

Town of Monroe Planning Board Workshop Meeting MINUTES

— 09/10/2020

Town of Monroe Planning Board Workshop Meeting (Thursday, September 10, 2020)

Generated by Norinne McSweeney

Members present

Anthony Vaccaro, Lisa McQuade, Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Jason Czerwinski, Jeff Manson, John Allegro, Pat Shea

Consultants:

Ashley Torre, Esq.

Shawn Arnott PE

1. Welcome

Procedural: 1.1 Roll Call

Procedural: 1.2 Pledge of Allegiance

2. Returning Project

Action, Discussion: 2.1 **Berchtold Subdivision** (0178-2019) SBL # 28-4-8 84 Circle Drive

Caleb Pawelski - Pietrzak & Pfau
representing the applicant

Mr. Pawelski reviewed what is happening. Looking for an extension to file subdivision as they complete a few minor details for the driveway easement.

Ms. Torre you are able to give a 90 day extension, best to do it to a meeting date so November 17, 2020 meeting. Extension of the conditional final subdivision.

Chairwoman Franson makes a motion BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to extend the Berchtold subdivision until November 17, 2020.

Motion by Chairwoman - Bonnie Franson, second by Lisa McQuade.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Anthony Vaccaro, Lisa McQuade, Chairwoman - Bonnie Franson, Jason Czerwinski, Jeff Manson, John Allegro

3. Scoping Session

Action, Discussion: 3.1 **Monroe Commons** (0182-2019) SBL # 2-1-10 Nininger Road

Caleb Pawelski - Pietrzak & Pfau

Barry Terach Architect

Joel Mann - Applicant representative

This part of the meeting is being recorded by a court stenographer - Debra Boggs

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby opens the Public Scoping session for Monroe Commons

Motion by Chairwoman - Bonnie Franson, second by Anthony Vaccaro.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Anthony Vaccaro, Lisa McQuade, Chairwoman - Bonnie Franson, Jason Czerwinski, Jeff Manson, John Allegro

Chairwoman Franson opened the Public Scoping Session for Monroe Commons introduced herself and the board members to the public and included the Town Consultants attending. Explained that everyone has reviewed the Scoping Document and has prepared comments which will be reviewed and what revisions are needed for the Draft Scoping Document along with any public comment.

Informed the public that the scoping document and the consultant comments are all available on the Town website.

went over the ground rules

reason we are here is for a scoping session on a project called Monroe Commons it is a non-residential development project that's proposed along Nininger Road in the vicinity of where Lake Region Tire is and next to a large development called Moshi Gardens Ms. Torre will now review the process and where we currently stand on the project.

Ms. Torre Good evening everyone just to provide some history the Planning Board is acting as lead agency for the purpose of SEQRA review, the applicant first came before the board in November of 2019 and since that time the Planning Board reviewed the environmental assessment form, it's coordinated the environmental review with the other involved agencies, so other entities that have some type of approval authority over some aspect of the project they've all been contacted and the Town of Monroe Planning Board has been designated as the lead agency. The Planning Board issued a positive declaration, so the planning board determined that the action may have a significant adverse impact on the environment. The Planning Board in their positive declaration identified many different areas where there might be a potential significant adverse impact on the environment. So the next step and where we are tonight is what should be studied. So tonight's the public scoping session and scoping is how the Planning Board is going to identify the specific potential impacts that are going to be studied by the applicant in a draft environmental impact statement or DEIS. So this is an important step in the SEQRA process because it's really a starting point for what's going to be

studied, what are the specific impacts, how they are going to be studied by the applicant. So the scoping document itself is essentially an outline of what's going to be studied. The draft scope has been submitted by the applicant and that's available again on the Town's website and it's been sent to all the involved and interested agencies and that is now going to be revised by the Planning Board based on the public comments, their own comments and the comments of its consultants and the involved and interested agencies. So just to stress that tonight's not a public hearing on the actual project itself it's a public scoping session, the comments are really supposed to be focused on what environmental impact should be studied by the applicant in the environmental impact statement. So again looking for comments on types of impacts, types of potential significant impacts on the environment it's not about whether you like the project or not, that is not helpful at this stage to the planning board. If there are no questions from the board I will turn it back over to the Chairwoman.

