

so far and if there are any further studies you want us to do. If there is nothing major and you feel comfortable, we would like to request a public hearing. Or we can come back after we receive your engineer's comments to address those first, but engineering wise, it is pretty straight forward.

Paula Kay – I can't tell as I am not physically there, but is Jay Patel here tonight? Matt Sickler – No. Paula Kay – I thought he was supposed to be here. John O'Rourke – We did receive his response and have no concerns with any of the comments. We will address all of his concerns. I think he wanted an additional intersection study. Helen Budrock – I think from my conversation with Jay, he had concerns about the traffic data being from 2016, so he wanted some background information to substantiate that. You know just to make sure that is right and we don't need some fresh counts, plus the other new counts were done in January when it was snowing. John O'Rourke – Absolutely and we have no issue with that. Chairman Sush – I believe we expressed questions and/or concerns at the last meeting, where they taken care of? Paula Kay – Yes, I think Jay addressed my concerns. Kristin Boyd – Is there a reason you used the 2022 January p.m. and then an old 2016 a.m. study information and merged them, or maybe it was vice versa? The information used just didn't totally make since to me. Or maybe it's irrelevant because a new study is going to be done. Steve Tarabokija – It was the other way around. The p.m. information was from an older study that was done for the Kartrite Waterpark, but they did not look at the a.m., so we went out and collected data for that. Kristin Boyd – Is there any reason you didn't just take the p.m. then? Steve Tarabokija – We actually have p.m. volumes from that. We placed automatic traffic recorder devices out there for 24 hours a day for 2 weeks, which are basically just small rubber tubes across the road that collects the data, and I believe Jay did comment on comparing that data to the 2016 data. We will be doing that in our response.

Helen Budrock – From a SEQR stand point, I believe the Board declared their intent to serve as Lead Agency back in December and technically if there are no objections, which there weren't, then you automatically become the Lead Agency. However, because so much time has elapsed, I think it would best if the board made a motion at this meeting to officially declare themselves Lead Agency. Do you agree Paula? Paula Kay – No harm no foul and I think it's better to do it again to be on the safe side.

A motion to declare Lead Agency was made by Arthur Knapp and second by Kathleen Lara. All in favor, 0 opposed.

Helen Budrock – I will pull up part II of the EAF and share it for everyone to see while we go over it. In terms of Impact on Land, the only areas that have the potential for a large to moderate impact are:

- The proposed action may involve construction on land where bedrock is exposed, or generally within 5 feet of existing ground surface.

Helen Budrock – I think Matt had a question on whether blasting would be necessary and was one of the comments. Matt Sickler – Yes. Looking at the grading plan, there are some areas of pretty significant cut. Based on the soil types provided, they indicate shell and bedrock, so I'd expand the study to describe excavation methods and whether blasting would be necessary. John O'Rourke – We have no issues with that. We actually have some deep tests that can be ran across the site. So, we can do those and update the plan. Helen Budrock – That can be in the updated standard part III, which has information on that.

- The proposed action may result in increased erosion, whether from physical disturbance or vegetation removal (including treatment by herbicides).

Helen Budrock – You submitted a SPEC for that, which Matt is in the process of reviewing. Matt Sickler – Which I am plugging away at. John O'Rourke – We know these take a long time to review and understand. Matt Sickler – Thank you. Helen Budrock – Does the Board have any other concerns regarding the impact on land? Kathleen Lara – No, because this was previously the block company, so the impact is minimal from what was existing. That's one of the reasons I liked the site and the location in regards to the highway.

No further comment.

Helen Budrock – Next is Impact on Geological Features and I have no impact there. Then there is Impacts on Surface Water, with a couple items that have moderate to large impact:

- The proposed action may involve construction within or adjoining a freshwater or tidal wetland, or in the bed or banks of any other water body.

