

APPROVED

TOWN OF THOMPSON
PLANNING BOARD
October 23, 2024

IN ATTENDANCE:	Kathleen Lara, Chairman	Shoshana Mitchell, Alternate
	Kristin Boyd	Christina Cellini, Alternate
	Michael Hoyt	Steve Vegliante, Consulting Attorney
	Arthur Knapp	Laura Eppers, Secretary
	Matthew Sickler, Consulting Engineer	Helen Budrock, Consulting Planner
	James Carnell, Building, Planning, & Zoning	

Chairman Lara brought the meeting to order at 7:00 pm with a pledge to the flag.

A motion to approve the June 12, 2024 minutes was made by Michael Hoyt and seconded by Arthur Knapp.

All in favor, 0 opposed

Chairman Lara appointed Shoshana Mitchell and Christina Cellini as alternating voting members for tonight's meeting, starting with Christina Cellini.

ACTION ITEMS:

ROBERT DESENA

130 Hilltop Road, Monticello, NY
Robert DeSena, Applicant

Robert DeSena – I am here tonight to combined my remaining two lots. Chairman Lara – You went to the Zoning Board for a variance and they sent you to us, right? Steve Vegliante – That is correct. Chairman Lara – So, did they get the variance? Steve Vegliante – He got the variance to allow him to keep the storage container but the conditions for that were that he make it look like a shed and that he combined the two lots, so that he did not have an accessory building without a main dwelling. Chairman Lara – And he needs planning board approval because they were part of a previous subdivision? Steve Vegliante – Yes. Chairman Lara – Okay.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

A motion to approve the lot combination was made by Christina Cellini and seconded by Michael Hoyt.
All in favor, 0 opposed

HAMPTON LAKES SUBDIVISION

Starlight Road, Monticello, NY

Glenn Smith – Project Engineer

Glenn Smith – To give the Board a little update, this is a subdivision out on Swinging Bridge and it was started back in August of 2021. Over the last year or so, we have got DOH sign-off for the septic and wells, the town engineer's approval on the SWPP, a DEC permit for stormwater during construction, and the 239 was done about 2 years back. We are nearing the end, but we never had a NEG DEC done, so we are here tonight to see what needs to be done for that. Sometimes the Town asks for a Developer's Agreement for projects such as this, to be drafted by the applicant and approved by your attorney, and I know the applicant has had issues with other properties, so we just wanted to see how we can move forward with this.

Chairman Lara – Right, and before I hand it over to our consultants, as you know, there is another project, also owned by Mr. Minsky, that he disturbance a considerable amount more of the property than he was supposed to. We have not heard from him yet on that and obviously the neighbors have been asking about it, so we would like to see something on that.

Chairman Lara – Matt, do you have anything for this before I hand it over to Helen to discuss the SEQR procedure? Matt Sickler – I mentioned this to Glenn earlier; when I went to look at this, I couldn't find a completed, full set of plans that incorporates all of the water elements, the road designs, the stuff from the DOH approval, and stuff like that, so Glenn is going to get me that. Maybe even a developer's agreement put in place. One comment I do have on the stormwater, which will have to be incorporated or addressed at some point and maybe even a developer's agreement, is the series of rain gardens proposed. I did discuss them with Glenn and Jim and the rain gardens will need to be laid out with the individual house design. Glenn shows your typical house on the plans, but those may change. Glenn Smith – Right and the houses and the driveways may move. Matt Sickler – And per my discussion with Jim, at the time each lot applies for their building permit, they will submit that design, which will require some escrow and stuff for review. I think that is something that should definitely be noted on the plan. Glenn Smith – I think that is something that will be in the developer's agreement, but we can put it on the plan as well. Matt Sickler – Okay because we want to make sure those get addressed at that point. The developer's agreement should also mention how the community buildings, such as the shul, will be handled. Chairman Lara – Okay. Thank you, Matt.

Chairman Lara – Helen can you please let us know where we are with SEQR? Helen Budrock – Sure. I can defer to Steve, but basically there is an email saying that I prepared the part 2 and part 3 of the EAF. I think at the very least, we should go through the part 2 and answer any questions there may be. Then, if the Board wants to do a determination of significance tonight, they can. Or you can save that for the next meeting when you have the opportunity to talk about the adjoining property and addressing some of the concerns there. Chairman Lara – Steve, do you have anything to add? Steve Vegliante – I think we can probably get very close to a determination. I am a little concerned that there is not a full plan set for Matt to review and I think it should absolutely be noted on the plan set that there is a developer's agreement on file with the town. I also think there are certain items in the developer's agreement that need to be noted on the plan. There is also the issue with the neighboring property and I think we need to know what is going on there while we are waiting for a SWPP. It is my understanding that these are still two completely separate projects, is that still true? Glenn Smith – Yes, they are two separate projects. Chairman Lara – And we understand that you are not the engineer on that project, but it has the neighborhood worried. Steve Vegliante – I just want to make sure this Board is doing everything correct and doesn't open both ourselves and the developer up to any issues. Are the parcels adjoining? Glenn Smith – No, I think that parcel is farther down the road, but he does own other parcels on the road. Chairman Lara – The thing here is this is a tight neighborhood, almost like an HOA situation. Michael Hoyt – I would just like to know what is going

on with the other project. This is the first I am hearing of additional clearing be done then approved.

