Town of Kent Planning Board

25 Sybil's Crossing Tel: 845-225-7802

email: planningkent@townofkentny.gov

Kent, NY 10512 Fax: 845-306-5283

RESOLUTION 12 APPROVAL OF TRANSCRIPT OF **ROUTE 52 COUNTRY SOUARE LLC** SCOPING SESSION **JULY 11, 2018**

Date: August 8, 2019

From: The Kent Planning Board

Re:

Route 52 Kent Country Square LLC Scoping Session Transcript

TM: 12.-1-52

Resolved on August 8, 2019 the Kent Planning Board reviewed a Transcript of the Scoping Session for the above mentioned property which was held on July 11, 2019.

In attendance were the following Planning Board members:

Phil Tolmach, Chairman

Charles Sisto

Dennis Lowes

Dennis Lowes, Vice Chairman

Stephen Wilhelm

Others in Attendance:

Liz Axelson, Planner

Bruce Barber, Environmental Consultant

Julie Mangarillo, Engineer

Bill Walters, Kent Building Inspector

Absent:

Simon Carey Giancarlo Gattucci Nisim Sachakov

Mr. Tolmach asked for a motion to approve and accept this transcript. The motion was made by Mr. Wilhelm and seconded by Mr. Lowes. Following were the roll call votes:

Phillip Tolmach, Chairman <u>Aye</u> Simon Carey Absent Giancarlo Gattucci Absent Dennis Lowes Aye Nisim Sachakov Absent <u>Aye</u> Stephen Wilhelm

The motion carried.

I, Vera Patterson, Planning Board Secretary of the Town of Kent, County of Putnam, State of New York, does certify that the foregoing and attached Transcript is a true excerpt from material discussed at the Planning Board meeting held on August 8, 2019.

Dated: August 8, 2019

Planning Board Secretary

TOWN OF KENT PLANNING BOARD

- 1. ITEMS FOR SEQRA PUBLIC SCOPING SESSION
- (A) Route 52 Development Special Permit, Site Plan and Erosion Control Plan.

Kent Town Hall 25 Sybil's Crossing Kent, New York 10512

July 11, 2019 7:30 p.m.

BEFORE:

PHILLIP TOLMACH, Chairman

DENNIS LOWES, Vice Chairman

STEPHEN WILHELM, Board Member

GIANCARLO GATTUCCI, Board Member

SIMON CAREY, Board Member

CHARLES SISTO, Board Member (Not present)

NISIM SACHAKOV, Board Member (Not present)

ALSO PRESENT:

VERA PATTERSON, Secretary

CYNTHIA WHITE, R.P.R., Official Senior Court Reporter

1 CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: Next, Route 52 Development 2 Corp. 3 Liz, do you want to speak first? MS. AXELSON: Yes. 4 5 CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: I have to open the scoping 6 session first. I should open the scoping session. 7 MS. AXELSON: Hang on. I'll jump up. 8 CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: Can I get a motion to reopen 9 the scoping session? 10 MR. WILHELM: I'll make that motion. 11 CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: A second? 12 MR. GATTUCCI: I'll second that. 13 CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: All in favor? Aye. 14 MR. GATTUCCI: Aye. 15 MR. CAREY: Aye. 16 MR. LOWES: Aye. 17 MR. WILHELM: Aye. 18 MS. AXELSON: So this is going to be the 19 continuation of a public scoping session. 20 What's happened since the last scoping session is 21 that Julie and Bruce and I conferred about the scoping

that Julie and Bruce and I conferred about the scoping outline.

We looked at the transcript, we looked at public

22

23

24

25

we looked at the transcript, we looked at public comments that came in, and worked closely to try to incorporate all of the public scoping comments that came

in. And also I made a number of revisions to the scoping outline to provide for the forthcoming zoning petition. I know that we have gotten a draft of that so at least we have a clue.

But before I had prepared the draft revised scoping outline dated July 2, 2019. I had already made provision for the forthcoming zoning petition based on what we knew at the time and based on what we knew from the scoping sessions.

What I'm suggesting tonight as a sort of order of how to do things, I'd like to just walk you through a resolution that I prepared for the Board's consideration in consultation with Julie and Bruce.

Also, this draft resolution has been examined by the Planning Board's attorney, Jeffrey Battistoni, and we discussed the process and how it's possible tonight most likely if the Board is in agreement, to be able to hold the public scoping session, hear any further comments, and then possibly to close the public scoping session and possibly to consider this resolution.

Just for the record, I want to just do a quick walk-through why are we doing a new resolution at this time. This resolution is intended and you'll do this at the end, but I would like to do the walk-through now so that way if you have any questions before you determine

whether to take action.

So this resolution basically walks back through the process that was done, walks you through to, let's see, all of the meetings that you've discussed this project over the course of I think a year plus.