Chairwoman Franson thank you Ms. Torre next we're going to turn it over to the applicant so they can provide a brief overview of the project, describe what it is so the public has a better understanding of your proposal Mr. Pawelski are you going to take the lead Mr. Pawelski I can take the lead for this. I just want to say first off good evening to all I'd like to thank the board for giving us the opportunity to do this public scoping session first I would just like to give a brief introduction of those who are present here with me. I'll introduce myself my name is Caleb Pawelski I work for Pietrzak Pfau Engineering Surveying we are the project engineers for this.

Also present with us tonight is Joel Mann of Brach & Mann Associates serving as project consultant, John Dahlgren of Tim Miller Associates he is the planner and he has prepared the draft scope for us and we also have Barry Terach of Terach Associates present he is the architect for this project. So a little bit of an overview

of where this actual project is located this lot is located on the northeast side of Nininger Road in the Town of Monroe Orange County New York section block and lot 2-1-10 it is 18.2 acres in size it's located within the heavy industry zoning district property is adjoined to the west by the Village of Kiryas Joel in the Town of Palm Tree municipal boundary and to the north by the Village and Town of Woodbury in this whole boundary As Chairwoman Franson previously mentioned also to the west of the project is the ongoing Veyoel Moshe Gardens development. The existing conditions of the property currently are wetlands and Woodlands. There are wetlands present on the southern end of the property with the EAF mapper identifying the class c stream present as you venture farther into the property elevations rise wetlands disappear and as mentioned the elevation will rise as you go through the back So the applicant is proposing the development of a mixed-use commercial building for this project. The proposed building will be four stories in height with a total of approximately 400,646 square feet inside the building will be for retail and office space as well as a 39 room hotel it will be served by two on-site wells for water and the waste water will connect to the orange county sewer district number one. Building entrances will be available on the first floor in the front and then as you go around the building the elevations will rise to match so as you go

along the left side of the building you'll have a second floor entrance and you get to the rear there will be a third floor entrance. There will be a loading dock on the eastern side of the building. Parking has been provided for this project in the form of 1071 parking spaces of which 805 are proposed to be constructed and 266 would be land banked parking spaces. In order to construct this project we will need to do some minor wetland disturbance in the front we're proposing 20,788 square feet of wetland disturbance for which we'll be providing one-to-one wetland mitigation so that's kind of a brief overview of what we're proposing to do. Chairwoman Franson thank you Mr. Pawelski so with that I am going to have this opened to the public for any comments they may have so we're going to look at the list of attendees and I will call out either a phone number or a name one by one and if you want to offer comments, if you want to speak again please just say your

name and address for the record, remember to speak slowly and you will be provided three minutes for your comments and again at the end of the time period if there's additional time after all the speakers we've gone through then we may open it up again to anybody who had some additional comments so with that Mr. Arnott if you could open up one eight four five seven two one two seven one two one Mr. Arnott just before we do that I'm not sure if I maybe missed it just wanted to mention about the part of the SEQRA review is the change in height for the HI District. Chairwoman Franson thank you so what Mr. Arnott referring to is that as part of this application the applicant is requesting a Zoning Amendment to allow the additional height within the HI Zoning district which applies to a couple properties in the town so that's part of the analysis thank you Mr. Arnott so is with the telephone number 2712 ending are they unmuted Mr. Mann if I may interrupt this is one of the owners he probably doesn't want to speak Chairwoman Franson okay you're certain Mr Mann Yes attendee is 1-845-783-9031 Hello Ward Brower Town Monroe Conservation Commission just two questions really what's the occupancy rate of these rooms in the hotel and as far as a wetlands replacement that's a one-on-one basis and where is it located next to the adjacent to the existing wetlands or where Chairwoman Franson so I don't know if we're going to necessarily respond to comments maybe we'll take them all at the end we're really just looking for comments on impacts if Mr. Pawelski can put those altogether and if there's time we'll go through some of those but we'll still note those comments and see how they fit into the scoping document Christopher Gerver no comments Danny we'll come back Laura Lawrence 30 Still Road Monroe New York thank you you're welcome what are your comments okay my well my question is I'm not sure this is my first time on one of these meetings I usually go in person unfortunately I'm here actually regarding the issue on Stevens lane on property Q and I think I might be at the wrong meeting Chairwoman Franson yes this is the Monroe Commons meeting. Lipa Deutsch did Lipa want to speak Mr. Mann I don't think so I think he's just watching.