Chairman Lara – Right, and the one thing that is really bothering me is at the public hearing for the glamping project, the public had come out about their concerns with this project and in good faith, we said that Mr. Minsky was aware and addressing things. Steve Vegliante – Just to let everyone know, I have had conversations with several on the team for the glamping project and what we are waiting for is a SWPP. Once that SWPP is here, they will schedule another work session, so that can be reviewed by staff and that project can move forward. Michael Hoyt – That is great to hear and even though these are separate parcels, they are the same ownership, and we like to see things clean on one before we start the other.

Kristin Boyd – I would like to also see everything completed, with the notes being added to the plan and getting a full plan set, before we move forward with the NEG DEC. I know there has seemed to be a lot of gaps in the communication with the staff hired for both projects, and things being done that were not supposed to be, so I would like to see things buttoned up before we move forward.

Glenn Smith – Helen, I think you mentioned that the town did a part 2 for the EAF, right? Helen Budrock – The applicant submitted part 1 and I have a draft for the part 2 that we can go through now if the Board wants.

Glenn Smith – Should we do a part 3 or would that be up to the Board? Helen Budrock – Yes and that is why I think we should go through them one at a time. I identified what I thought were the large to moderate impacts based on the plan submitted, but I want to make sure the Board is in agreement with that. Then we can fill out the part 3 once we all agree on what the impacts are.

Chairman Lara – Does the Board want to go through that tonight or would you like to wait? Kristin Boyd – I'd like to wait. Steve Vegliante – That may be best, because it could change the determination and to be fair to the applicant, I don't think we should answer those questions without a full plan review.

Glenn Smith – That is understandable and there will probably be some large to moderate impacts, so that would probably be best.

Helen Budrock – Chairman, are you okay if I share my draft with Glenn so he can take a look at what I have so far? Chairman Lara – That would be great because we want to see this project move forward.

Helen Budrock – Okay. Glenn, I will sent you a copy of what have drafted up.

Christina Cellini – And you mentioned earlier that he may own other properties in between these two. Glenn Smith – I am not sure exactly where they are, but they are all small parcels and I think some have houses on them.

Chairman Lara – I think that is correct, but I don't know if they are adjoining. Kristin Boyd – Some of them are adjoining the other project's property, but I don't know if he own's the property that adjoins this one; the one at that is at the end of Lake Shore.

Chairman Lara – Christina, were you asking because you are worried about him expanding? Christina Cellini – Yes. Christina Cellini – I don't think that is an issue here, but the glamping site is an issue.

Glenn Smith – How about I put together something showing all of the parcels he owns in the area? Steve Vegliante – I think that would be very helpful.

Chairman Lara – Yes, that would be great. Thanks Glenn.

Jim Carnell – Going back to the other project really quick to answer some of the Boards questions; they got their site plan approval and a site permit to clear the site. After that the building department was notified that there appeared to be additional clearing going on, so we went out there and the lot had been cleared over the weekend. So, I believe some of the property owner's and staff in my office contacted the DEC and made them aware of the situation. Mr. Minsky and the contractor who preformed the work are in a little bit of a disagreement about how thing went, but they quickly engaged in site stabilization with seed and mulch and other things like that. I believe they submitted an application to the DEC for the SWPP, knowing one was being prepared, to prevent any further action from them. Also, the Town issued a stop work order and as far as we are aware the work as stopped. Like Steve mentioned, at this time, we are just waiting on the SWPP to be completed so that we can sit down and see what we need to do from there.

Matt Sickler – Did they clear the trees and stump them? Jim Carnell – Yes. It was not the entire parcel, but it was about 3.2 acres roughly. As far as this project, which is obviously why Glenn is here tonight, one of the things I mentioned to the chairman earlier was that this is not just a subdivision, this actually needs site plan approval for the common lands and the improvements on those common lands. Typically, as part of the developer's agreement, we will engage out town engineer for site inspections and oversite. There will need to be some bonding for the infrastructure and the improvements. They are going to remain private

roads, so our town code does require oversight of those. Glenn Smith – That will all be part of the developer's agreement. Jim Carnell – Right, but I just wanted to point that all out for the Board. Chairman Lara – I like it. Jim Carnell – Maybe they can start working on some cost estimates to get over to Matt's office for review and approval because the bond is based off of those costs.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

Chairman Lara – Okay, I think you have heard enough and know what needs to be done and we will see you back when you are ready.

