

APPROVED MINUTES
Town of Goshen Planning Board
Town Hall
41 Webster Avenue
Goshen, NY 10924

APRIL 15, 2010

Members Present:

Reynell Andrews
Lee Bergus, Acting Chair
Susan Cleaver
Mary Israelski
John Lupinski
Raymond Myruski

Also Present:

Neal Halloran, Building Inspector
Ed Garling, Consultant Planner
Dennis Lindsay, Consultant Engineer
Kelly Naughton, PB Attorney
Rick Golden, PB Attorney
Karen Schneller-McDonald, Environmental
Consultant

Absent: Ralph Huddleston

A&L Acres 13-1-34.2 – 217.8 acres, 30 lot subdivision located on Houston Road in the RU zone with an AQ3 & two scenic road and one stream corridor overlay. Modified subdivision plan.

Representing the applicant:

Steve Esposito

Mr. Halloran stated that the applicant wants to give some land to the Daughters of American Revolution, which results in a change to the site plan.

Mr. Esposito said the applicant met with the DAR and that they requested two parcels of land that adjoin their existing schoolhouse. The applicant would like to transfer title to 1.25 acres and .07 acres. He said the land is basically the lawn area that the DAR has been maintaining. He said the map has not yet been filed and that they'd like to modify the lot line.

Mr. Lindsay said the applicant still meets the requirement of leaving 50% of the site in open space.

Mr. Golden said that it would be an amended Resolution of Conditional Final Approval and that changing it to make the modifications does not affect any of the time frames. He said it will not require a public hearing.

Mr. Golden said that the PB could make a motion to approve an Amended Resolution of Conditional Final Approval for Phase 1, Lots 1-20 and drainage easement for A&L Acres by updating the map and the submission and adding the following paragraphs:

“This application received Conditional Final Approval for Phase 1 on October 5, 2009. Such approval was in compliance with Local Law No. 4 of 2009 permitting the application to proceed under the zoning and other laws and subdivision regulations applicable immediately prior to the effective date of Local Law No. 1 of 2008. Previously, the Planning Board granted a 90-day extension of the Conditional Final Approval of Phase 1, extending the approval until July 4, 2010. This amendment to the Conditional Final Approval shall have no impact on the expiration of the original Conditional Final Approval. It shall expire eighteen months from the effective date of Local Law No. 4 of 2009 (October 2, 2010) pursuant to Section 7 of Local Law No. 4 of 2009 (“Superseding Provision”), unless otherwise extended by Town Board Resolution or unless a Final Approval (without conditions) for the project is filed within that time in accordance with state and local laws.”

He said there will need to be three additional conditions which would be numbered 19 through 21 and would read as follows:

19. Prior to final approval, the applicant shall submit a letter from the Daughters of the American Revolution acknowledging their willingness to accept the land being offered.
20. Prior to final approval, the applicant shall revise the plat to indicate that the two lot lines proposed to be modified and removed are subject to the PB receiving and granting final approval to a lot line adjustment application involving the parcel of land belonging to the DAR.
21. Prior to final approval the applicant shall submit an application for a lot line adjustment involving the parcel of land belonging to the DAR, which application shall receive the determination of the PB.

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Mr. Myruski, seconded by Ms. Cleaver, the Town of Goshen Planning Board approved the Amended Resolution of Conditional Final Approval of A&L Acres with its three new conditions as read by Mr. Golden at the April 15, 2010 meeting. Approved unanimously.

Mr. Andrews	Aye	Ms. Israelski	Aye
Mr. Bergus	Aye	Mr. Lupinski	Aye
Ms. Cleaver	Aye	Mr. Myruski	Aye

Goshen Properties 13-1-34.1 & 39.1 – 39.7 acres, 14 lot subdivision located on Houston Road and Route 17A located in the RU zone, with an AQ3, two scenic road and stream corridor overlays. Modified subdivision plan.

Representing the applicant:

Steve Esposito

Mr. Halloran said that the applicant is asking for a modification to the approved subdivision plan. He said that one house has been built but the applicant is having trouble selling the lots along Houston Road that are “back loaded”.

Mr. Esposito said that the Planning Board had asked that the three driveways for Lots 5, 6 & 7 be combined without access off Houston Road. He said the developer is having trouble selling them with the shared driveways. He said the applicant would like to make lots 5 & 6 access directly onto Houston Rd. at a common spot, but leave the lots configured as they are. The applicant also wants to move the house at the corner, Lot 4, approximately 45 degrees to create some privacy because the lot does not have a rear yard.