Chairwoman Franson since we do have some time I would ask that our consultants if they would kind of provide some highlights of their review with regard to the draft scope and maybe some of the items that they think should be added to the draft scope and evaluated based on their review and so I'll first open it up to Aaron and Nina in terms of if you want to bring

anything to the board's attention

Mr. Aaron Werner I actually prepared some remarks I wasn't sure how many folks were going to speak and I wanted it brief so I am just getting on some highlights

Good Evening everybody I'm Aaron Werner I'm a planner with AKRF of the Hudson Valley office as you've heard tonight we're part of a group of consultants brought on by the town to assist with reviewing this application including technical review of several analysis topics that are included in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement Scoping Document so the memo that we've provided to the planning board outlines specific areas of focus that we're tasked with providing technical expertise on which include land use and zoning, transportation, historic and archaeological resources community facilities and services, fiscal impacts, noise, air quality, odor and lighting, visual resources, community character, energy and the alternatives. So before I summarize a couple of highlights from these comments in the memo I wanted to point out that in our discussions with the other consultants and the and Chairwoman Franson we've agreed that the scoping document requires some reorganization specific to chapter titles mainly in order for it to be more in line with the applicant's EAF that was submitted as well as the Planning Boards pretty detailed Positive Declaration that was adopted so you'll notice that's a recurring theme as you review our memo in terms of specific topics for

the DEIS. I'll summarize some of our thoughts on the description of the actions, the approach that we recommend to analyze the zoning text change that was brought up and the assessments related to transportation visual and the alternatives. For the project description we recommend that it be as comprehensive as possible in terms of all the actions before the Town Board, the Zoning Board of Appeals and the Planning Board the applicant seeks approval of a zoning text change, variance, special permit, and site plan with each reviewing body having a role so aside from the site plan we've asked that several additional drawings and plans also be presented up front in the EIS project description section to fully describe all the elements of the proposal so that can include the site plan, floor plans of the building all the elevations, architectural renderings, colors envisioned, storm water plans, the landscaping plans. It's all listed in the memo there with regard to the text amendment since it would apply to the entirety of the HI District. The DEIS must address the district-wide implications of that action so we're recommending that in the DEIS and in the scoping document a new chapter be added which would discuss this particular action. It would discuss the existing HI Zone parcels in the town and assess the potential for environmental impacts from increasing the maximum height this which is what's proposed from 40 to 50 feet. So the format of this chapter it's in our comments so just to give you a summary it could include a description of all the parcels within the HI district including location, acreage, ownership, existing land use, a discussion of the future development potential on these parcels if there is any potential impacts associated with the additional height that would be permitted for future development in the discussion of those impacts it can be limited to what's relevant you know not everything would apply but obviously land use zoning applies, visual could apply, utility demand etc so

that's how we think that should be addressed and that's typical for EIS's that have an action that's outside of just the project site for transportation we we're asking that for one the build year needs to be accurately described currently it's listed as 2008 I think it might have been a typo or it's an outdated scope we've also requested several study area intersections be added to the traffic impact study and most importantly a detailed data collection plan should be presented to the town before any work begins to properly account for what you know what are normal baseline conditions in light of the atypical traffic situation that we're currently seeing with the pandemic on the visual front potential impacts of the project should be illustrated with renderings, photo simulations that will accurately reflect the height, dimensions, physical placement, architectural materials, colors, window glazing etc for the project and potential impacts on visual and aesthetic resources for that visual impact assessment again we don't think that work should really begin formally without the Planning Board's input on specific vantage points to be used for the study where in the town can you see the site, are there special conditions or certain locations that maybe you didn't think of when you originally were scoping this so a plan should be presented that outlines those particular vantage points. We also recommended the same for the noise study. I didn't include a summary here but noise receptor locations should also be presented to the town before they begin and on the alternatives lastly I'll just talk about a couple of thoughts we had in consultation with the other consultants we in addition to the no action which is already covered in the scope we're recommending an as of right alternative be added which would assume the same mix of uses as the project but would comply with all dimensional requirements of the zoning there would be no zoning text amendment no variances and all the other applicable sections of the town zoning code would be complied with including parking the alternative could be developed with the required number of parking spaces therefore there would be no land banked or deferred parking under that alternative and also we thought of a multiple building alternative concept which would be assuming the same mix of uses but maybe within more than one building two or more buildings to accommodate what's proposed. So that's the snapshot of our comment memo you know it's several pages there's a lot of comments I'm sure you'll have questions as you all go through it, but I just wanted to give some highlights .