KEVIN'S BISTRO

249 Rock Hill Drive, Rock Hill, NY

Tim Gottlieb – Project Representative

Tim Gottlieb – We are here tonight for a site modification. The applicant is looking to add an additional 4 parking spaces in the back of the building for employee parking. Chairman Lara – I don't know if other board members have been there recently, but there is a surprising amount of space on the site. This is a tiny site, so he has really done a good job with that. Jim, is there any issues with parking in the back? Jim Carnell – No, in fact our code recommends more parking than is currently there. I did have one question though; is there any fill that will need to come in? Tim Gottlieb – No, it is pretty level there. Michael Hoyt – When this was the Krispy Apple, I think there was parking in the back. Dave had that trailer back there too that had to be cleaned up. Chairman Lara – This site is infinity nicer than we have ever seen it. Michael Hoyt – Correct and I think employee parking back there is a good idea. Chairman Lara – I agree. Matt, you okay with everything? Matt Sickler – Yes. I just have one question; will there be additional exterior lighting installed back there to help with visibility? Especially since it gets dark pretty early this time of year. Chairman Lara – That is probably a good idea. Jim Carnell – Maybe just add a note to the plan for that. Tim Gottlieb – And that they will be downward facing. Matt Sickler – Exactly. I think it is pretty dark back there so any additional light will be beneficial. Jim Carnell – Also, our water and sewer superintendent usually requires a grease trap be installed; was there ever one installed? Or was there already one there from the Krispy Apple? Chairman Lara – I know there is a grease container on the side of the building. Steve Vegliante – And I believe I had a discussion with Kevin about it because I am a little bit of a restaurant nerd. Jim Carnell – Okay, I just wasn't sure. Christina Cellini – The little loop shown on the site plan is for people to turn around? Tim Gottlieb – Yes, it is so the car in the last spot has room to get out. Christina Cellini – And there will be some sort of barrier so that they can't back into the patio, right? Tim Gottlieb – Yes, there will be bollards.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

A motion to approve the minor modification to the previously approved site plan was made by Arthur Knapp and seconded by Kristin Boyd.

All in favor, 0 opposed

DISCUSSION/POTENTIAL ACTION ITEMS **(as determined by the board):**

AVID-CANDLEWOOD SUITES HOTEL

Rock Hill Drive & Emerald Place, Rock Hill, NY

Larry Mitchell, Project Engineer

Larry Marshall – To give the Board an update, since we were last here, we have submitted an updated SWPP and revised the plans to address some of the outstanding comments. So, we are back to discuss those things with the Board tonight.

Chairman Lara – Matt, would you please start us off. Matt Sickler – My office did receive the revised SWPP and I believe we have started the review process for that. I believe someone from our office reached out to you today with some questions we had. Larry Marshall – Yes. Matt Sickler – Okay, so that is in the works and hopefully we can wrap that up sometime in the next few days. If we have any comments, we will get those over to Larry's office and out to the Board. Other than that, previously we have some minor site plan comments that I believe have been addressed for the most part. I'm not sure if you want Larry to go through those, but there is nothing major at this point. Jim Carnell – I think some of the stuff came from the public hearing, so maybe the Board would like to hear or see how that stuff was addressed. Larry Marshall – I did not bring that transmittal with me tonight, but we went through all of the public hearing comments and responded to those. Jim Carnell – Was the site plan updated because of any of those comments? Larry Marshall – No. The public hearing comments did not affect the plans at all. Jim Carnell – Okay. I just thought that some of the updates were because of public comment. Larry Marshall – No, the changes on the updated site plan come from Matt's review comments. I can go over those if the Board would like. Chairman Lara – That's up to you guys. Matt Sickler – I am skimming through them right now and there are some bulk table revisions, which are pretty dry, some parcel consolidation, no more exterior generators, and landscaping and lighting has now been provided. That is something the Board may want to look at since you haven't seen that yet. We did ask them to take a look at the grading where the entrance comes in, but as you know that road is steep, and grading may make turning into the entrance a little awkward. It would probably be okay for a passenger vehicle, but it might feel a little wobbly for a box truck. There is not a lot that can really be done differently there. Maybe just a quick look at the landscaping and lighting plan to make sure that is the look and feel the Board wants. Chairman Lara – Thanks Matt.