And I'm going on to page two of the draft resolution. And it also recounts the fact that on October 11, 2018, you classified this as a type one action, declared your intent to serve as lead agency, directed the secretary to circulate notice, and circulated materials to involved and interested agencies about the project, including statement of use, full EAF and plans.

Then on April 11th, you established yourself as lead agency, adopted the contents of Full EAFs parts two and three, Full EAF part three narrative, identifying project impacts and evaluating the magnitude of those impacts. And you adopted a SEQRA positive declaration, at that time a determination of significance, indicating the project may result in significant adverse impacts on the environment and environmental impact statement must be prepared.

And you set the date for the initial public scoping session for May 23rd. And then it recounts that you held the scoping session. And that due to a project change raised at the May 23rd public scoping session the

Board continued the scoping session to Thursday, June 13th and to today.

And we are anticipating a petition for a zoning amendment regarding building height. So that's documented on page three of the resolution.

And basically the next few paragraphs get you ready to do an amended SEQRA positive declaration; in other words, an amended determination of significance to incorporate the fact that a zoning petition to amend zoning texts in the IOC zone will now be part of the proposed action.

The resolution also documents all the different letters that you've received and the fact that you've examined a transcript.

And basically the last page you're kind of repeating some steps you have done and you are going to adopt the contents of Full EAF parts two and three, Full EAF part three narrative, to include the change in the proposed action. You'll do another positive declaration, declaring the need as before for an environmental impact statement.

And then you'll adopt the scoping outline last revised July 2, 2019, as your final scope, including the anticipated zoning amendment.

And you're going to direct Vera to circulate a

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

copy of the resolution, EAF parts two and three, and part three narrative, and the scoping outline revised July 2 to the project sponsor, the Supervisor of the Town of Kent, the Town Board of the Town of Kent, because they are now becoming an involved agency once the zoning petition is submitted to the Town Board.

And you're going to direct us to file the amended positive declaration with the ENB.

Then there is a final paragraph I'm going to read out loud, which is:

Further resolved that should any further issues that arise specifically related to the change in the proposed action to include the zoning amendment from circulation of the amended positive declaration resolution and all the parts that go with it within 30 days from the date the amended materials are circulated, probably next Thursday, or within 30 days of the date that a copy of the anticipated petition for a zoning amendment is provided to the Planning Board, whichever occurs later, the Planning Board will consider whether another amended positive declaration is required and whether the adopted scoping outline must be revised and re-adopted.

So I just wanted to frame that for you. And you can assess whether you feel you are ready to take those actions.

We'll hear from the applicant's folks. And then we'll hear from the public as part of the public scoping session. And then I believe that you can close the public scoping session depending on what we hear.

CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: Does anybody have any questions for Liz? Gentlemen, you're up next.

MR. CARUSO: Good evening, everybody. Michael Caruso, the applicant's attorney.

Members of the board, good evening. We've circulated a draft petition to the Town Board.

As Liz had indicated there is a prospective zoning amendment that we were discussing at the last scoping session. I have a draft of that in front of me.

I'm not sure if it's made to every planning board member yet. I believe, Mr. Chairman, one went to you. Forgive me if everybody was not on that E-mail circulation, as that was this afternoon.

I'll take you through that briefly. So what we're proposing which is consistent with the project as it's been proposed as the iterations have come before the Board, the prospective operators and some of the back end development for the site and some of the hotel chains that we've already identified, the criterion specific to their development packages that we would have to satisfy which necessitate the amendment I'm going to describe now.

1.4

What we proposed to the Town Board, and this has been circulated to the Supervisor, the Town Board's attorney as well, and discussed with the two of them is an amendment to Section 77-25, subsection H of the zoning code as it relates to Lot and Bulk requirement specifically within the IOC district.

What we're asking for is that the maximum height and number of stories be altered. Where they require or limit to 40 feet in three stories maximum, we're requesting five stories and 70 feet. And the reason is not necessarily because we're going to or we believe the operators are intending to stack rooms all the way up to 70 feet, it's to accommodate the brand and style of their marquee and the way their hotel designs are now conceptualized.

And we believe that as the project is pretty well tucked into the hill and pushed as far as we can towards 84, that the impacts of any of the zoning amendment text is really -- there is no impact to the scope of the project if you will. This is the legal mechanism we feel is best to accommodate and achieve that.

So since we've started really the scope of the project, the scope of the hotels or their size I don't think has changed. So it's just the way that we need to accommodate it under the current code and height and bulk

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

requirements.

So the petition lays out the grounds and the description of the project which the Board is well familiar with.

I go through in considerable detail the comprehensive planning goals that are laid out in the comprehensive plan that was revised in 2008.

I'll take you through some of the more salient points in the petition. You know, the comprehensive planning goes into great detail about enabling and encouraging mixed uses within the IOC districts, specifically these types of stand-alone mixed uses that are able to self-sustain if you will.

