdown was 330 feet away from the 2 Jacob Drive well and over 2,500 feet away from the ICHUD wells. When you look at the cone of influence its going to be much greater from that well that's 300 feet away that's drawing down six feet rather than a well that's a half a mile away that only drawdown 16 feet. Jim Barnicle – So the neighbors are affecting that well? Mr. Gironda – Yes.

Paula Kay – Should we have our hydrogeologist look at this report? Richard McGoey – Yes, I'm going to recommend that.

Mr. Gironda – 21 Hamilton Road did see 13.6 feet of impact. That well is only 630 feet from the production well one. If you can see the test of well one, the maximum drawdown on site of the adjacent well two was 11.4 feet. There was actually more draw down at the 21 Hamilton Road which is at 630 feet away. We will take away a couple feet of that and say that's surrounding wells. They are more around ten to eleven feet of draw down at 21 Hamilton Road. There static level 58.8 feet we brought down to 68.8. There might need to have more investigation require there, although she did not report having any problems with her well. It may be a good idea to find out how deep her well is. If there is a report of a well loss, perhaps it should be determined whether it's a pumping equipment or drawdown situation. The conclusion is that there was some impact but not enough to impact the everyday use of those wells.

Paula Kay – I think this is something the Board is going to have to look at. To see if there is going to be any impacts now or in the future. Mr. Cappello – We are fine with the DOH looking this over as well. Mr. Gironda – As well as the DEC and Delaware River Basin Commission has to review this. Paula Kay – Correct, but this Board has an obligation to make sure the homeowners who have been in here and have objected to various things for years. That we are not causing issues.

Mr. Gironda – In my professional opinion some of the homeowner's issues are from aging well and aging pumping equipment. We saw some problems and we also helped fix some problems. ICHUD wells may have been maintained over the years. While a homeowner well has not been. Michael Croissant – Also, these well will have more of an impact on a daily basis then a homeowner well. Mr. Gironda – We had one well on 2 Dora Drive who ran his pump for a full 12 hours during the test. Chairman Kiefer – Why? Mr. Gironda – I guess because we were running the test.

A motion to retain the hydrologists was made by Michael Croissant and seconded by Jim Barnicle
5 in favor; 0 opposed

Rabbi Schwartz – I got two prices and one was Mr. Miller, will this be a conflict? Mr. Cappello – I don't think so. I would ask that our Hydrologist contact Mr. Miller.

Mr. Cappello – I understand the Board did get the letter from the Village that you were looking for and that they are ok with the pump station. Jim Carnell – This e-mail doesn't say what I'm looking for. I want to know if the pump station can handle what is coming, not that the Village Board approved building of twelve more units in. Mr. Cappello – It said that they met our requirement so we can start. Jim Carnell – You gave them money. Mr. Cappello – We gave them money and have an agreement with the town, that was a signed agreement, that was if we paid we could connect to the system. Originally, we had 28 units and now it's 24. It doesn't seem that they have an issue with it. Jim Carnell – We will get though the rest of the summer and make sure the pump station will work as is. Mr. Cappello – Is that something that you would do? I want to make sure your ok with this. I'll get you the language that you want. Richard McGoey – Someone has to evaluate the Village Pump station and ICHUD station. You have to understand that those station run for 24 hours. Rabbi Schwartz – Which ones? Richard McGoey – Both. Rabbi Schwartz – Ours's does not run 24 hours. Jim Carnell – Does the meter report? Rabbi Schwartz – Yes, its run's eight to ten hours a day and sometime less. Jim Carnell – I know that last summer the Village had alarms going off several times. Rabbi Schwartz – I was talking with the Village today and they said they didn't have an issue.

Jim Carnell – I have an issue issuing building permits this summer. Rabbi Schwartz – We aren't going to start to after the season. Jim Carnell – Then there is no reason to issue them now. Mr. Cappello – I'm hoping that the payment to the village was not just to pay them but for them to get everything running.

SUSTAIN RELEASE / CAMP KENNYBROOK
73 Camp Kennybrook Road, Monticello S/B/L: 27.-1-10
Peter Cirillo, Architect
Daniel McCormick, Sustained Release

Mr. Cirillo – We have been to three work sessions with Richard McGoey. I believe the drawing that were presented last Monday were not up to date. I talked to Heather and she asked that I bring in copies.

Richard McGoey – We talked about the noise issue and dropping everyone off. We think we solved the traffic issue. Mr. McCormick – We have been working with a company called Purple sound out of New York. They use a system called funktion -one. They catch the sound waves as it travels away and then have an exact precise time delay so when the one sound it down and the other is up its cancel's each other out. This was developed for outdoor festivals. Since then, they have used it in smaller areas like ours.

Matthew Sush – How specific do those calculation have to be in order to cancel the sound out? Mr. McCormick – Very specific, but there are computer programs they use. I think they are complex but have been systematized by the people at the sound company. We want to keep our main stages in doors.

Chairman Kiefer - And you will have security guards? Mr. McCormick – Yes. Since we have two stages, one restaurant, one cafeteria and one cantina and a lot of people socialize on site. I think we should have no issues keeping the sound down. Jim Barnicle - 296 people in the building or on the grounds? Mr.

McCormick – Per building. Mr. Cirillo – Both of these building can contain more than 300 people. If you have more than 300 people you need to have a sprinkler system and we don't have one. So, what we propose is limiting it to 299 people so the building doesn't need a sprinkler system.