Helen Budrock – Did you get to see the questions in my memo about the wetlands that are there, whether or not they are federally regulated and any other information you have on that? John O'Rourke – Actually it's a "federal wetland", but it is isolated. We submitted a report basically stating that the federal wetlands are isolated and that there are no state wetlands or any other wetlands on property. Helen Budrock – Did we get that? Because I thought there were and I didn't see a wetlands report when I looked for one. Maybe I just missed it. Matt Sickler – There was a habitat report. Helen Budrock – I think it was just the delineated plans. John O'Rourke – We will get you a report. Helen Budrock – That would be great. Matt Sickler – I think that will be helpful to have some documentation on file describing how it was delineated, as the site is being disturbed.

No further comments.

- The proposed action may cause soil erosion, or otherwise create a source of stormwater discharge that may lead to siltation or other degradation of receiving water bodies.

Helen Budrock – Again, Matt is in the process of reviewing the SWPP, so this should be covered there.

No further comments.

Helen Budrock – Next is Impact on Groundwater, which is expected to have no, or small impact. Where there any other questions on water? If I am remembering correctly, I don't think there are any details missing, other than we didn't have pump test data or specific locations. Is that something you guys are continuing to do? John O'Rourke – I think we have a well location, but we weren't planning on doing any well drilling at this time. Due to the previous use, we know there is plenty of water there. Helen Budrock – And you feel confident that there is sufficient fire suppression there? John O'Rourke – Yes and they have a water storage tank so that will fill slowly and be there if need be.

No further comment.

Helen Budrock – Moving on to Impact on Flooding. There is no expected impact there. There is also no impact on Impacts on Air. There is impact on Impact on Plants and Animals and the moderate to large impact areas are:

- The proposed action may substantially interfere with nesting/breeding, foraging, or over-wintering habitat for the predominant species that occupy or use the project site.

-
Helen Budrock – This is the environmental study you refer to earlier. There is an eagle’s nest like a ½ of a mile or so from the site, but it is not expected to have an impact, particularly if you limit your construction activities to certain times of the year. Any questions on any of that? Arthur Knapp – My only thought is, we want to make sure the eagle situation is dealt with because that came up on another project and we were questioned about it. I just want to make sure that it has been validated and that the nest doesn’t get interrupted. Helen Budrock – I agree. Definitely take a look at that study. Also, you can make it a condition to limit blasting to certain times of the year.

No further comments.

- The proposed action requires the conversion of more than 10 acres of forest, grassland or any other regionally or locally important habitat.

No comments were made.

Helen Budrock – Impacts on Agricultural Resources and Impact on Aesthetic Resources have no impact. I have yes for Impact on Historic and Archeological Resources, but everything is no, or small impact. I think a letter was submitted from SHPO, who originally identified that there could be some archeological resources, but I think that has since been addressed by SHPO and there were no resources to worry about. For Impact on Open Spaces and Recreation, I have no. It’s not a critical environment so, Impact on Critical Environmental Areas is a no. Impact on Transportation is obviously a yes as we already talked about the traffic study. So, we know that is evolving and they will respond to Jay’s comments. Impact on Energy is a yes, but it is all no, or small impact.

Helen Budrock - Impact on Noise, Odor and Light is a yes and the only question we had was in regards to the neighboring residences, but if they are not occupied, then it may not be an issue. I do know we did request a noise study from the other warehouse project, so we may want to do that here too. Can you explain a little bit more about this? John O’Rourke – It’s a warehouse, but it is replacing an old manufacturing building so, it certainly will not be any worse than then. We directed all of the trailer parking away from the residences and they will actually be blocked by the building. Other than the noise of a truck driving down that road, we don’t anticipate any noise. Helen Budrock – If someone comes to the public hearing, complains about noise and wants to have a study, you guys don’t have an objection to that, so at this point one may not be necessary. Kathleen Lara – I don’t think it is, once again, only because it is an existing warehouse site that was active up to about 10 years ago, the highway is right there and it is a very commercial area. Michael Hoyt – It backs to the quarry anyway. Kathleen Lara – Correct. John O’Rourke – And the Quick way in the front so I don’t think we will add much noise, but again, if we have any comment from the public, we will certainly address that.