You know, establishing a medium to promote medium and large scale commercial establishments capable of thriving independently as in Article 7 of the IOC District goals, purpose and permitted uses.

And we describe how this project is really suited to this type of a goal based on the fact that we have a larger undeveloped tract of land. The fact that we can mitigate some of the visual impacts of some of the features, some of the hotels obviously.

We have sufficient area, we have sufficient grade we believe. And we've taken a number of steps I think to incorporate all those concerns into what those goals are.

With respect to Chapter 4 in the comprehensive plan as it relates to population, you know, we think that the site will easily offer diverse employment opportunities, bring people to the area, kind of enhance that population base if you will.

Chapter 6 in the comp plan identifies studies for new zoning, increased economic development. We certainly feel that this will enhance the tax base, bring, you know, a number of drivers economically and it fits within the goals economically of the comprehensive plan.

In terms of recreational opportunities, you know, again this amendment and the purpose for which we're advancing it are to help satisfy these comprehensive planning goals so under recreation there is an identified need to increase facilities accommodating activities like basketball, tennis and year-round activities inside, specifically citing indoor facilities. And obviously we're proposing an indoor water feature or park. We're working with some of those details but obviously I think that's a concern to be alleviated and hopefully a goal to be fulfilled.

And some of the other comp planning goals in Chapter 8, vision implementation as it relates to green building design standards, to the extent that the relief we are asking for under the amendment would prop up the

height, we believe that we have a number of mitigating factors in green building standards to help offset that, the availability for solar or any other green technologies or LEED standards that have been discussed that may be able to be incorporated I think certainly are within the profile of what the comprehensive plan is asking for.

So the end result we think is that this project and the proposed amendment really do check off a lot of boxes if you will in the comprehensive plan and what it's trying to achieve for IOC.

We're trying to tailor this amendment in a way that it's not generic, that it doesn't have a widespread impact, and it doesn't fundamentally change the nature of our application which we certainly don't think it does.

And one of the ways to temper that even further in our petition in subsection E, we identify some ways that the Town Board and even the Planning Board in discussing this together, we could possibly attach special use conditions to this type of relief.

exceed 50 acres in size; certain building setbacks from property lines that might be more enhanced in this situation based on the size of the buildings or the size of the lot; minimum occupancy, perhaps, you know, a standard to be applied; no less than 150 rooms per buildings that

are going to be suitable for these kinds of increases, or tailoring relief only to hotel uses.

So these are some of the things we can think about with the Planning Board, with the Town Board in how best to condition the amendment and, if you will, make it more tailored to the use that we're proposing, instead of just making it a blanket district-wide enabling type of legislation which is what we're not trying to advance here.

We want something that is unique and that there's another applicant that comes along in a couple of years, a couple of months, whatever it is, they have the opportunity and the Board can also look at it holistically and decide whether the use fits the intended purpose of the legislation.

So hopefully they'll be more behind us that they could benefit from this as well, obviously the IOC district.

So that's a run through of the petition. I hope we will have some good discussion, I trust we will in front of this Board, in front of the Town Board with input from everybody involved.

But I think it certainly doesn't change the scope or any of the scoping elements that we have outlined that, you know, Liz and the consultants in our project team have taken a lot of pains to get right.

1 2 3 4 5 6 Any of the language? 7 8 add? 9 MR. SCOTT: Yes. 10 amended draft of the resolution. 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 finalize the document. 18 19 MS. AXELSON: Okay. 20 21 22 Any questions for Peder? 23 resolution?

Like I said at the last scoping session, it's just a different means to get to that result, the result being how we want to develop the site, which I think has been very consistent hopefully for the Board.

So any questions about the proposed amendment?

CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: Peder, do you have anything to

I did take a look at the

The only thing is I'd like to have Liz look at page three of four of the Part three EAF, just because we think there might be some issues with the inclusion of a paragraph in regards to the building heighth under impact on transportation, impact on energy.

I just want to make clear that the new underlined entries are to be included in these subsections before we

MR. SCOTT: That's my only comment. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: Great. Thank you, Peder.

MR. WILHELM: Liz, is this impacting the

MS. AXELSON: I don't think so.

24

MR. WILHELM: Okay.

CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: Can I get a motion to -- oh, no.

Is there anyone here who would like to speak?

MS. AXELSON: Why don't you do a resolution to officially open the scoping session.

MR. WILHELM: We did.

MS. AXELSON: Okay.

MR. WILHELM: Yes.

MS. AXELSON: You're sure?

MR. BRADLEY: This has become a big night for me.

I haven't been on TV this much since I was over there.

I just have a comment, being the former Chairman of the Zoning Board in the town.

We seem to be as a town all of a sudden doing a whole lot of spot zoning and we're doing it for specific projects.