Chairman Lara – Helen, did you get a chance to look at this? Where do we stand with SEQR? Helen Budrock – If the Board feels this is far enough along in the review process, I was going to suggest a NEG DEC resolution be queued up for the next meeting and possibly even an approval resolution. I think whatever outstanding items there are, such as the landscaping, are fairly minor. Chairman Lara – It will give us all an opportunity to review the updated stuff by the next meeting. Helen Budrock – Right and decide if there are any conditions that need to be included. I can start working on the parts 2 & 3 of the EAF and maybe Steve can start working on the approval resolution. Or do you want to take it one step at a time? Steve Vegliante – Let's do the NEG DEC first and if the applicant wants to start the process of drafting up the approval resolution, they most certainly can. Larry Marshall – We will work on the NEG DEC first and if the Board is so inclined, we will start a draft approval resolution. We don't anticipate any substantial comments in regards to the SWPP or the landscaping and lighting, but any comments we received, we will obviously address. Steve Vegliante – Okay, so if you want to draft up the resolution and get that over to me, I will take a look at it. Matt Sickler – And we should have the SWPP review done by sometime next week, so I can reach out to Steve and Helen if I think there are any comments that may affect the NEG DEC or approval resolutions. Chairman Lara – Okay.

Michael Hoyt – What is going on with Emerald Springs and the water there? Chairman Lara – I believe it is almost buttoned up and there is just some final paperwork that needs to be done. Jim Carnell – I have been away for 3 weeks so I'm not really sure where they are at with that, but I know they were really close. Chairman Lara – You can ask the town supervisor for an update because that is who gave me the last update. Michael Hoyt – But they did get something worked out for water? Larry Marshall – We are connecting to the existing water system that is out front. Michael Hoyt – Wasn't there an issue connecting there? Larry Marshall – Not that I am aware of. Michael Hoyt – I thought this project came about when it was in the middle of being switched from the county to the town. Steve Vegliante – I think they have vested rights. Michael Hoyt – I think there is more to that. Steve Vegliante – Okay. Jim Carnell – Do you have a contract with the county? Larry Marshall – This is part of the original subdivision and is incorporated into that water district. Jim Carnell – Right, but do you have a contract with them yet? Larry Marshall – No, we do not. Steve Vegliante – I will look into it, but I thought there was a raised system. Michael Hoyt – No, there is not. Steve Vegliante – Okay, so I will look into it. Chairman Lara – And we will have that answer by the next meeting. Larry Marshall – Is this something we will should also be looking into? Chairman Lara – No, let Steve look into it because I think it is the town now. Larry Marshall – Okay. Steve, when should I follow up with you? Steve Vegliante – If you don't hear from me by Thursday, reach out. Larry Marshall – Okay. Helen Budrock – Mabe this is something that will need to be a condition. Steve Vegliante – Like Larry pointed out, I think they have rights to connect, there just may be some paperwork that needs to be done.

Kristin Boyd – Did we talk about signage? I can't remember. Are we okay with it or is it something that should be looked at with the landscaping and lighting as well? Larry Marshall – So, the landscaping plan, as well as the lighting plan, has been provided and I think they have been provided for several submissions now. We welcome any comments on those. I think the landscaping plan is pretty substantial and the biggest question would be whether or not you want some supplementary landscaping around the perimeter. Kristin Boyd – Right and I think that was brought up before. Christina Cellini – I think Shoshana also brought up possibly adding some walkways through there so people can safely access the businesses on Rock Hill Drive. Chairman Lara – I remember that and I feel like there was a grading issue, so Larry, maybe you can look back at your notes from that. Larry Marshall – Okay. I will have to look back into that because we did not incorporate that. What we had originally thought of, was to put a break in the retaining wall and incorporate stairs, but that proved to be very difficult. Chairman Lara – The topography on this site is tough. Shoshana Mitchell – Correct and I know they can't put real sidewalks in if they can't meet ADA requirements. Larry Marshall – We can certainly bring sidewalks out to the street, but I'm not sure if you want to encourage that. Getting down to the intersection is going to be very difficult due to the nature of the site and existing street. Chairman Lara – Understood and signage is something we are also going to want to see. Larry Marshall – We can put together a sign package with all of the details. Jim Carnell – You can send that into the building department and we will take a look at it. Larry Marshall – Okay. Steve Vegliante – And just make sure that everything you are proposing is okay with the franchise, so that you don't have to come back in the future to modify that. Larry Marshall – We will be working with them to stay within their parameters, as well as the town's, to find something that will work. Steve Vegliante – Perfect. Helen Budrock – And I can take a closer look at the landscaping plan, but I do not see any issues at this time. I would encourage the Board to take a closer look as well, just to make sure you don't want to see anything added or changed. Larry Marshall – There was also a mention to the lighting plan; we are using all dark sky compliant lighting fixtures. Kristin Boyd – You won't be able to see them from the interstate or around town, right? Larry Marshall – I can't say that with 100% certainty because of the topography of the site. We do sit high, so you will probably be able to see there is lighting on the building. Matt Sickler – I think you will see the site illuminated, but I don't think you will see shining lights. Larry