Mr. Lindsay said that the changes will impact the scenic road corridor and the PB will have to consider whether the applicant mitigates that sufficiently. He said that the new Town Code does not like shared driveways.

Mr. Garling said that the way the applicant wants to re-configure Lot 4 is “better and more attractive.” The PB will have to look in detail at how much of the tree line and berm will be eliminated to get the driveways in, he said.

Mr. Bergus read a letter to the PB from Steve Andryshak, Highway Superintendent for the Town of Goshen, dated April 9, 2010, stating he sees serious problems with having several driveways coming out onto Houston Rd. He said he wants all of the driveways to go to the interior road, with one road coming out onto Houston Rd.

There was a lengthy discussion about re-configuring the driveways with members of the PB concerned about adding more curb cuts on Houston Rd., citing safety, the heavy volume of traffic and the speed at which the cars travel on the road.

Mr. Golden told the PB that the applicant has a right to come before the Board to ask for a modification. He said the PB should focus on the planning aspects and determining what is a good plan, and less on why the applicant wants the change.

Mr. Esposito suggested that the modification would be more in conformity with the new Town Code which doesn't want shared driveways.

Mr. Andrews suggested a new configuration of the driveways with just the driveway for Lot #6 coming out onto Houston.

Builder Albert Fini said he wants the driveways on Lot 5 & 6 to come out onto Houston Rd. He said that Lot #7 is built and sold already, but said that the marketability of flag

lots is not popular and that he can't sell a house with a shared driveway. He said he believes the sight distance is adequate.

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Ms. Israelski, seconded by Mr. Andrews, the Town of Goshen Planning Board recommends to the applicant that they will accept allowing a modification of the site plan that would include the driveway for Lot #5 exiting to the rear onto the interior road, the driveway for Lot #6 exiting onto Houston Road, the addition of landscaping in the area of the curb cut for Lot #6 as well as Lots #1 & #2 at the driveway entrances, and the elimination of the lot line at the rear of Lot #6 so that the portion of where the driveway is, will become part of Lot #7 so there will be no overlaying easement. Approved 4-2.

Mr. Andrews	Aye	Ms. Israelski	Aye
Mr. Bergus	Aye	Mr. Lupinski	Nay
Ms. Cleaver	Nay	Mr. Myruski	Aye

Mr. Golden pointed out that this will be a recommendation to the applicant about what the PB may consider to be acceptable.

The PB discussed the issue of rotating the house on Lot #4 and determined that they did not have a problem with it.

Mr. Golden said that the driveway issue will be an amendment to a major site plan and that under the code will require a public hearing. He told Mr. Fini that he could go forward with rotating the house on Lot #4.

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Ms. Israelski, seconded by Ms. Cleaver, the Town of Goshen Planning Board sets a public hearing for May 6, 2010 on the issue of reconfiguring the driveways on the subdivision application of Goshen Properties. Approved unanimously.

Mr. Andrews	Aye	Ms. Israelski	Aye
Mr. Bergus	Aye	Mr. Lupinski	Aye
Ms. Cleaver	Aye	Mr. Myruski	Aye

Mr. Golden said there will be two amendments to the site plan, one dealing with the slight rotation of the house at Lot #4 and the slight rotation of that driveway to the interior road and one for the driveway issues for which there will be a public hearing. He said that to comply with SEQRA, the PB will need a motion to re-confirm for this separate action, the Negative Declaration it previously gave the application.

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Mr. Myruski, seconded by Mr. Andrews, the Town of Goshen Planning Board reconfirms for this separate action, the Negative

Declaration previously given to the subdivision of Goshen Properties. The motion was approved in a 4 to 1 vote with 1 abstention.

Mr. Andrews	Aye	Ms. Israelski	Aye
Mr. Bergus	Aye	Mr. Lupinski	Nay
Ms. Cleaver	Abstain	Mr. Myruski	Aye

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Ms. Israelski, seconded by Mr. Myruski, the Town of Goshen Planning Board approves the modification of the site plan restating the prior conditions of the earlier site plan and adding two new conditions: that the applicant must submit a revised site plan indicating the shifting of the house and driveway on Lot #4 consistent with the PB discussion of 4-15-10 and upon the specific location of that driveway to be acceptable to the Town Engineer with respect to adequate drainage. Approved unanimously.