The zoning on this thing was done -- it was done through a master plan of which we worked on for quite a long period of time. The height of these buildings was set and it was done for a reason. It was done for the entire town.

We seem to be bypassing the zoning board where you can get a variance for this height and going directly

to spot zoning and changing the code, whereas I believe we did this at length to build a road for the nursing home either. We spot zoned for the nursing home and created that in an R-80 district where it could have been just -- that could have been recognized as a preexisting condition and it could have gotten what it got now.

And I just find that it's a little bit unsettling for me being on the Zoning Board for so many years that all of sudden we seem to be skipping the boards in town and we're going directly to spot zoning for certain projects.

And I think that this is an example of spot zoning, of changing the code and doing it by amendment just, you know, to be able to handle this one project.

I just found it very disconcerting and I would just like to make that comment.

This could be handled by variance extremely simply and to just get a variance for the height of the building. I don't know why we have to change the codes all the time. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: Anybody else like to speak? Please.

MR. SAMPSON: My name is William Sampson. I've been up here 47 years. If I jump around a little bit I want to apologize it's the first time I'm doing this.

I'm a trailer driver. I've been a trailer driver

for 30 years. And what I wanted to express was the impact that I think that the development is going to have as far as a truck stop is going to be very devastating to this town.

Number one, the weight of these trailers are 90,000 pounds maximum. The lengths are anywhere from when I started driving the legal limit was 40-foot trailers.

Now they're 55. Tractors extend to 50 feet long. You got 70 feet of truck, 65 feet of truck. When they get off 84, they get on 52, you are going to have a line. How are people going to get off 84? Number one.

Number two, when they make the turn to go up 52, one lane up, one lane back. You're going to have to widen up the road. Left turn in, there's going to be a backup. Because people coming down, they got the right of way.

The impact on the ground with the oil, the fuel, the truck washing, the chemicals they use. That goes into the ground. Water comes from the ground. Our wells are in the ground, you know. Wintertime, we get salt in our water because of -- they got to salt the roads. But, you know, nothing we can really do about that. But this is something that would really be I think harmful for the people of Kent.

It's a great idea they're going to want to put hotels in there. They don't want to put a luxury hotel

next to a truck stop. You're not going to go into a room hearing a truck running all night. And they tell you can't run it all night. As soon as that guy walks away in the wintertime you're going to fire that baby up because you're cold.

I'm trying to think of the other things I was going to say here.

The weight is going to run out the roads. You're going to -- now, when I first started driving there was no weight. There was 46. The ruts in 46 on the right lane, cars could not go into that lane. It would really run them out. It's just a lot of weight.

And the roads up here, I don't think they can sustain that kind of weight. Your driveways can't get that kind of weight. So, you know, you get an oil truck going down your driveway, you worry about them cracking up the road. You can imagine 90,000 pounds, four or five, six. How many trucks are going to go into this truck stop a night? 80, 90. A lot of trucks, a lot of weight, a lot of noise, a lot of impact on the environment. I think that speaks for itself.

But I thank you for your time. And I thank you for hearing me.

CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: Thank you. And these are all things we're considering.

Please.

MS. DOHERTY: Kathy Doherty, taxpayer. I also am concerned about trucks, if they're coming off of Exit 17, I believe Peder said at our chamber meeting that they were going to add another lane there, but that's also going to be in front of the new school bus truck stop. So I think that's going to interfere with the buses.

And my concern is that if they're coming off of Exit 18, the causeway is very old. We have a lot of trucks going over there now, that if you add more tractor trailers, I have a shop just off of 52. I watch tractor trailers go up and down 52 all day long. And now you are going to add more.

I don't think this is the type of business we want. I don't know if the water park is phase one or phase two. Is the water park -- I've heard rumors that the water park might not happen. Then we're just stuck with a truck stop. I don't understand a truck stop with a water park and kids and trucks. I don't get that.

And the hotel, you know, for the truck stop, and now again I heard that it was going to be a service station for the trucks, a gas station for the trucks.

And, I mean I believe -- is there a new owner now after a year? I mean, I've watched what they did for the property that the school bus stop is on, where that was

supposed to be three pads. How it ended up one level piece I don't know. You know, and my concern is you're going to be blasting over there and here we go again.

And are the dead trees from the storm going to come down? I don't know. And, um, in 2008, when I was town supervisor, we worked on the master plan and we worked hard on the master plan. And we did an IOC, you know, that we wanted good business here.

If you are going to start changing it, why don't you have a moratorium and relook at the master plan because Bob's right. There's so much spot zoning and the town board, I've never seen where they have to be involved in all this stuff.

And you have two town board members that have publicly said they're for this project. You know, you have the Town Supervisor that was here at your last meeting and you have the deputy supervisor who has said at public meetings, when I've been sitting there, that some people are against this and he doesn't understand.