Chairwoman Franson thank you Mr. Werner Ms. Peek did you want to add anything Ms. Peek no I think Mr. Werner captured AKRF's comments accurately thank you

Chairwoman Franson next why don't we have Mr. Frank Getchell if you want to just give a highlight of what you're reviewing and then any highlights of that review

Yes good evening Frank Getchell I'm a Hydrogeologist as part of the team and so I've been concentrating primarily on water resources and the geology related to groundwater. So my focus primarily on a scoping document that was looking at impacts on those resources I think one of the things that we'd like to see

concentrated on is the use of the wells and the impacts of the use of those wells on the ground water resources the wetlands streams and also the impacts of any impervious surface

that's going to be introduced to the site on those resources because of the nature of the geology there we think it's important that when looking at scoping and figuring out how to assess that features such as bedrock fractures which have been identified in the area be looked at and mapped relative to the site

relative to the changes in the site impervious surfaces thermometer detention basins and the wells and I believe what I've seen so far is that testing is going to be completed pretty much in accordance with EEC and DOH requirements. I just want to make sure that those testing results and data are provided as part of the documents DEIS document and that the testing not also look beyond just the wells themselves but impacts on the resources too your site is located within the Ramapo River Valley aquifer system so I think it's important that the testing and the potential for impacts on that system be addressed. I think that was primarily it regarding groundwater. The only thing also we had looked at was environmental conditions at the site I know there are requirements for looking at past site history and in particular any sort of evidence of past disruptions or dumping at the site the project with this type of construction requirements is obviously going to disturb most of that site and if such soil or materials exist we believe that that needs to be addressed relative to not just the construction but also the post development of the site use of the wells and any kind of influence of pumping and modifications of drainage obviously there's a lot more detail provided in our memo that lays all that out and it's much more specific but I think those are the more salient points that we focus on.

Chairwoman Franson great thank you Mr. Getchell Up next Dave Tompkins from CHA if you want to give a little bit of an introduction and what you've examined.

Thank you Chairwoman Franson good evening my name is Dave Tompkins I'm with CHA consulting out of Colony New York my specialties of wildlife ecology and wetlands science so I looked through the application and it's got some things missing that really are needed basically a wetland delineation report and a habitat assessment report. The wetland delineation report should identify who delineated the wetlands, when they were delineated, and does a jurisdictional determination exist, who validated the wetland line and this would fall under the jurisdiction of the core to do that. There's a stream out there the stream is not shown on the maps that I could see it seems to be incorporated into the wetlands that is a maps DEC stream it's got a tributary number I'd like to see some measurements on that some field data sheets as to bank width flow etc. The habitat assessment identified one bat species as being in the area there's also several other species that are there. In my memo I believe the wetland is an emergent wetland anything in Orange County that's emerging technically has to be evaluated for bog turtle habitat so there's some things missing there but I think the production of a wetland delineation report and a habitat assessment would answer a lot of those questions. You know some of my concerns about the project are how you've automatically taken over twenty thousand square feet of wetland in in my experience there's usually a process in getting permits for wetlands and you've gotta demonstrate avoidance minimization and then compensation. I think it's a little premature to already say you're going

to do one-to-one mitigation because that may not be true that ratio could actually be much higher depending upon the quality of the wetlands which bears fruit from the habitat assessment, so I think you know the whole permitting issue is going to tie back to the wetland delineation report and the habitat assessment. I did have the same question as the other gentleman before where are you proposing the mitigation. We don't have to get into the details of the mitigation project right yet but it should kind of be conceptually visualized out where is it going to be is it available you just can't fill almost half an acre wetland and just say we're going to mitigate and not identify where and again it's very questionable as to whether that one-to-one ratio will hold up. I haven't seen this wetland so the value of that wetland is going to determine what that ratio ultimately is. One last thing on the landscaping plan I'd like to see some wildlife value if possible built into that landscape plan, for the loss of habitat. That's pretty much what I have Bonnie.