Marshall – Right. I think the only time you will be able to see the actual fixtures is if you were standing well below and under it. I think we are close to the elevation of the highway, so we are pretty much on-level there. I think the only time you will be able to see them is from the intersection down below and nothing is shining out, so there won't be any issues when driving by. Kristin Boyd – Okay. Shoshanna Mitchell – Is there any way to add some staggered plants and bushes, just to kind of break it up? Larry Marshall – We did incorporate a bunch of trees around the site, especially down at the intersection, and we have some bushes up near the fixtures themselves. But keep in mind that it will take time for the landscaping to fully grow in. Shoshanna Mitchell – Absolutely. Larry Marshall – And we also stayed at low level lighting, so it will not be lit up like a car dealership and there are not that many lights in total. Chairman Lara – This is in a commercial district and we understand that you need to draw attention to the building, but we appreciate you not going over the top with it. Matt Sickler – The parking is arranged so that it is not too far from the building, so the illumination from the building helps with the lighting for that and it's not like they are lighting up a massive parking lot. Larry Marshall – And the lighting fixtures are designed so that the lighting is directed towards the building and off to the sides. But we are welcome to any comments the Board may have on the landscaping or the lighting. Chairman Lara – Okay.

No further questions or comments from the Board.

Chairman Lara – We will see you at the next meeting. Jim Carnell – As long as we have the information by the deadline. Larry Marshall – I think we just need the NEG DEC resolution, so that shouldn't be an issue. Jim Carnell – Okay because our second meeting in November has been cancelled, so the next one would be the first December meeting. Larry Marshall – Okay.

THOMPSON'S OWN SOLAR

Downs Road, Monticello, NY

Robert Romine, ClearPath Project Representative

Justin Seeney, Project Engineer

Elizabeth Weatherby, AKRF Project Representative

Robert Romine – Since we were last here, we replied to a bunch of comments and provided a lot of information. We did do a few updates to the site plan, but I will let Justin get into that. Some of the comments required us to advance the design, particularly the electrical design, so the biggest change here is that we are now using a cab system, which is where the wires are mounted under the panels, but above ground. That way there will be no trenching in the wetland areas. The wires will go underground here and here; close to the inverters, so that they can convert the power from DC to AC. But that is just for a short stretch. I think that was the biggest change I had, so with that, I will hand it over to Justin now so he can go over the site plan.

Justin Seeney – Since we were last here, about a month ago, we met with Helen and Matt to go through both party's comments and we have since prepared a packet that has been submitted to address those things. The site plan had pretty much been finessed a little and the new wiring design Robert spoke about incorporated. Because of that the wires now run more centrally and the utility pads downsized considerably. Chairman Lara – It's nice to hear that it will be smaller, but why is it smaller? Robert Romine – We switched from what are called central inverters, which are essentially large boxes, to string inverters, which are a bunch of much smaller units. So, it is just a different way of doing it and the reason for the

switch is because we are getting further into detailed design and to the final selection of equipment, and this seems to be the better way to go. Michael Hoyt – What is the difference in appearance? Robert Romine – We submitted a cut sheet for it and if you look in the electrical set, there is a detailed showing what these things look like. There is also a detail that shows what the wiring under the panels will look like. Chairman Lara – Okay and it minimizes the impact, so that is good. Justin Seeney – And I would say all of these changes are pretty nuance compared to what we have presented in the past, in terms of the bulk of the solar farm layout. Although, the rendering that were provided recently are still accurate. It's just the design has been kind of refined. Just to walk through the revised site plan; the pink is the access road and what we have done in that respect is we relocated where the bioretention basin will be and introduced the vegetative swale, both to aide in water quality treatment. We updated the SWPP with some of the additional data that was asked for, demonstrating that we are within the DEC allowances for the flow rates. Like we talked about before, there is a ridge right about here on the site and some of the runoff flows down this way, straight to the DEC mapped stream back here, and some flows down this way into this creek, which makes its way back to the stream with the rest of the runoff. There was quite a bit of concern around the SWPP and how it will work, so I think what we have done and re-submitted to Matt demonstrates that we are in compliance with the stormwater code. We are working our way into a stream that is on our property and ultimately stays channelized. We also introduced additional fiber rolls to break up the sheet flow as there are some steep areas on the site. As for other changes in the submission, a lot of it was clarifying what kind of regulatory framework is around the wetland. What the blue dashed line represents is the delineation of the wetlands and we have previously provided a delineation report to support those. That report also goes into how this is all under the nation-wide permits for solar farms. The green on the plan is the clearing line and that is pretty similar to what has been submitted in the past. The lay down area will be over here and it will be access from a passage here, and as requested by your planner, we did give detail on how that will be restored once construction is done. The decommissioning plan was plan was another hot topic in Delaware's memo, so we d\beefed that up and provided some additional details. So, there was a lot. Elizabeth Weatherby – Also, the lighting was removed because there was a comment on that. Robert Romine – That was kind of my fault because I thought it would be nice to have some lighting on-site incase some emergency work needed to be done at night, but because the public had some concern there, we just took it off. Elizabeth Weatherby – Another thing we went over and incorporated was the commitment to leave this area wooded. Chairman Lara – And what was the width of that again? Robert Romine – It is 50 feet at the smallest point here and gets wider as you go further down into the road. Justin Seeney – We basically added notes to the site plan that binds this project to not be able to clear that area as long as it is a solar farm. Chairman Lara – Okay.