So Charlie Sisto had to recuse himself from anything with Patterson Crossing because he verbalized his opinion before he was a Planning Board member.

So now you have two town board members that are speaking out and maybe they're going to have to recuse themselves for them to change.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: Thank you.

Anyone else would like to speak? Please, come One at a time. up.

MR. CUTILLO: Hi. Pat Cutillo, representing Cutillo's Restaurant and also some of the neighbors on Horse Pound Road. Can you guys hear me all right?

You gentlemen look way better in person than on You have your rocket charts with you? You have your description charts with you?

MR. SCOTT: I do not.

MR. CUTILLO: No, okay.

I just want to be real quick because I got to get back to the restaurant.

I want to make sure you guys got my letter. will read it to you.

As a property and business owner directly across the street from the Route 52 Development Project being proposed by Kent's Country Square, we have concerns about the 54-acre mining operation, the vibration concussion, and blasting from the rock that can cause damage to our property, the possible cracking in foundation, interior walls of the hundred-plus year old building, water supply, underground pipes, the rock retaining walls that sit along Route 52 that are on our property, as well as any excess water runoff that might do damage to any structure on our

ground and our water quality.

I never heard back from anyone on the Board or if an engineer wanted to come and see the retaining walls that I'm talking about which sit directly across from the entranceway.

So I just had to come and say that and if you guys have anything to say on that. Was the letter received?

MR. WILHELM: Yes.

MR. CUTILLO: Okay.

MS. AXELSON: Did it come? Okay. If I just --

CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: Please.

MS. AXELSON: I'm just replying to the concern about whether the letter was received. I was just speaking with Vera and the other consultants, and, yes, we did get the letter. And I remember very distinctly in the scoping outline incorporating elements that had to do with the concerns expressed in your letter.

The reason that there was no reply is that this process is about creating an outline, kind of like a giant list of things that the applicants will have to address in an environmental impact statement. I'll go grab you a copy of the scoping outline.

MR. CUTILLO: Okay. Thank you.

Our second concern is the depth of excavation on

our water table. The water -- I'm familiar with this property because I grew up across the street from it.

In 1988 it was proposed to be Watch Hill Condo Complex. Their very highest outcropping is 950 feet.

Route 52 is 800. They're going to go down below grade, bringing it almost to the same depth as North Horse Pound Road. Most wells on North Horse Pound Road are at 150, 120 feet, so we're concerned about the water table.

I just wanted to put that all on record.

As far as scoping for the information provided for the truck stop, very quickly going through the documentation, because not that I am a lead agency but I am right across the street. It would have been nice to know a little bit sooner. A lot of the detail of this project was called Exit 17, Ludingtonville, Bowen Road, which made a lot of people believe that well, that's 84. We're going to have an entrance off of 84. It's a truck stop, and that makes sense. There's a lot of the confusion about that in the community.

Another thing that we have is the truck stop, I only have some of the information. Maybe it's in there and I missed it. There was no mention of the amount of volume of diesel, or bio diesel that will be stored. Is it going to be above ground or below ground? This is an environmental issue but being that it's a truck stop it

seems like an issue that would be on the general scoping which isn't really provided.

Some other things that aren't provided is hotels in general like to run off of some kind of town provided assistance of natural gas or sewer, what have you.

The only area for sewage treatment is directly behind the La Quinta Inn and it's a very small footprint. I know that there is a side note on the chart about how in the future after we get through the scoping session, I'm not sure of the wordage, that septic lines, power lines, things like that would be addressed. But it seems that this should be mentioned in a little bit more broad term for a scoping session.

Also, if being that there is no natural gas in the area, many of these hotels would need propane, the rest stop, the kitchen area. There is no notification pad, future development site, which might include a garage.

This is off the highway. It's a truck stop.

Truck stops normally will allow someone like a wrecking company to come through. So if we have a wreck on 84, they're going to pick it up. They're going to bring it through our town. They're going to park it there. That's their business. That's fine. But there is no mention of possibly the area that it would be held in. There's no chained-off area.

These things can be carrying hazardous waste material. There's no mention of the macadam or anything that would be used to absorb such a thing if you are going go into the wrecking business.

And also my last concern as far as the zoning goes for the hotel is I understand this is a safe thing issue is why it's in zoning. Is — this is going to be for the Radisson. I'm not a big supporter of Radisson. And the reason for that is because it's owned by the Jin Jiang Company of China. And I don't feel that we need to bend over backwards for a Chinese government owned company to come in here and say hey, I really need you to change your zoning so I can go a little bit higher. That's all I really have to say on that.

I got to get back to work. Thank you, gentlemen. And please be in touch with me.

Oh, and also the truck stop, there is -- the excavation for the rock area is extensive for the hotel area but there is no rock excavation chart that was shown for the truck stop area.

I know that piece of parcel is not level. It's not as high as 950 feet but I think that it should be included in the scoping. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: Thank you.