Helen Budrock – Moving on, Impact on Human Health has no impact and Consistency with Community Plans also has a no, which really mean yes. I don't know why they phrase it in a double method. Consistency with Community Character has a possible impact, but it is small as it is zoned for commercial industrial use.

Helen Budrock - That completes the EAF part II review, are there any other analysis the Board feels will be helpful before we schedule a public hearing? Kathleen Lara – In my opinion I think the biggest thing is traffic. I think it is an excellent site and a low impact location for a warehouse. As long as the traffic is reviewed and spelled out, I don't see any issues. Helen Budrock – What would the Board like to see as the next step? Would you like to see the applicant's response to the comments already made and the additional stuff we asked them to add to the extended part III, or do you want to go ahead and schedule a public hearing in hopes that that information will be in by then? John O'Rourke – We would like to get a public hearing scheduled so that we can see if there is any public concern we need to address. You can always keep the public hearing open and we have no objections to that. Paula Kay – Helen, do we need a 239 on this? Helene Budrock – Yes. Paula Kay – Do we want to do that first and then schedule the public hearing? Helen Budrock – That's up to the Board. Do you feel like there is sufficient information to send it to the County at this point? Kathleen Lara – Yes. Chairman Sush – Yes, I think so. Maybe a revised or updated traffic report and/or answering the comments of the traffic consultant prior to the public hearing would be helpful. John O'Rourke – Yes, we would submit it before the public hearing. Helen Budrock – Usually when you do a 239 review, the County likes to know when the public hearing date is, so that they can respond in time, even though they technically have 30 days, but I am wondering if we should shoot for November 16th. Does that work for you guys? John O'Rourke – That would be fine. Kathleen Lara – And it gives them 30 days, which is fair. Paula Kay – The first meeting in November is the 9th. Helen Budrock – That is correct. So, it would have to be either the 9th or the 23rd and I think the 23rd gives a little more time to address everything. John O'Rourke – The 23rd is fine. Paula Kay – When is Thanksgiving? Chairman Sush – That is a good point. There is a chance that the meeting on the 23rd will get cancelled and that is probably something we will discuss at the end of this meeting, but there is a good chance we won't have that meeting. What time is the Town closing that day? Jim Carnell – We are scheduled to close at 4:30 but a lot of the times the supervisor will let us go early. John O'Rourke – If it's easier to schedule it for your first meeting in December, that is fine with us. Obviously, I don't want to be here for Thanksgiving either. Helen Budrock – There is a fifth Wednesday in November, so you can always push it to the 30th, but then you would have a meeting the very next week. Kathleen Lara – There's no rush, right? Michael Hoyt – And the applicant is okay with waiting? John O'Rourke – That is fine with us and it gives us more time to answer the questions. Plus, we want the public to come out with any concerns they may have and if the meeting is right before Thanksgiving, they may not be able to. Helen Budrock – So, it will be tentative for December 14th. John O'Rourke – And if we get any other comments, possibly from the SWPP, before then, we may be able to address those as well before the public hearing. Jim Carnell – And, any comments from the 239, if the County has any. Chairman Sush – That seems like the best date for everyone.

A motion to request a 239 review was made by Kathleen Lara and second by Arthur Knapp.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

A motion to schedule a public hearing on December 14, 2022 was made by Michael Hoyt and second by Arthur Knapp.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

178 SERENITY LLC

178 Serenity Lane, Monticello, NY
Hayden Carnell, Project representative

Jim Carnell and Helen Budrock were recused.

Hayden Carnell – We are here tonight for a lot combination. The owner owns the large 221-acre parcel and in 2018 he purchased 2 adjoining parcels. One parcel was combined and for whatever reason, the other one was not. As it was a part of a previously approved subdivision, we need Planning Board approval to combined it.