Chairwoman Franson great thank you very much Mr. Tompkins. So Karen I don't believe is on so I'm going to ask Mr. Arnott and then Ms. Torre if they wanted to bring up anything.

Mr. Arnott I can just give a brief overview of my memo generally I was looking at water infrastructure, wastewater infrastructure and then soils topography and storm water management specifically on the wastewater as was discussed before the applicant is proposing to do a pump station and then convey all the sewer to the adjacent proposed project and infrastructure that is proposed to be installed there so just looking to identify quantity of waste water quality of wastewater and best management practices related to both of those on the water end we discussed that there's two wells being proposed that Mr. Getchell got into a little bit on the hydrogeology side, but then how that water is treated and then proposed to be conveyed to the project or the building and treated and available for fire protection and on the soils and storm water side how the existing grade is going to change how much cut and fill is there going to be looking at potential areas where vegetation could be without disturbance and then the preparation of a storm water management plan and erosion and sediment control plan which will be required based on the size of the development. Those are my concerns.

Chairwoman Franson thank you Mr. Arnott, Ms. Torre did you want to add anything

Ms. Torre just briefly I had some comments just on overall formatting structure and I think Mr. Werner and I were on the same page just how we think the document could be better structured for the board to better understand and for the public to better understand and for the applicant to really understand what's being expected and what types of studies that are desired of them. So I think one of the big thing was the Zoning amendment because that really wasn't addressed in the scope it wasn't really a focus as far as the impacts of that because it is district-wide so that's definitely something that needs to be incorporated. I gave some comments just on the substantive sections as well throughout based on conversations that the Planning Board had early on. One meeting there's discussions about wanting to see similarly

sized buildings so where in the county something comparable so that's something relevant to the land use zoning chapter so things like that to incorporate. I don't know whether the board has any questions or if you want to talk about process.

Chairwoman Franson so I just want to say before we open it up to the Planning Board to ask the consultants any comments, but before we do that I just noted there was one attendee that's popped up with cpb, Joel does that sound like that's someone from your group, no so why don't we see if we can unmute cpb just to see if they are here to offer any comments so cpb you are muted if you want to unmute and state your name and address for the record and if you have any comments on Monroe Commons you can offer them as far as concerns you may have with environmental issues. Hi Craig Brady Highland Mills just attending for information purposes.

Chairwoman Franson all right thank you for joining us. So then with that you know Mr. Pawelski Mr. Brower had two questions and it did come up among the consultants comments one was is there mitigation shown yet on the plan and the second was guest room occupancy. Not sure if the project is fleshed out to that degree to talk about what anticipated number of guest rooms and occupancy is but if you want to touch upon either of those Mr. Pawelski I can't really flesh out what the total occupancy would be I can tell you that we have proposed a 39 room hotel that is what we wrote in terms of who would be in those rooms I can't give you the definitive answer on that at this time. In regard to the wetland mitigation on our sketch site plan we do show proposed one-to-one mitigation we would be expanding the existing wetlands on the southern edges towards Nininger Road. On the plans you can see down there in the southern portion that hash portion that is the proposed one-to-one mitigation area and obviously as we go through this process we will provide a wetland mitigation plan. Chairwoman Franson I saw that Barry may have kind of raised his hand, did you want to say anything about the hotel Hi Barry Terach architect the only thing I wanted to offer about the hotel occupancy at this time though 39 rooms are different suite arrangements each of those suites is set up for a double occupancy each one bedroom two beds every one of the 39 rooms is set up for that so I guess we're talking about 78 occupants. Chairwoman Franson okay thank you so that gets to Mr. Brower's comments that he had raised so I'm going to allow the planning board members if you just want to raise your hand so that we know who's going to speak first if anybody wants to ask any questions of the consultants or the applicant.

Member Vaccaro a couple of questions one for my benefit and maybe the public's benefit if we could slowly go through who the consultants are for the planning board what their specialty is and who is attending tonight if there's any Monroe's consultants Chairwoman Franson representing Monroe

Member Vaccaro yes

Chairwoman Franson why don't we start with Mr. Werner

Hi I'm Aaron Werner with AKRF for Environmental Planning Engineering Consulting Firm, Nina Peak who's also on the line we work together in the Hudson Valley Office which is in White Plains so we've been brought on to look at select chapters that are mostly planning related chapters which I rattled off in my summary I'll go back through that again it's land use, transportation analysis, historic resources, the community facilities analysis, fiscal impacts, economic fiscal impacts, the noise, air quality order and lighting aspects, visual resources, community character, energy usage and the alternatives and just general kind of quarterbacking of the SEQRA process and in general, but those are the areas that we've been brought on to assist with.