MR. CAREY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: Anybody else, please.

MS. GODITILD: Hi. My name is Kassandra Gotitild. I'm coming as a mom of the community. My three kids go to KPS.

So I'm just a little concerned about what we would have issues with as far as dust and blasting and stuff. Will the kids possibly feel any of these vibrations or hear any of it? I know it's further down. I know we did a lot of stuff for where the bus depot is but this is closer to the school district. I also drop my kids off at school every morning and pick them up. We already have the Kent Police Department showing up to stop the traffic so the buses can come in and out of KPS in particular because you can't get out making left-hand turns where the bus depot currently is. So that's a hard problem.

My backyard is also butting up to 52. I'm on a turn. I constantly hear trucks Jake braking around the turn. Our noise level is already higher. Now, this is in Lake Carmel but I know you're proposing it's off of the Ludingtonville/52 area, but we know people don't always follow directions up to where coming and going of trucks coming on and off a highway and the extra traffic will be coming from.

So and, um, I know we're having a little issue, especially in Lake Carmel with extra wild life,

particularly bears and the wolves and stuff like that that are coming more and more into the populated area.

If we're going to keep de-zoning and deforesting, sorry, taking away all of our forest area, are we going to have more issues with more animals coming into more populated areas which doesn't make it safe for our children to play in?

That was all I had to say.

CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: Very good. Thank you.

MS. GODITILD: Thank you.

MR. GATTUCCI: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: Anybody else? Please. Please.

MS. CURTISS: Katherine Curtiss; 2 Mooney Hill Road, Town of Kent.

I can't let this opportunity go by without once more expressing my opposition to this project. And I think one of the things that has come out tonight, one particular topic, is the traffic issue. And that traffic issue has not been addressed.

And it's nice to see that other people realize what the impact of this -- if this goes in, what the traffic impact will be.

I don't know where the DOT comes down on this. I haven't seen anything from the DOT. I don't know if

they've been contacted. I don't know if their opinion has been asked, any kind of input from them. But it's one part of this that seems to have been ignored. And yet I think it is absolutely critical.

Bill Sampson knows what it's like having been a truck driver for many, many years. He's given you some very practical considerations and problems.

Anybody actually who has spoken tonight has pointed out practical impacts on traffic in this area. I live in the general vicinity. I know what Exit 17 is like. And it's tough enough now. There is not even a light there. I don't go that way to go down into town in the morning. I go down Ludingtonville Road to 311 because you can't get out from Ludingtonville Road with the traffic on 52.

So you can imagine what it's going to be like if you put something else in that's going to generate all this traffic. So as I say, I think that's one thing that really needs to be looked at because I don't think it's been adequately addressed up to this point. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: Thank you.

Anybody else? Please.

MR. SAMPSON: May I add something?

CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: You have to pay a second time,

too.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SAMPSON: I'm sorry?

CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: I'm joking.

MR. SAMPSON: The only thing I wanted to add on, I live across the street from the Kent Primary and elementary schools. If that water gets bad, a lot of people tell you, hey, you got nothing to worry about. said that about Ground Zero. 18 years before they gave the right to fight it, to get medical assistance. So you can hear that stuff all the time.

And then another thing like I say is the motels, trucks today are built like your house. They got refrigerators. They got stoves. They got televisions. They got WiFi, computers.

A guy don't have to go into a hotel. He can't afford to go into a hotel. They pay about \$200,000 for the tractor. So they make their money in there. What they're going to use the hotel for, hot sheets. You're going to have a lot of undesirables up here. You're going to have to expand the police force to police that area.

It's just common knowledge. Go over to 17K over by Newburgh. There's a truck stop there. Maywood, there's a truck stop there. Check them out. Go in there in the wintertime. Listen to all the trucks running in the back. Smell it. Look at the ground with the oil. Those trucks leak. The older ones leak. Everything, your cars when

1 they get old, they leak. Trucks is bigger. Bigger motor, 2 bigger oil, bigger reservoirs. They leak. 3 I just wanted to bring that up, you know. 4 worry about my great grandkids. You guys got to worry 5 about your grandkids, some of yous. 6 All right. I just thank you for your time. 7 CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: Thank you. 8 MS. KOTZUR: Susan Kotzur, Kent. 9 Three issues that I have. One is the spot 10 zoning. I think it's a bad idea. You start with one. 11 CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: We don't decide zoning here. 12 MS. KOTZUR: Pardon? 13 CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: We don't decide zoning here. 14 MS. KOTZUR: All right. Well, if you let one in, 15 then another one will come in. 16 The four driveways proposed to come out onto 17 Route 52, there are four; correct? If you look at the 18 There's four driveways coming out. maps. 19 MR. SCOTT: Very quickly, Peder Scott. There is 20 a main entrance which is --21 VIDEOGRAPHER: Peder, can you pull up a little 22 bit. 23 MR. SCOTT: There is a main boulevard which 24 services the main components of the project. Halfway up

the roadway there is an emergency exit, entrance. And

beyond that there is two entrances currently serving the truck stop. But that may become one. So that's four.