Mr. Andrews	Aye	Ms. Israelski	Aye
Mr. Bergus	Aye	Mr. Lupinski	Aye
Ms. Cleaver	Aye	Mr. Myruski	Aye

Reiger – 9-1-8.452 – 360.9 acres, 106 units, located on Craigville Rd. at the end of Broadlee Road in the RU district with an AQ3 & AQ6 overlay with a scenic road corridor overlay and flood plain overlay.

Representing the applicant: Steve Esposito
Dominic Cordisco, Esq.

Mr. Bergus stated that this was a continuation of the public hearing. He told the audience that any comments made, or concerns raised, will be addressed by the developer in the preparation of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). The developer and their consultants are not obligated to respond tonight, he said, but are responsible to address the questions and concerns in the FEIS.

Dominic Cordisco Esq. said that the public hearing was opened in January and continued over to February and that while the applicant is interested in receiving additional public comment, “at conclusion of tonight we will request a closing of the public hearing.”

Mr. Esposito gave a brief overview of the project which is located on Craigville Rd. and consists of 360 acres and is a cluster plan development. He said the applicant is proposing 106 lots and explained how the number of lots was determined through a process starting with a conservation analysis. He said that 68% of the site will be open space preserved under a conservation easement and that 10% of the 106 lots will be affordable housing required by the Town Code. All residences will be served by central

water and sewer. Mr. Esposito said the applicant has done well testing in accordance with the water testing protocol of the Town and according to State standards. He said there will be two main entrances off Craigville Rd. and that the development will also tie into Broadlee Road. He said that all residence will access onto interior roads and that there will be no driveway cuts on Craigville Rd. or any other existing roads.

Mr. Esposito said the applicant is proposing a waste water treatment plant, a water tower and a connection with the water tower to the Stonehedge water tower as an emergency connection. He said its water testing programs were approved by the Town and the Orange County Health Dept. and said “we were required to test twice the average daily demand with the best well out of service, so the test rates greatly exceed what the average daily demand for the project would be when built out.” He said there will be no clearing along Craigville Rd. and that the remaining woodland is about 300 acres, with the open space approximately 250+ acres which will be under a conservation easement.

PB Engineer Dennis Lindsay said his office prepared a 12-page memo on the Environmental Impact Statement with comments on the EIS in terms of the responsiveness to the scope prepared by the PB and things they want the applicant to look at. He said they also prepared a 10-page memo regarding site plan and subdivision issues.

Mr. Lindsay said that the Town of Goshen is very concerned about water supply and that the Code’s water testing requirements are written in that fashion. When the Town modified the Code they thought it appropriate to have more conservative testing so as not to have problems on adjacent properties and the properties being developed, resulting in a requirement of 250% of the average daily demand, he said. Mr. Lindsay said the applicant has done certain testing and that the testing will satisfy the code requirements for a certain number of units, “maybe not all of the units they have right now,” but they can do additional testing to get up to the 106 units they propose or they can go to the ZBA for relief from the code requirements, he said.

Mr. Garling said a review letter was prepared by his office in January. He said that basically the project is well-designed, but that he is seeking to have additional land preserved, specifically on the steep slopes and other lands that may be very close to the existing streams and drainage areas as well as the wetlands on the site. He said the two major issues are the water supply and how many of the lots can be developed, based on completion of the water analysis, and some environmental issues which may have some limitation on the number of lots. Mr. Garling said that once the total number of lots is known, he will ask that some of the lots be shifted or eliminated and for more screening around the water tower. He said he has requested a visual showing the water tower and believes it will protrude 10-15 ft. above the tree line which is the only portion of it that he believes will be seen. He said an issue will be how much of the tower can be seen and the color of it so that it will blend in.

Karen Schneller-McDonald, the Town's environmental consultant said she prepared an extensive memo in February. She said she looked at habitat and asked for additional information on some of the existing conditions on the site in order to better mitigate. She said one of her concerns is water because there are some water based habitats on site that are affected by water quality and supply.

Mr. Bergus opened the hearing to public comment.

Joy Palazzola of 9 Candlewood Drive said there is a petition containing over 50 signatures of people concerned about the water for the project. She said the petition asks for more testing on the water issue, that six wells in Ridgeview Estates be tested and three wells along Ridge Road within the 2500 ft. distance from the development. The petition was presented to the PB and was received for the record.