Hi I'm Frank Getchell a hydrogeologist with Weston and Sampson our local office is in lower Hudson Valley area for close to 38 years with another firm that was acquired Recently so pretty familiar with the local hydrogeology and I'm going to be focusing on the groundwater supply, groundwater impacts associated with the development with the use of the wells, groundwater quality, current versus what may be associated with impacts from the proposed development, but also looking at it relative to the immediately surrounding areas because groundwater does move it's dynamic they're not sitting on a bathtub so my area will be focused around that, also be looking at environmental conditions on the site relative to soil quality not geotech but anything associated with artificial fill any kind of past dumping that may have been in place as part of past uses at the site and also looking at the immediately surrounding sites as far as having any influence on that environmental quality.

Hi Dave Tompkins I'm a wildlife biologist and wetland scientist so they've asked me to look specifically at the ecological resources and wetland impacts as well as environmental permitting for those and wetland mitigation as well. I live up in Ulster County I'm in the Town of Shangham but I've worked in Orange County extensively through my you know 40-year career here Shawn Arnott from McGeoy Hauser Edsall the Engineer for the Planning Board generally for the scope of the scope of the review for SEQRA I was looking at water, waste water kind of site elements and then the storm water side grading erosion and sediment control and I'll be reviewing the SWPP Ashley Torre of Burke Miele Golden and Naughton and we're the attorneys for the Planning Board so legal issues and really the SEQRA process coordinating we'll be working with AKRF on that as well

Chairwoman Franson thank you Member Vaccaro do you have any more Member Vaccaro yes two things one is do we have a traffic consultant and why aren't they here tonight.

Chairwoman Franson we do and we voted at a prior meeting AKRF is doing the traffic Meber Vaccaro okay and then the other thing I'm not sure which consultant would look into this but this was a discussion early on one of the things that the applicant is proposing to offset runoff requirements and impervious surface is pervious paver stones and my questions about that in terms of the life expectancy and how that really does mitigate for or replaces impervious areas. Chairwoman Franson so Member Vaccaro there was I think a letter that came from Mr.

Maldonado the Building Inspector in terms of pavers and them related to impervious versus whether it's pervious block coverage and as far as impervious surfaces durability the engineering aspects of it that would be Mr. Arnott reviewing that. Member Vaccaro okay thank you

Chairwoman Franson anybody else members

Member Czerwinski I know we're still early on in the process here but has there been any early indicators that a phase two study would be necessary for this

Chairwoman Franson that would be directed to you're talking about a phase two environmental site assessment Member Czerwinski yes

Chairwoman Franson this is pretty early on we don't have anything at this point Mr. Getchell you want to speak to that

Hi Jason when we looked at the documents provided so far we did provide comments indicating taking a look at the site history and regarding that I think we're supposed to be doing a site visit sometime in the near future looking for evidence of past dumping filling what have you on the site and asking the applicant that if such information or evidence is there that some kind of sampling be done that would be your phase two and also with respect to that we were also requesting as part of the memo that when the testing is done on these proposed supply wells that they also be sampled and submitted for analysis so I think that's going to cover pretty much where you want to you know with any concerns that might arise all right. Member Czerwinski thank you

Mr. Werner I'll add to that in talking with Mr. Getchell and the other consultants we recommended that hazardous materials in general be kind of covered under a construction chapter in the document which would summarize past uses like Mr. Getchell said and then anything that would be required as part of construction usually remediation goes hand in hand with construction so that's where we're proposed we're requesting that that be covered Member Czerwinski great thank you