MS. KOTZUR: But it is four on the plan?

MR. SCOTT: There is -- the emergency one could be considered a access, yes.

MS. KOTZUR: There is four. I think it's four.

Also the police department, that's going to be affected immensely. And the fire department. So those are issues that really, really need to be addressed.

So thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: Thank you.

MS. KOTZUR: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: Anyone else? Please.

MS. COLAS: My name is Ellen Colas. I live on Fairview Court.

It's no secret that we live between the two worst exits off 84 that exist. The infrastructure on 52 is deplorable. You're inviting a condition here that just seems mind boggling at this point.

It's an overwhelming project I think that we're taking on. And I just want to reiterate my opposition and glad to have the opportunity to be part of this scoping session tonight. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: Thank you. Anyone else? Please.

MS. AXELSON: Please sign in if you haven't.

CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: Ma'am, can you come back in and sign in, please.

Liz, did you want to add anything before I close the scoping session?

MS. AXELSON: Anybody else want to comment?

CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: Is there anyone else who wants to comment?

Can I get a motion to close the scoping? No, not yet.

MS. AXELSON: Is anybody else commenting?
CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: No. Just you, Liz.
MS. AXELSON: Just me again.

A couple of points. Um, so Bruce and Julie and I were looking through the scope as commentary came up to make sure because we had taken a good deal of commentary and added a lot of detail.

So I'm just letting the Board know, for example, on page 34 there's a section that deals with fuel, fuel storage, impacts and mitigation related to that.

Rock excavation is dealt with throughout because there is discussion of mining being done in phases as part of the proposed action. And then in numerous sections there are discussions of mining impacts as well as blasting and procedures for that.

Let's see. There is a section about noise on page 32 that's also quite detailed. And then the traffic aspect of the scoping outline runs from page 23 to 24. We have added to that. And also the Town's consulting traffic engineer has spoken.

Just to go back a step, for people who are attending the scoping session for the first time, I want to remind the Board that initially the proposed action was all of these aspects of development and it was to include an area variance to address the Applicant's concern about being able to build a higher building than was allowed in the IOC zoning district of, you know, in other words, bigger than three stories, bigger than 40 feet.

And so initially the scoping outline looked at things that way. When we were informed that there would be a zoning amendment instead and folks can look at the transcript from the May 23rd scoping session, there was immediate discussion that a zoning amendment would have to address generic impacts because the industrial office, commercial, IOC zoning district is fairly extensive in the town.

So basically the materials that I have given you to amend the Pos Dec, the whole reason to amend the Pos Dec has to do with dealing with the fact that this environmental impact statement will be in part a generic

environmental impact statement to address the potential for any of these zoning changes to be utilized by other properties within the IOC zoning district. So we have to look at the change overall or generally or generically.

And also changes have been made throughout the scoping outline to address the zoning amendment. In the description of the action in the first several pages under land use, under traffic, under energy, under emergency police, fire services, and in other places because the building height and also under community character and visual, the added building height will have an effect in terms of what we see, in terms of how the site is overall developed, in terms of it may result in increased floor area than we looked at before. And also in terms of fire fighting, energy, et cetera. So I just wanted to clarify those few points.

And if there is no other scoping commentary, then what you have in front of you -- well, I can walk you through in a moment.

Do you have any questions at all about the draft resolution, part two, part three of the Full EAF or the part three narrative?

CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: Anybody?

MR. CAREY: No.

MS. AXELSON: And then the scoping document

revised July 2. By the way, there is one more copy of the scoping document. And I believe that the scoping document is also on the website, Vera?

MS. PATTERSON: Yes.

MS. AXELSON: So the public can find that there.

In any case, it is very detailed. At Steve Wilhelm's suggestion we put in bubbles to indicate where changes were made and why and what letter it corresponds to.

Let's see. So we look through -- while we were listening to commentary tonight to see if we needed to make any other changes to the scoping outline and the issues that were raised have been addressed in here, including police security for the public and for, you know, the truck drivers using the site.

So I believe we've covered the bases and I believe that the change in the project to deal with the zoning amendment is adequately addressed in here.

Peder Scott had a question he pointed out to me before. And I'm turning to Full EAF part two -- sorry, Full EAF part three narrative. And in there I underlined things that have to do with the zoning amendments -- sorry to be repetitive -- having to do with generic impacts of increased building heights in the IOC zone.

Under transportation I also included it, the

0.4

proposed action, including the zoning amendment may result in generic impacts of increased building heights/floor area because if there's an added floor there could be more floor area.

Impact on energy, same thing, more floor area.