Paula Kay – Do we have a signed Owner’s Proxy on file? Again, I am working from my phone. Kathleen Lara – Yes. Hayden Carnell – It was submitted separate from the application so it is not attached to the application. Paula Kay – Okay and is there an EAF in the file somewhere? Hayden Carnell – There was not an EAF submitted for the lot combination, but there should be an original EAF from the Subdivision. Paula Kay – Can you just make sure we have something for the file? Hayden Carnell – Do you want a new short form EAF? Paula Kay – Yes. Hayden Carnell – No problem. Paula Kay – Thank you and you can do it subject to.

Matt Sickler – Are these parcels vacant? Hayden Carnell – Yes. Well, the main parcel has a home, that is not located, but the other 2 parcels are vacant. Matt Sickler – Alright as long s there is only 1 dwelling.

Kathleen Lara – These lots are separate from the Motor Club, right? Hayden Carnell – Yes, it is a different development.

Kathleen Lara – We are only required to approve this because of the previous subdivision, right? Hayden Carnell - Correct and it was subdivided back in 2013. Kathleen Lara – So, can we move this to action?

Matt Sickler – If there’s only 1 dwelling and the parcel is being consolidated, I don’t see any issue with that. Matthew Sush – Okay. Great.

ACTION ITEMS:

178 SERENITY LLC

178 Serenity Lane, Monticello, NY
Hayden Carnell, Project representative

Jim Carnell and Helen Budrock were recused.

This project was just discussed in the last Discussion Item.

A motion to approve the lot combination, subject to an EAF being submitted, was made by Michael Hoyt and second by Kristin Boyd.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

ROCK HILL VOL. AMBULANCE CORP

96 Lake Louise Marie Road, Rock Hill, NY

Thomas Bogursky, Project representative

Thomas Bogursky – At the last meeting you requested an updated site plan and the I believe the engineer sent one over. Matt Sickler – Yes, we did receive the updated site plan and it showed the location of the shed. Helen Budrock - Great.

No further comments from the Board.

A motion to approve the minor modification to a previously approved site plan was made by Kathleen Lara and second by Arthur Knapp.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

BBIS AUTO AUCTION

Route 17B, Monticello, NY

Zach Zabo, Project representative

Zach Zabo – We are here tonight to discuss the rock wall in front of the berm. Our applicant would like to change the facing on that wall. Instead of a stone, in-laid wall, they are proposing a rock face retaining wall. It's not going to be the entire height of the berm; it will only replace a decorative portion of that rock wall. I have a few handouts, that you may have already seen, but this is what they are proposing.

Kathleen Lara – What's the reason for the change? Zach Zabo – I believe it's material availability and this route will be a little bit cheaper. It has the stone base on it so it kind of looks like a stone wall. Kathleen Lara - Makes sense. Zach Zabo – It's only aesthetic. Jim Carnell – On the original site plan or one of the approved, modified site plans, there's a cross section detail, do you know what page that's on? Helen Burdock – I see 1 through 4, but I don't know which one you want. Chairman Sush – Rendering # 1 maybe. Jim Carnell – I think that's from the original project, but on the actual site plan, there is a cross section shown. Zach Zabo – I think it was the landscaping plan and think it was 5C1., but I do have the renderings that BHT had provided originally and I will hand those out as well. These were provided early on and shows the original stone wall proposed. Jim Carnell – I spoke to Russ several times about it and I told him being this is still in the review process and the aesthetics of the property were quite important to the Board, I was not going to make the decision. They would have to figure out what type of material they want to use instead of dry stack stone and present it to the Board. I want to say it was going to be 4 or 2 feet high and 30 inches wide. Zach Zabo – Yeah, it was 2 feet high and 30 inches wide. Jim Carnell – They want to put the stone, but because it wasn't really a structural component, like the retaining wall over at Home Depot, and it's just aesthetics, they should come back to the Board. Chairman Sush – Is the purpose or use changing at all? It's not a retaining wall, right? Zach Zabo – No, it's not a retaining wall. These are retaining wall blocks, but it is decorative.