Chairman Lara – I know some of the board members have some questions on this, but I am gong to ask Matt to speak first as he some specific things he wants to discuss. Matt Sickler – Honestly, we don't see many nation-wide permit 51 applications and like Justin said, there was quite a bit of information provided. We have started to review it and I think it will be helpful to address what exactly is covered by that permit, so that Helen and I can advise the Board accurately. Once the review is complete and we have all of the questions or concerns Helen and myself may have, we can get those over to the applicant for their review. That way we can comfortably advise what that permit consists of. The permit itself was like 50 pages long and there were a few sets of conditions. Helen Budrock – Right, and going through those conditions, kind of one at a time to make sure how each will be addressed, was one of the things advised in the Delaware memo. The rest of the comments were minor, but did suggest the Board take a closer look at the screening to make sure you also feel it is adequate. The only other suggestion was to possibly request some additional information about the truck traffic during construction. Even though the highway superintendent is not requiring a bond, doesn't mean the planning Board shouldn't necessarily look at that. If you feel there may be some impact to the road ways during the time of construction, it is certainly within your purview to request some additional information for that. Chairman Lara – Steve, have you ever

done something like that? Steve Vegliante – Well, is there going to be a lot of truck traffic during construction. Robert Romine – I think we provided in the comment response what we expected the traffic to be. Chairman Lara – Okay, good. Robert Romine – What we typically see is 1 to 2 trucks per day and that would be over an 8–12-month construction period for this project. But there may be a period of about a month that will peak due to deliveries and you might get 5 -6 trucks a day. Steve Vegliante – I'm more concerned about large, earth moving equipment. Robert Romine – The goal is to leave the land as undisturbed as possible. Justin Seeley – Right. The tree clearing is probably the most intensive of all the operations and once the trees are down and the stumps are cleared, all that's left is putting the poles in the ground. Shoshana Mitchell – And the equipment to do that is not very big, right? Robert Romine – Right. It will just be some post drillers and during that time, you won't see too much traffic on the road because they will come in and leave the equipment on site until they are done. The deliveries are what will cause the highest volume of traffic. Steve Vegliante – I can review this more with the building department and Rich. Jim Carnell – I had another brief discussion with Rich about this and it not needing any bonding, and the only comment he had was that they keep the street clean and clear. He asked that the keep a small sweeper or something of that nature on-site to clear any mud or debris that gets tracked out onto the road. Matt Sickler – That should also be part of the SWPP. Justin Seeley – Right. That will be part of staying SWPP compliant and there will be weekly inspections done. Matt Sickler – Also, as part of the decommissioning plan, there is an estimate for a bond amount to be posted and I think the Town Board takes that on. Jim Carnell – Correct. Chairman Lara – Cool.

Michael Hoyt – At the last meeting we discussed NYSEG and trying to get something from them showing the new lines coming in, did we get anywhere with that? Chairman Lara – I did mention this to my contact at NYSEG and he said, I'll get back to you. So, I don't think we are going to get an answer. Michael Hoyt – We know that is not your problem, but it would have been nice to see. The route they are going to take to get to this site. Robert Romine – I know for us; they won't provide anything until we sign an interconnection agreement and that requires a hefty deposit and we don't want to do that until we have some sort of site plan approval. That is usually our very next step after site plan approval because having that agreement in place is a requirement for our NYSERTA funding. Chairman Lara – Okay. Robert Romine – We would also like to know what their plan is, since we are paying for the upgrades and would like to know if any easement will be needed, but there is no way they are going to give that to us. What we do know, and also submitted as part of our package, is that the existing line down on Cimarron Road cannot handle the injection. The question is how are they going to extend service to this site. Matt Sickler – I remember seeing that somewhere in this packet and it mentioned something about the existing line failed and needed to be updated. Robert Romine – Right. We have to replace, I think, 5 or 6 fuses with reclosers along that line. Along with extending the service. Steve Vegliante – So, maybe to kind of answer Michael's question, is it safe to say any improvements being made will be between Cimarron Road and the site? Robert Romine – Yes, for the new lines. But the existing line, with the fuses we are replacing, runs over to the Casino and then down to Rock Hill and those fuses are spaced out along the way. And that will be a fairly easy job. Matt Sickler – Will there be much of a visual change? Robert Romine – No. There shouldn't be. Michael Hoyt – Okay. I wanted to bring it up because I know there was public concern about it as well. I think the concern is a big box or something along those lines being put up in front of their house. Robert Romine – It shouldn't be anything like that. It should just be some more poles and lines. They shouldn't need any protection equipment from Cimarron over to the site at this time, but with that infrastructure now being there and accessible, new things can connect to it and you might then see a need for something like that in the future. Michael Hoyt – At this point I think we spent enough time on this and if you can end up getting something, great, and if you can't, you can't and that's okay too.