Ms. Palazzola asked who is going to own the open space and whether it will be able to be developed. She also asked where the affordable homes will be located and whether or not the developer can change the style of the homes, depending on market changes.

Mr. Golden said that if the developer wants to change the style of the homes, he will have to go back to the PB. He noted that the provisions of the Town Code spell out in detail the affordable housing requirements that the project has to comply with and that the public can read those requirements.

Susan Bloom of the Village of Goshen said her major concern is the cumulative effect on the schools. With this development and others being considered, she said she thinks it is going to have an impact on the schools.

Howard Weiss of Ridgeview Terrace stated that Stonehedge has to tank in water every other year because they have problems with the wells and it has cost a fortune over the years to bring in water. He said that if Stonehedge keeps running out of water and this project is going right next to their water tower, it doesn't make sense to him, adding that Stonehedge will have some kind of impact on this.

John Szeffc of 35 Ridge Rd. said that when the project's attorney said he was going to ask that the public hearing be closed tonight, he believes the attorney said that there was no one present at the hearing continuation in February to comment. Mr. Szeffc said he wanted to correct that by pointing out that he was at every meeting and has commented.

Gerald Boss of Craigville Rd. said he is interested in the sewer plant. He said he knows of at least four projects before the PB now and has heard that these projects have several options, to build their own sewer plant, to utilize the Village sewer plant or to use a Town municipal plant to be built to service these projects. He said he doesn't know what

sewer plant is planned for the project. Mr. Boss said that for years he has been the lone protector of the Otterkill Creek and asked if the developer builds its own plant where the flow will go, into the Black Meadow, the Otterkill or a tributary? Mr. Boss asked for a cumulative study of the amount of effluent that will go into these streams, rivers and creeks from any number of sewer plants and the four different subdivisions that are being planned and said he has requested it numerous times. "One accident and you have big problems." Mr. Boss also asked for a 12-month environmental habitat study stating that there are certain species that come and go, bog turtles come and go, he said and asked if you do a test for them in August, have they left?

Frank Guerrera of Ridgeview Terrace said he understands the testing was done on wells during the wet season of the winter and asked whether the testing shouldn't be done during the dry period. He said he thinks the testing was done at an optimum time when the water table may have been at its highest. He called for additional testing to be done.

Rich Ferrara of Ridge Road said that the sports facility on 17M is close to the development and that sometime someone is going to open it and it will then use a huge amount of water.

Mr. Halloran said that the sports facility was bought by someone who is going to open a tennis court. He said that at one point it was considered for a swimming pool but the problem was that they couldn't find enough water.

Frank Guerrera asked if the development goes through and there are water problems, whether the Town is prepared to assume the liabilities if people's wells all of a sudden go dry. "We are all very concerned about the water consumption," he said.

Mr. Golden said that no town, including the Town of Goshen has a general obligation to provide water if in fact there is a problem with someone's water as a result of this subdivision, or any other subdivision. He said that the PB has in the past had a mechanism in place where there are certain bonded monies put up by the applicant so that if in fact there are problems, then the Town Engineer would investigate and make a determination on behalf of the Town as to whether or not the cause was the subdivision, and therefore monies could be withdrawn from that fund.

Bill Wyman of 43 Ridge Rd. called building a development with expensive homes and low class homes "a joke". He said people want to live in the same kind of area as to the houses that are there. He said he estimates this development will cost at least \$2 million extra in school taxes. He reiterated that you can't put low income and good housing in the same place and said that when low cost housing was built for the police, firemen and emergency medical personnel in New Jersey, that they all bought up the low income housing and in a year, sold them for twice as much.

Mr. Golden said there are code requirements that will not allow that to happen. Mr. Wyman said that whatever provisions there are, they can't be maintained.

Jim Iaquinto asked why Reiger Homes wants to build the project and what are the long term and short term plans of Reiger Homes in Orange County. Since there is not a ground swell of demand at this moment, he said it makes no sense to him why they would want to fight all of these various issues.

Frank Guerrero said he expects that the waste products are going to be discharged into adjacent creeks and small waterways which meander close to our homes and asked who will monitor that and who will be responsible. "We are not pleased that we are going to have waste treatment plants in a suburban rural area that we all have worked hard to be able to live in and we wanted a certain lifestyle and our lifestyle is now being disrupted."