Mr. Cirillo goes over the site map. Once people come, they stay for the weekend very few go to town. Chairman Kiefer – This is just one weekend? Mr. Cirillo – Yes, three nights. Matthew Sush - Is there a shuttle to town? Mr. Cirillo – No they use their own cars. Mr. McCormick – It's rated for 1,000 people but we limited the parking to 220 cars and then we have buses coming in. Jim Barnicle – Is this open to the public? Mr. Cirillo – No, it's a private membership system.

A motion for a Public hearing on August 14, 2019 was made by Michael Hoyt and seconded by Michael Croissant
5 in favor; 0 opposed

Mr. McCormick – The drawing we have here tonight is what we will use for the pubic hearing? Richard McGoey – I have to look them over.

ROCK HILL LIQUOR STORE
184 Rock Hill Drive, Rock Hill, NY S/B/L: 32.-2-46
Michael North, PLS, North & Houston Land Surveyors
Dharmesh Patel, owner

Mr. North – Richard McGoey had a few comments and we complied except for the easement for the electrical line and that's because it doesn't happen that quickly. Richard McGoey – Just show the easement on the site map. Paula Kay – I need the wording for the easement. Mr. Patel – I'll have Jacob Billing get it to you.

Mr. North – I added the note for the right of way and another note for the Zoning Board Appeals approval of all our variances.

A motion for negative declaration motion under SEQRA was made by Matthew Sush and seconded by Mike Croissant
5 in favor; 0 opposed

A motion for a site plan approval condition on the easement being added to the site plan was made by Michael Hoyt and seconded by Michael Croissant
5 in favor; 0 opposed

SMOKERS CHOICE
146 Rock Hill Drive, Rock Hill, NY S/B/L: 32.-2.56.2
Larry Marshall, P.E

Mr. Marshall – Because of the amount of disturbance we have to do a Storm Water Retention plan. This will take a little bit of time. We have prepared a revised plan to show a double row of white pine trees. We are proposing twenty-eight of them. Michael Croissant – What height? Mr. Marshall - Eight to ten feet in height. We talked to the applicant and he's ok with any changes you may have. Michael Croissant – I would say bigger. Matthew Sush – Ten to Twelve feet! Michael Hoyt – They are going to grow quickly and they will open up on the bottom. Matthew Sush – They will, maybe get different types of trees. Mr. Marshall – They are 15 feet on center. I met with the applicant today to discuss more landscaping on the site and that will come at a later time.

Richard McGoey – I'm confused on the grading between Route 17 and your building and it's not on the plan. There is a big berm there now. Mr. Marshall – I asked that today and they said they built a berm to plant fruit trees? Matthew Sush – Was that done after the last meeting? Michael Hoyt – No. Paula Kay – I drove past today and see there is equipment on the property and I'm not sure if they are still working. Mr. Marshall- I asked and they said they haven't done anything since being yelled at. Richard McGoey – You need to update the site plan.

Richard McGoey – It's a shame, if they just followed the plan then they would not have to do a Stormwater management.

Chairman Kiefer - I drove by the other day and I was surprised on how high one section of the parking lot was. Mr. Marshall – That is a modification that they requested and it's been added.
Chairman Kiefer – But why? Chet Smith – That was the original grade. Mr. Marshall – They asked that we cut it down two feet and that is shown on the site plan.

Mr. Marshall – Beside the tree's any other things you need? Chairman Kiefer – I think ten to twelve-foot trees are good. Matthew Sush -Maybe diversity with the trees! I would do grouping of three to five.

Matthew Sush – If they plan on doing any landscaping in the back add that to the plans.
Michael Hoyt – Isn't that berm pretty close to the state's property? Mr. Marshall – Yes, but I'm not the surveyor so I don't know the exact numbers.

Michael Croissant – Any interior landscaping being done? Mr. Marshall – Yes, we just haven't added that yet. We will have a full landscaping plan for you.

Paula Kay – When do you plan on being back? Mr. Marshall – We won't have the SWPPP done by the next meeting. Paula Kay – I know your doing your part but your applicant is not. Mr. Marshall – I don't have an issue coming to each meeting to keep you informed.

A motion to close the meeting at 8:39 pm was made by Jim Barnicle and seconded by Michael Croissant 5 In favor; 0 opposed

Mr. Kohn – What about Family Fun Park? Paula Kay – You are not on the agenda.

A motion to re-open the meeting was made by Michael Croissant and seconded by Michael Hoyt
5 in favor; 0 opposed

FAMILY FUN PARK
65 Friedman Road, Monticello, NY S/B/L: 5.-1-6.3
Joel Kohn, Representing applicant
Israel Oster, owner

Mr. Kohn - SWPPP was done this week. I have a copy here and it was sent out. All comments should have been responded to.

A motion for negative declaration motion under SEQRA was made by Matthew Sush and seconded by Jim Barnicle
5 in favor; 0 opposed

A motion to approve the site plan conditioned on the SWPPP being approved by Richard McGoey was made by Matthew Sush and seconded by Michael Croissant
5 in favor; 0 opposed

A motion to close the meeting at 8:43 was made by Matthew Sush and seconded by Michael Croissant
5 in favor; 0 opposed

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Mitchell

Debbie Mitchell

Secretary
Town of Thompson Planning Board