Christina Cellini – Can you guys clarify the estimated loss of wetlands. This states the project will not

involve permanent loss of any on-site wetlands, other than the foot print of the steel posts, which is approximately 9 square feet. Does that mean per post? Elizabeth Weatherby – No, that is for the whole project. Believe it or not, none of these wetlands are mapped by either the DEC or the Army Corp and there are more than we expected. But we really have tried to minimize and avoid impact to all extent practicable for this project. We were not able to reduce everything, but we were able to avoid a lot of impact. Also, most of the impact will be during the construction of the panels. Once they are up and functioning, the impact will be very minimal with only a total of 9 square feet. Christina Cellini – Okay. That makes sense.

Shoshana Mitchell – Most plants are over 26 inches in height, with wetland plants being one of the exceptions, and I'm sure there will be a maintenance plan that includes some weed whacking to keep the plants from clocking the panels; will that maintenance effect the absorption rate of the pants at all? Elizabeth Weatherby – It shouldn't. We are proposing a northeast wetland mix to enhance the wetlands that are out there and these panels rotate throughout the day, so there shouldn't be any excessive shading. Also, as part of the SWPP, we will have to reach stabilization before we can close it out. Justine Seeley – The absorption rate may change, but it will be in a gradual fashion. Shoshana Mitchell – Okay and in other solar projects we have seen, they talked about increasing some of the buffer around the parcel, to help with that. Justine Seeley – Right and that is why we proposed the fiber rolls, which will all be outside of the wetland.

Chairman Lara – Helen, where do we sit with SEQR? Helen Budrock – Well, we had a miscommunication about the circulating of the lead agency notices. They were not mailed out, so the Board will not be able to take any kind of action tonight or until the 30-day period is up. Even though that won't be by the next meeting, maybe this project can still come back and give us an update on any outstanding issues. At that meeting, if it seems like most of everything has been taken care of, we can discuss the idea of queuing up a NEG DEC resolution for the first meeting in December. Chairman Lara – That sounds fine, but just a forewarning that our next meeting is already quite large and you may be sitting here a while. Robert Romine – That is fine with us and we will do what we need to do. As for the lead agency notice, we have never done this part, so we apologize for the miscommunication. It is my understanding that this is a SEQR lead agency notice, so with the Army Corp being federal, it is not part of the state process, so do they need to be included? Steve Vegliante – I would include them as an interested agency. Elizabeth Weatherby – It is my understanding that it is still limited to state and local. Steve Vegliante – There is no down side to included them and I doubt they will respond. Elizabeth Weatherby – Okay. So, we will get the notices out tomorrow and notice of mailings for those to you. Justin Seeley – From process stand point, does there need to be a re-intend to serve as lead agency declared? Helen Budrock – No, there was just a delay in getting the notices circulated. Steve Vegliante – Just to cross T's and dot I's, lets just ask for a motion to redeclare the intent to serve as lead agency. Chairman Lara – Okay.

No further questions and comments from the Board.

A motion to re-declare the Board's intent to serve as Lead Agency was made by Arthur Knapp and seconded by Christina Cellini.
All in favor, 0 opposed

OLD ROUTE 17 WAREHOUSE

1283 Old Route 17, Harris, NY
Barbara Garigliano, Project Attorney
Ross Winglovitz, Project Engineer

Ross Winglovitz – We were last before the Board back in 2023 with a couple different concepts. We were proposing to build 2 separate warehouses, but we have now combined those into just 1 warehouse that will sit parallel to Old Route 17. The loading dock will be on this side and parking over here. One of the comments the county had on this was to combined the 2 entrances, the one for the solar farm and this one, so we did. Which actually benefitted us a little bit because we were able to make the building a little longer; gaining some square footage. Making the total square footage now 48,000 sq. ft. Other than that, it is the same exact layout. We have done and submitted a SWPP for Matt's review. There is a septic design and the septic will be located here on the site. We have also provided a grading plan, the well location, the location for the water tank, and so forth. There will be 2 driveways, 1 being for the loading dock. We are impinged by the hill that the solar farm is on, which we already have to cut into a little bit, so that is why there is no access from around the side. One of Matt's questions to me was if this would meet fire code and we believe it will and will demonstrate that. Chairman Lara – When this came before us previously, what I liked is that this is an industrial area and it fits in.