Chairwoman Franson anybody else you can just unmute yourself

Member Vaccaro follow-up to my question for the traffic AKRF is doing the traffic do they have or did they have anything to say about what they're going to be focusing on Mr. Werner AKRF is reviewing the applicant's consultant's work I believe Creighton Manning is the applicant's traffic consultant AKRF will be reviewing that work Member Vaccaro okay Chairwoman Franson I think in particular what we came away from in an initial discussion with the consultants that somehow needs to be reflected if they haven't taken any traffic counts yet is the fact that we are dealing with Covid right now and so you know how do we estimate what the full traffic impact would be you know in a you know as if this was a pre Covid situation so I think you know that's kind of the level of detail we're getting into you know to ensure that this environmental impact statement addresses all these alternatives and our current environment the realities of it so I thought that was pretty astute. Does anybody else have comments from

the Planning Board

Member Manson just a couple of things I had a chance to quickly go through the Information from the memos from the various consultants some of the things that I'm going to be particularly looking at is it looks like the site is going to have some significant grading to accomplish the plan and looking at as far as the removal of earth and soil is going to be done from the site and what's going to happen to that and the impact of that or fill brought in to create the landscape that they need for this design. Something that came up in a couple of the things is how to accomplish some tree preservation on the site and also some screening I guess along the front of the site and I'm particularly interested in the existing wetland conditions and what that's going to look like after everything's done. How the mitigation is going to mitigate. It looks like from what Mr. Pawelski pointed out earlier on the site plan when we brought it up that a lot of the mitigation area is along the road and how we can accomplish both possibly the mitigation there if that's where it winds up being and continue to have some screening to this site along the roadway. So those are just some things that I was thinking about. I was particularly interested in AKRF comments about looking at either looking at the situation both without any changes to the zoning law or you know any variances that might be particularly needed. What it would look like if they were working within those strictures if that's what needs to be and also the looking at the possibility of a multi-building alternative. So I'll be looking at those areas of the EIS in particular so I just want to highlight that. Chairman Franson thank you Member Manson that's good any of my other board members

Member Vaccaro can I bring up one more thing I just thought about it but the state troopers barracks is there and they have a helicopter landing pad and if they're talking about height increase potentially in this area or any other traffic for that wondering how that may impact the project Chairwoman Franson thank you for that so we'll have our consultants take a look at that and how that concern may be integrated into the EIS whether that's traffic question a community facilities and services question anything else everyone. So with that Ms. Torre should we close the public scoping session but leave for now the time period open to receive any kind of written comments for at least 10 days or so Ms. Torre yes that makes sense you could close the public scoping session except you will receive comments for 10 days that falls on a Sunday so it would be that Monday the 21st would be 10 days I could work with Norinne to get something posted on the website some kind of notice letting people know that you'll receive written comments through them Chairwoman Franson okay so before we close the public scoping session does anybody have anything that they want to add any last thoughts either applicant Consultants everybody's good all right so. **BE IT RESOLVED** that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby close this part of the public scoping session and process but that we leave the time period open to receive by email or mail or drop off written comments to the town by September 21st at 4 pm that's when town hall closes.

Motion by Jeff Manson second by John Allegro.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Anthony Vaccaro Lisa McQuade Chairperson - Bonnie Franson Jason Czerwinski Jeff Manson John Allegro Pat Shea

Chairwoman Franson so with that we have closed this part of the public scoping session process thank you everyone who participated thank you to all our consultants who are representing the town planning board members uh as well as thank you to the applicant for being present to listen to the comments and any public members who came and attended and provided their comments this zoom meeting will be available for viewing Norinne on the town website yes so if there's anybody who couldn't attend they can also watch this zoom session at our next available planning board work session when we can address this on the agenda the intent is to have a revised draft scoping document that addresses and integrates all the comments raised by the consultants and anything raised by the public and then ultimately we will adopt it within the time frames that were agreed to with the applicant so thank you very much all we will be talking to you all soon have a great night

BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby close this part of the public scoping session and process but that we leave the time period open to receive by email or mail or drop off written comments to the town by September 21st at 4 pm that's when town hall closes.

Motion by Jeff Manson second by John Allegro.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Anthony Vaccaro Lisa McQuade Chairperson - Bonnie Franson Jason Czerwinski Jeff Manson John Allegro Pat Shea

4. Adjournment

Action: 4.1 Adjourn Meeting

BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby adjourns tonight's meeting at 8:25pm

Motion by Chairperson - Bonnie Franson second by Jason Czerwinski.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Anthony Vaccaro Lisa McQuade Chairperson - Bonnie Franson Jason Czerwinski Jeff Manson John Allegro Pat Shea

..