Susan Bloom asked if there are plans in the EIS for the sewer plant that she can look at, said that nothing is selling right now and asked why here and why so many houses.

Mr. Lindsay said that the EIS contains an outline but that a full design has not yet been done.

Ellen Guerrero , 7 Ridgeview Terrace, asked what is meant by being "tapped in" to the Stonehedge water supply. She said it sounds like when Stonehedge runs out of water, as they do, then they will just tap into the wells that are suppose to supply this development so that these wells will supply Stonehedge too when they run out of water.

Mr. Lindsay said that in general it is good for a town that has multiple water systems to have interconnections. "If you run out of water in one area, it is good that you can help out another area. It is not at the detriment of the supplier, it is to help out someone that needs water and would not be done if it put both in jeopardy," he said. Ms. Guerrero asked if anyone is thinking of the current homeowners. "It is our wells that will be supplying not only this development but in a drought situation, our wells will be affected when we have to supply not only Reiger but Stonehedge as well," she said.

Mr. Halloran said that Stonehedge does not have a problem with shortages of water.

Bill Wyman said he lives 550 ft. from Craigville and Ridge Roads and asked if his well runs dry because of a water drain, will the Town make a provision that the builder re-drill a well for him.

Frank Guerrero said that due to the lack of specific information on sewage treatment, he'd like to request that the hearing be continued. So far there have only been vague proposals, he said.

Rich Ferrara of Ridge Rd. said that the sports facility is right near Broadlee Rd. and added that the swimming pool was eliminated due to lack of water so the proposal doesn't make sense to him.

Mr. Boss said he has seen four builders walk away from their sewer plants and from their water plants and the Town usually accepts them and forms a water district. This happened in Hambletonian Park, Arcadia Hills and Stonehedge, he said, and it falls on the residents. Mr. Boss asked if there is any law or contract to compensate if this does happen.

Mr. Golden said that the applicant has submitted a plan for both water and sewer and that it is up to the Board's consultants to analyze and critique and determine if it is adequate.

Mr. Esposito said that of the various technologies, the preferred plan is on-site treatment.

Rick Berry, of Ridgeview Terrace, said that in any type of storm, there is a lot of drainage off Craigville Rd. and it becomes very dangerous in the winter. He said it is a potential hazard to drop more water off, especially during the stormy months.

Joel Markowitz asked if the regional plant is now off the table. Have the developers removed it from consideration, he asked. Mr. Esposito said that what is shown now is an on site plan with three alternative technologies.

Peggy Segerman of Ridgeview Terrace, asked if the homeowners will be allowed to dig their own wells. Mr. Bergus said "no".

Tom Alders asked if the Town will be responsible to fix and maintain the roads which will be impacted by all of the different projects going in along Craigville Rd. He asked if the cumulative effect on the roads has been looked at.

Rick Berry asked if an accident analysis has been done stating that it is a very dangerous stretch of road and that at least a dozen accidents have occurred. He suggested checking with the police.

Amelia Ferrara said that it appeared to her that the water tests were done on the border of the wetlands and asked how an accurate reading could be obtained if that is the case. She said it looks like the tests were done on the Wallace farm and that 10 to 15 years ago it was all considered wetlands.

Mr. Lindsay said that as far as the sampling of the water supply goes, the locations are appropriate.

A member of the public asked when and where the FEIS will be available for review.

Mr. Golden told the audience that there is no specific time frame for completion of the FEIS. He said that after the public hearing is closed, there will be an additional ten days for people to submit additional comments and then it will be up to the applicant to put together the FEIS. "That may require additional studies that the PB feels are necessary and certainly the responses to all of the questions of the public, they could do that in a month or in 6 months," Mr. Golden said. When the applicant submits the FEIS, the PB has to decide if it is complete. There will not be a public hearing on the FEIS, there will be an open meeting of the PB where they will decide if it is complete and where people can listen. Once the FEIS is considered complete, there is another 10 day period to submit comments. He recommended that anyone who wants to know the status of the FEIS can call the Building Inspector.

Mr. Golden said that the standard to decide whether to keep the public hearing open is whether the PB believes that additional time would help them with additional comments from the public. If the PB believes the public has had sufficient time and that granting more time will not add to the process, then a public hearing is often closed. If the PB thinks they still need the public to assist them in making their decisions, then they have the ability to keep it open, he said.

