

TOWN OF GOSHEN
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW BOARD
May 8, 2024

The regular meeting of the Environmental Review Board of the Town of Goshen was called to order at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday, May 8, 2024 at Town Hall.

Present: Neal Halloran, Chairman

Carol Laskos
John Lupinski
Karina
Grace

Absent: Thomas Burnham
Lou Adamis –
Jeremy Zweig, Planning Board

Items for Discussion/Action –

Peaceful Paws –

Public thinks it is good location and there is a need. Electric forklift offset required by DEC. No complaints of noise or odor.

17M Flex Building –

Chairman addressed the audience regarding the project scope.

The Environmental Review Board made the following comments and/or recommendations:

- Parking
- Truck traffic versus pedestrian traffic is not being addressed properly
- Extra lane on Cannon Hill for turning suggested in lieu of a sidewalk
- Traffic study at Cannon Hill Road was suggested by a constituent (a grant is being offered to restudy the 2008 study of 17M)
- Suggest that applicant conducts a traffic study or wait for the DOT updated study
- Area is considered a disadvantaged community (DAC) in the 17M corridor. Grants available to not add to the disadvantaged community. Traffic and polluted particulate.
- Lane by shoulder also suggested

Owens Road Solar –

The Environmental Review Board made the following comments and/or recommendations:

- Archaeological area, no phase three

TOWN OF GOSHEN
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW BOARD
May 8, 2024

- 24 trees in wetlands were missed in the clearing and cannot be disturbed until November. Suggested approach the DEC for the trees to be cut before November
- Performance bond suggested in a high amount

31 Creamery Circle –

The Environmental Review Board made the following comments and/or recommendations:

- No concerns

ILL 1 –

The Environmental Review Board made the following comments and/or recommendations:

- Change of LL for one company. Other companies can follow. Solid waste is not allowed.
- Traffic, cancer, COPD, pollution, forever chemicals, air pollution, odor, ground water pollution, lower quality of life, property value.
- What has changed to overturn the existing law?
- What does it bring positive to the community?
- Striking out a provision of the existing law could lead to any other solid waste facilities. Reckless beyond reason in the broadness of striking through the law.
- Law so vague, there are no recommendations even possible.
- Already a DAC
- LL1 is related to Hughes Energy
- LL modification suggestions include not allowing the law on principal aquifers, fracture traces, rivers, and soils.
- How close is too close to these sensitive areas like just listed.
- Referendum should be considered.
- Goshen is not being valued like surrounding communities such as Warwick.
- Goshen has enough negatives with landfills, jails, psych center, transfer stations, incinerators.
- Look into the impact of a DAC
- Notifications due to DAC
- Forever chemicals go airborne and also attach to organic matter.
- Consequence of this law related to forever chemicals.
- Strips of all protections related to solid waste.
- Increase in asthma rates and attacks.
- Conflict of interest between the Supervisor and the Hughes Energy Board
- Supervisor should be recused from the discussion and the room when the LL is being discussed
- Consider some enhanced way of notifying the entire Town due to the far-reaching nature of this Local Law

TOWN OF GOSHEN
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW BOARD
May 8, 2024

- Notifications of meetings should be considered on the app

Hughes Energy Research, Development and Demonstration Facility

The Environmental Review Board made the following comments and/or recommendations:

- Technology is from the 1980's
- Experimental process
- Foiled emails regarding conversations already allowing for a 100,000-sf building in the future is segmentation of the project under SEQRA.
- Security vans have been seen on the Hughes energy site
- Was the Board informed that Supervisor was a member of the Hughes board. ERB said they were not informed.
- Record of Decision on Operational unit one and two. No one is talking about it.
- Cannot demonstrate a successful process anywhere in the United States
- Cannot find any other existing plants in the world
- Planning Board should have letter from County stating exactly from where the waste is coming from
- There are no answers to what Hughes is going to do in order to provide recommendations.
- Contamination is likely due to single containment.
- Is the processed, sterile material, is it more likely to be contaminated in the future?
- Provide data from other facilities that have been run, or Wilson has run if it is the same technology since there are no facilities in the US.
- Will there be gases, odors?
- The process is vague, including the end product
- How long can the material be stored
- What is the quantity of material to be stored
- Waste from the autoclave waste needs to be stabilized before it can be finally dumped somewhere else
- What is in the steam and where does it go?
- Odors
- Noise from autoclave
- Particulate possibility in the air
- Impacts to wildlife
- Data statement regarding the whole process of autoclave
- Glues in cardboard boxes
- What exactly goes into the autoclave?
- Request a presenter who could speak intelligently to the project, not an attorney or site engineer
- Empirical evidence
- Is the waste hazardous material?
- What will the chemical reactions be from the autoclaving process?

TOWN OF GOSHEN
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW BOARD
May 8, 2024

- Will river and aquifer be protected?
- What kind of truck will take away the product.
- Sealing of concrete floor.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9.24 p.m.