And consistency with community plans having to do with the zoning amendment for increased building height and related generic impacts. And consistency with community character.

So I think you have a pretty detailed packet.

And if the Board is so inclined, I'm recommending and I believe I have Julie and Bruce's support that you may close the public scoping session by simple motion and then take action on the draft resolution.

CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: Thank you.

Gentlemen, can I get a motion to close the scoping session?

MR. LOWES: Going to motion.

CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: A second?

MR. GATTUCCI: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: All in favor? Aye.

MR. CAREY: Aye.

MR. GATTUCCI: Aye.

MR. LOWES: Aye.

MR. WILHELM: Aye.

1 MS. AXELSON: So I don't know if you want me 2 to -- I don't want to repeat the walk-through. 3 CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: Yeah, is there a way we can --4 MS. AXELSON: But basically the whereases, as I 5 said, pages one through bottom of page three, those are all 6 whereases setting forth what you've done, the context of 7 your decision-making. And then if you look at page four of 8 five, those resolveds are all of the items that you are 9 addressing tonight. 10 MR. WILHELM: Do you want to make a motion to 11 adopt the resolution? 12 CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: Okay. Can I get a second to 13 adopt the resolution? 14 MR. GATTUCCI: I'll second. 15 CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: We need a roll call vote. 16 Mr. Lowes, Vice Chairman, how do you vote? 17 MR. LOWES: Aye. 18 CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: Mr. Gattucci? 19 MR. GATTUCCI: Aye. 20 CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: Mr. Carey? 21 MR. CAREY: Aye. 22 CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: Mr. Wilhelm? 23 MR. WILHELM: Aye. 24 CHAIRMAN TOLMACH: I vote aye. It passes. 25 Peder, anything else?

MR. SCOTT: I'm all set. Thanks.

MR. CARUSO: Thank you very much, everybody.

MR. LOWES: Question. Question. Peder, have you taken a look at any of the record plans for Route 52 as

THE SECRETARY: Repeat that.

MR. SCOTT: Well, our traffic consultant has looked at all of the traffic incurred. We have completed a traffic study. We've looked at accident reports for every intersection along that -- our access strip. And it's incorporated in his traffic report which we've already submitted.

The only thing we are going to do with that traffic report now is incorporate with potential of the bus yard operating in the currently I guess it's under submission for a review on the gravel yard or pit down the street from us.

But beyond that, nothing's really changed of significance with the traffic report at this time.

MR. LOWES: I was more concerned about how that road is constructed as far as what's underneath the blacktop that's on there right now, and how that's going to affect any of your design work to add off a pass-around or a turning lane.

Is the proposal ultimately going to be to tear

the whole thing up and redo the road or --

MR. SCOTT: I can explain really quickly. DOT has recommended a complete resurfacing when we add on our lane. And at that point in time we'll be increasing the capacity of the road surface to our anticipated truck traffic. And that's already been discussed with DOT.

MR. LOWES: Yeah. My inclination is to think that Route 52 through there was part of the old farm to market reconstruction back in like the 1930's so there is probably a pretty good concrete road underneath all that stuff.

MR. SCOTT: Yeah. Subgrade is our biggest concern when we look at any roadways. You can build whatever you want as a surface but if the subgrade isn't strong enough, that's why you have failed roads everywhere.

Looking at the site and the topography we have excellent soils in that area which serve as a foundation for a road surface.

So we anticipate pretty much just increasing the pavement thicknesses, fixing the shoulders and we're widening the road as well by another lane.

So when we complete all those operations it will be a new road and we will be ensuring the capacity as we do. We'll be providing documentation of our certification of adequate capacity.

1 MR. LOWES: And you're working with DOT as you go 2 along with all this? 3 MR. SCOTT: We filed a permit with DOT. We met 4 with DOT already. Our traffic consultants have also met 5 So we're in the midst of that at this point in 6 time. 7 Please remember that everyone's waiting for us to 8 finish the DEIS, FEIS process before we really get into 9 final permitting. But we have met with all the agencies in 10 regards to the project. 11 MR. LOWES: Yeah, so some of the concerns that 12 have been voiced this evening you have already --13 MR. SCOTT: We've already been there, yes. 14 MR. LOWES: Done your homework on it? 15 MR. SCOTT: Correct. 16 MR. LOWES: Just for the record. 17 MR. SCOTT: We have, yes. And we filed a report 18 with you already from the traffic consultant. And, again, 19 as I said, we have to add in the impacts of the buses to 20 our traffic. 21 MR. LOWES: Okay. Great. Thanks. 22 MR. SCOTT: Okay. Thank you.

public scoping session was concluded.)

(Whereupon, the Route 52 Development portion of the

2425

** C E R T I F I C A T I O N **

Certified to be a true and correct transcript.

Cynthia White, R.P.R., Senior Court Reporter

*** ** **