PB member Susan Cleaver said she has been asking all along to see a copy of the Army Corp. of Engineers' submission, and the applicant has been asked for a copy of it and it has not been provided to the PB. Also, she said that when she visited the site there was a stream and a well that she believes are on the property, but are not shown on the map, and should be shown. She said that two Army Corp. wetlands that showed up on earlier maps are now no longer shown on later maps. This should all be clarified, she said, adding that she feels the hearing should be left open until the information is provided so the public can comment on it. She said the well, a pond and stream are located towards the Pleasant Run development. She thinks they may affect drainage on the site.

Ms. Cleaver made a motion to keep the public hearing open. It was seconded by Ms. Israelski and discussion followed.

Mr. Lindsay said that at this point in the process it may be best to have it noted and make sure it is addressed in the FEIS.

PB consultant Karen Schneller-McDonald said she has had similar concerns from the beginning on the accuracy of the wetland delineation. She said that one of the most basic information needed is to have an accurate wetland delineation of the entire site.

Ms. Cleaver explained that part of her concern is that there are areas that are missing and she doesn't know if they have been looked at by a wetlands person, whether they have been studied for any kind of habitat presence, where the drainage goes and what houses they may be near. It is hard to locate without seeing it on a map, she said. The well and the pond below it was in the PB's scope, Ms. Cleaver said, for recreation, a possible skating rink, and that without having input on it from the public, it is void. She said she is not satisfied with putting it off to the FEIS.

Mr. Golden told Ms. Cleaver that after the public hearing is closed, the PB can request that this information be provided in the FEIS. If the PB is not satisfied with it in the FEIS, then it can determine the FEIS is incomplete and tell the applicant to go back and obtain more information. When there is enough information then the PB makes findings based on that information. The findings may restrict this project in one form or another, he said. The purpose of a public hearing is if you believe you wouldn't be able to address these issues yourself and need the public to help you address these issues. He said there has been three public hearing nights so far and that the courts say you are not suppose to keep open a public hearing just to keep the process going, it is simply to try to provide an adequate opportunity for the public to speak their mind and to give their opinion so that you can take that into account.

Mr. Cordisco, the applicant's attorney, said he thinks there has been a full and fair opportunity for the public to comment and that to leave it open is counter-productive. He said the applicant can't submit its FEIS until the public hearing is closed.

Mr. Andrews told the public that it has to have faith in the process. "If we or our professionals review the FEIS to see if all of the questions have been answered, and if they haven't been, then we don't accept it. The applicant has to answer all of the questions, he said.

The motion to keep the public hearing open did not pass, a vote of the six PB members present resulted in a tie (3 to 3) with Ms. Cleaver, Ms. Israelski and Mr. Lupinski voting to keep the hearing open.

A motion was then made by Mr. Andrews to close the public hearing. It was seconded by Mr. Myruski. It did not pass, ending in a tie (3 to 3) with Mr. Andrews, Mr. Bergus, and Mr. Myruski voting to close the hearing.

Mr. Golden said that the PB, being down one member, was at a deadlock as to whether or not the public hearing should be closed. He suggested that the PB members discuss it amongst themselves. The PB members left the room.

Upon their return, **VOTE BY PROPER MOTION**, made by Mr. Myruski, seconded by Mr. Andrews, the Town of Goshen Planning Board closed the public hearing on the application of Reiger. Approved in a 5 to 1 vote.

Mr. Andrews	Aye	Ms. Israelski	Nay
Mr. Bergus	Aye	Mr. Lupinski	Aye
Ms. Cleaver	Aye	Mr. Myruski	Aye

Ms. Cleaver said she hopes that the applicant will provide the map showing the well, pond and missing wetlands to the PB in an expedited manner so she doesn't have to ask again and said she hopes the public will review the FEIS and come to the meetings.

Mr. Golden said that people have 10 days to submit written comments. He said the process is still an open process, that the FEIS has to be submitted and the public has a right to review the FEIS. He said there will be at least one or two meetings with respect to the PB's review of the FEIS and then there will be another time to comment in writing before the last round of the SEQRA issues which is coming up with the Findings. The Findings will be based on all of this review with respect to the environmental impact and how it affects the plan that is being submitted and potentially approved by the PB.

ADJOURNMENT: A motion to adjourn the meeting at 11:20 p.m. was made, seconded and approved unanimously.

Lee Bergus, Acting Chair
Notes Prepared by Susan Varden