Kristin Boyd – Can we get the beautiful green trees back? Zach Zabo – I will talk to the client. They know it's something that has to be done. Chairman Sush – I was going to ask about that too. Is that a guarantee from either the contractor or the nursery? Will those be replaced. Zach Zabo – I'm not sure at this time, but I will talk to the client and see where we are at with that, but I know some of those

trees definitely need to be replaced. Matt Sickler – They were a feature on the approved site plan, so prior to the project being completed, they would have to be taken care of. Jim Carnell – The contractor is aware of it and has indicated they will certainly be replaced prior to finishing the job. Zach Zabo – I am meeting with them tomorrow so I will bring this to their attention. Paula Kay – Maybe you can send an email to the Board after your meeting letting them know the outcome so they can have a better idea and we can put it in the file. Zach Zabo – Okay.

Michael Hoyt – Is there going to be some kind of cap on the wall? Zach Zabo – Yes, there will be a cap on the top. I think I will be 2 feet of wall, then the cap and the rest will be berm.

Chairman Sush – Will it be all one height, like the picture provided, or will there be steps? Zach Zabo – There would have to be steps due to the nature of the berm and how it drops over 17B. Jim Carnell – I think it will end up being long runs of wall between the steps as it is fairly flat there. Zach Zabo – Yeah, it is pretty flat and only starts to trail off towards the end. Jim Carnell – It don't think it would end up being more than a couple steps and because it's not very tall, there won't have to be any support from the other side. Chairman Sush – Do we have to be concerned about people climbing on this wall? Michael Hoyt – It's pretty far off the road.

Helen Budrock – Is there a way you could get an actual sample? Something the Board can touch and feel. Zach Zabo – I don't have anything on hand today, but I'm sure we could get something. Kathleen Lara – I would almost prefer this to some wall because I feel like this would look more finished and I think structurally, it would last longer. Michael Hoyt – Also, I think this will look cleaner. Kathleen Lara – Me too and I appreciate what you are saying Helen, but I personally don't need to see a sample as long as we know the color. Michael Hoyt – I don't need a sample. Kathleen Lara – As long as we know the color and have an idea of what it's going to look like. Michael Hoyt – What color are you looking to use? Zach Zabo – They haven't indicated a color yet, so if the Board has an input, I will let the client know. Kathleen Lara – I like the gray, rock color and it blends into the landscape. Zach Zabo – Okay. Michael Hoyt – I don't see why they should have any issue with that. Matt Sickler – If they do, they can always come back with an alternative. Kathleen Lara – I just think the orange color would be too much. Michael Hoyt – I agree it should be a shade of gray. Chairman Sush – Is there color options? Zach Zabo – I'm not sure, but I will go back to them with they gray request, which is similar to what we originally proposed, and if they have any reason why they want to or need to go with another color, I will come back. Kathleen Lara – If they say no, then I would like to see samples like Helen had suggested earlier. Zach Zabo – Okay.

A motion to approve the minor modification to a previously approved site plan, subject to they new stone being gray in color and a written update on when the trees will be replaced, was made by Michael Hoyt and second by Kathleen Lara.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

PRIOR APPROVALS/ENFORCEMENT:

HAMPTON LAKE, LLC
Starlight Road, Monticello, NY
Glen Smith, Project engineer

Paula Kay was recused.