Chairman Lara – Matt. Do you have any questions before I open it up to the rest of the Board? Matt Sickler – Like Ross said, we talked a little bit about the fire access and I think they just need to demonstrate that there is enough room for a fire truck to turn around and add that to the plan. The building height I wasn't clear on and if it needs the aerial apparatus access, which looks like would only be on one side. Ross Winglovitz – That is correct. Matt Sickler – Okay, so maybe just add that to the plan as well. Also, if you could look at the truck turning template for the loading there just to show there is sufficient room for the trucks to pull in and then back into the docks. I know you are crunched for space, but the upper docks look a little tight. Then any exterior building lighting. Will there only be some on the front side and I don't know if you need any emergency exits, but those may need to be illuminated. Ross Winglovitz – There could potentially be exit doors here and they are required by building code to be illuminated. As for the front parking, it is only 64 feet away so we should be okay there, but we will probably need some light poles in the back. Matt Sickler – Okay. Just make sure the areas being light up don't have a glare issue. Ross Winglovitz – Absolutely. Matt Sickler – And I am assuming the height for the holding tank is less than 35 feet, right? Or that would be a lot of water. Ross Winglovitz - Yes, it is. Matt Sickler – Okay. I haven't dug too deep into this, but those are just some general concerns.

Chairman Lara – Helen, do you have anything? Helen Budrock – It has been a while since we seen this, so just to reacquaint myself, it looks like we sent the 239 out and it came back as incomplete because they wanted more information, such as the sight distance and the stormwater. It sounds like they are further along now and have some more information, so I'm wondering if it should go back to the county. Chairman Lara – I think so. Helen Budrock – And then if you guys are ready after that, I don't see that we ever had a public hearing on this. Barbara Garigliano – Right and I don't believe you declared lead agency on this either. Helen Budrock – Per the Project Overview form we did, so let me just take a look. Barbara Garigliano – Maybe that was for the solar farm? Steve Vegliante – It is checked on the Overview form for this project, but there is no date listed. Helen Budrock – On the time line it says this was here on 6/14/23 for a 239 referral and lead agency, so maybe just check your notes or the minutes on that. If you want us to declare it again so you can re-circulate the notices, we certainly can. Barbara Garigliano – I don't ever want to do anything twice, so if we can find it in the minutes that would be great. Ross Winglovitz – I think it is an unlisted action anyways. Helen Budrock – I don't see any copies of the lead agency notice in the

Drive, so I think it wouldn't hurt to just re-declare the intent just to be safe. Barbara Garigliano – And like I said, I don't have anything in my file and I would if we mailed anything. Helen Budrock – So, if you like, you can declare your intent to serve as lead agency tonight and I think it would be an uncoordinated review, unless anyone disagrees. Steve Vegliante – I pulled up the minutes from the 6/14/23 meeting and a motion to declare the Board's intent to serve as lead agency was made by Kristin Boyd and seconded by Christina Cellini and all were in favor. Barbara Garigliano – Okay. Steve Vegliante - Even though it was done and is uncoordinated, it can't hurt to redeclare your intent again anyways. Chairman Lara – Okay. Laura Eppers – Do we also need a new motion to send this back to the County? Chairman Lara – I was going to ask the same thing. Steve Vegliante – It can't hurt. Charman Lara – Okay and what about the public hearing? At this point, it would have to be the first meeting in December. Helen Budrock – Right, but at least that would be checked off and out of the way. Barbara Garigliano – And that would be December 11th, right? Chairman Lara – Yes. Barbara Garigliano – Okay. Helen Budrock – And you never know who is going to come out for the meeting or what they will have to say, so maybe just some renderings of what the building will look like would be helpful. Kristin Boyd – And maybe a plan on what the landscaping and lighting will look like as well. Barbara Garigliano – Okay.

No further questions and comments from the Board.

A motion to reiterate the Board's intent to serve as Lead Agency, uncoordinated, was made by Michael Hoyt and seconded by Arthur Knapp.

All in favor, 0 opposed

A motion to refer this project to the County for a 239 review was made by Arthur Knapp and seconded by Chritina Cellini.

All in favor, 0 opposed

A motion to schedule a public hearing on December 11, 2024 was made by Kristin Boyd and seconded by Michael Hoyt.

All in favor, 0 opposed

A motion to close the meeting was made by Michael Hoyt and seconded by Arthur Knapp.

All in favor, 0 opposed.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Eppers, Secretary

Town of Thompson Planning Board