Glen Smith – I was last here for this project back in August and the Board asked for some information in regards to what's going on at this site. We also talked about where we stand with DOH approval. We have since received DOH comments and we are working on addressing them now. We also got the comments from Matt's office in regards to the SWPP and we are also working on those and that's kind of where we stand with the technical comments. I went to the site last week and took some pictures that I sent in. I have some copies with me tonight if you didn't get to see them. Prior to last week, I hadn't been out there in a while, so I don't know what it looked like before these pictures were taken. Along with the pictures, I submitted a smaller version of this map. Up top here is Swinging Bridge Reservoir, the property is 105 acres total and all of these little orange dots is roughly where the fifty some building used to be. Most of them have been taken down over the last couple of month and only 2 campers were left at the end of Lake Shore Drive, which the contractors are using like offices. Other than those, the rest of the structures were taken down and hauled away. I heard there were a lot of piles of scrap and building debris on the property, but as of right now, there isn't really any piles anymore. However, there are several small piles of white metal, for example, washers and dryers, that were taken out of the buildings. Those will be removed and there are roll-off containers there for removal. My biggest issue is there is about 1,500 feet of shore line on the property and only some of that has silt fence and some areas don't have any yet. Most of what is there is in pretty good shape, but some of it was down because a branch or tree fell on it. The contractors are immediately going to fix the silt fence and start installing more. I told them wherever there is soil disturbance, they need silt fence between there and the lake. I will go back in the next couple of weeks and make sure all of that was done. Walking along the shore, I didn't see any run off into the lake and it had just rained the day before, but it is something we will monitor. It's pretty much just this 2,000-foot stretch here where the buildings were and that's being cleaned up. The rest is virgin territory and has never been touched. As for the fire brought to my attention, there is an old swimming pool on the property and that is where the fire was. Debris was being burned in there and as you can see from my pictures, that has been cleaned up as well. There is currently some trees and branches in there, but they are to be removed and the pools walls collapsed. There is actually a proposed house to go there. They are still cleaning up, but I would say they are about 90% done. I didn't find any paper or insulation on the property, that can blow into the lake, at this time. Once again, we will have to watch it, but they are making some progress.

Matt Sickler – Do you think you will be able to get the disturbed areas somewhat stabilized before winter? Glenn Smith – That is a good point. A lot of the area were seeded and have grass growing, but there is a large, cleared area about 400 feet long and 200 feet wide that I told him to have seeded and mulched by next week, which he said he is going to do. Matt Sickler – Okay.

Kathleen Lara – Thank you Glenn for going out there and getting back to us with an update. Michael Croissant couldn't make it tonight, but he wanted to point out that he was right about the silt fence all along, and he told me to say that. He did want the silt fence fixed ASAP because we are going to get some rain tomorrow, I don't know if that is feasible, but it sounds like it will be taken care of in the next week or two. Glenn Smith – Well, it has been a week or so since I was out there. Jim Carnell – They had a machine there the other day.

Kathleen Lara – Some of the homeowners are saying that the trucks are using the entrance they promised they wouldn't use. Please just remind them of their promise. Glenn Smith – I know they have been using the one off of Starlight Road, but I will remind them.

Helen Budrock – The only thing standing between you and site plan approval is comments from DOH. Glenn Smith – Which we have and are addressing. They had a lot of comments as the project is fairly large and has 35 septic systems and wells, but we are working through them. Kristin Boyd – Do we have those comments? Glenn Smith – I think the Building Department is copied on the correspondence, but I will get you a copy if you don't have one. Helen Budrock – I don't see them, so if you don't mind. Glenn Smith – Sure, but I'm going to warn you it's lengthy reading. Matt Sickler – I will take a look at them, so that we don't end up with duplicate comments.

Chairman Sush – Are all of the demo permits up to date? Jim Carnell- All of the structures are already down. Glenn Smith – Correct. There are only 2 little campers left. Jim Carnell – As far as I know the DEC has not been back out for and debris or other issues. Glenn Smith – Since the fire, they have not seen the DEC. Chairman Sush – Okay because that was one of my other questions because you mentioned there was no blowable material on the site, but in these few pictures, it looks like there is. Glenn Smith – No, there is scrap metal and other stuff they have to pick up by hand, but it is not blowable stuff. It's metal and wood and stuff like that. Like I said they are working on it and know it needs to be picked up. Chairman Sush – Okay.

The Board discussed cancelling the November 23rd meeting because of Thanksgiving and possibly having a meeting on the last Wednesday of the month, November 30th, if need be. They will make a formal decision by the November 9th meeting.

A motion to close the meeting was made by Kathleen Lara and second by Michael Hoyt.
All in favor, 0 opposed.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Eppers, Secretary

Town of Thompson Planning Board