www.courtreportingny.com

STATE OF NEW YORK : COUNTY OF ROCKLAND

TOWN OF STONY POINT : PLANNING BOARD

- - - - - - - - X

IN THE MATTER

 OF

THE BREAKERS

- - - - - - - X

Town of Stony Point

RHO Building
5 Clubhouse Lane

Stony Point, New York

February 25, 2016

7:00 p.m.

BEFORE:

THOMAS GUBITOSA, CHAIRMAN
PETER MULLER, VICE-CHAIRMAN
MICHAEL FERGUSON, BOARD MEMBER
ERIC JASLOW, BOARD MEMBER
EUGENE KRAESE, BOARD MEMBER
JERRY ROGERS, BOARD MEMBER

APPEARANCES:

STEPHEN M. HONAN, ESQ., Special Counsel MAX STACH, Town Planner
AMY MELE, ESQ., Attorney for Applicant JOHN O'ROURKE, P.L.S., Town Engineer WILLIAM SHEEHAN, Building Inspector MARY PAGANO, Clerk to the Planning Board

ROCKLAND & ORANGE REPORTING
2 Congers Road
New City, New York 10956
(845) 634-4200

www.courtreportingny.com

		2
1	Proceedings	
2		
3	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Please stand for the	
4	Pledge.	
5	(Whereupon, the Pledge of Allegiance was	
6	recited.)	
7	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Mary, please call	
8	the roll.	
9	PLANNING BOARD CLERK: Mr. Jaslow?	
10	BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: Here.	
11	PLANNING BOARD CLERK: Mr. Muller?	
12	VICE-CHAIRMAN MULLER: Here.	
13	PLANNING BOARD CLERK: Mr. Ferguson?	
14	BOARD MEMBER FERGUSON: Here.	
15	PLANNING BOARD CLERK: Mr. Rogers?	
16	BOARD MEMBER ROGERS: Here.	
17	PLANNING BOARD CLERK: Mr. Kraese?	
18	BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: Here.	
19	PLANNING BOARD CLERK: Chairman	
20	Gubitosa?	
21	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Here. All right,	
22	before we get started, if you have your cell	
23	phone, just put it on vibrate.	
24	First item on the agenda is The	
25	Breakers. This is a Site Plan Conditional	

Proceedings

2.2

Use located on the North End of Hudson Drive 600 feet north of Tomkins Avenue, part of the review of the scoping documents.

If you'd like to give us a quick update.

MS. MELE: Good evening, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board, members of the public. Yes, we've been working hard on addressing the comments received in response to the draft scope. We received quite a few comments, all very thoughtful comments that we're trying to address one by one.

We have updated the scope to address the majority of the comments. However, there were some comments received from the DEC, I believe it was just yesterday or the day before, that we have not had the opportunity to incorporate it in the document yet.

I had a conversation with Mr. Stach today about the content of our response, and some areas where the draft scope would be elaborated upon a little bit. And I had given a sort of digested version of the comments with where he referenced them in the scope.

Proceedings

2.0

2.2

And Mr. Stach indicated that he would prefer to see them referenced in the actual comment letters themselves. So in other words, we would reproduce all the comment letters, and next to each comment, we would have a reference. You know, see Comment Number One, let's say. And then we'd have an attachment that would address the particular comment raised in that letter.

We would also in the letter underline the meat of the comments so that you know exactly what we were responding to, so that you had an actual verbatim listing of every comment that you could attach to your final scope for the public to view.

So in order to get that done, what we had spoken about was I could get that done by March 3rd. We were requesting that the Board set a special meeting for March 10th, at which time we could go through the scope literally comment by comment, if the Board wishes, to try and finalize it.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Very good, thank you.

2.2

MS. MELE: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Max, can you give us a quick update?

MR. STACH: Sure. So I think Amy covered a lot of our discussions earlier today. As you know, there's been extensive comments on the scope so far. That all needs to be incorporated or addressed, one or the other, in the final scoping document.

The draft scope that was placed on the internet, as you recall, is the product of the project sponsor. The final scope has to be a project of this Board. So this Board has to be happy with this document.

In order to get there, I felt that there had to be a lot more clear relationship to what are we going to change in this scope, and what was the comment that caused us to change that in the scope. Additionally, there's likely to be some changes that you all believe need to be made, and I have some comments that I think I'd like incorporated as well.

So in order to get there, as Amy said,

1 Proceedings 2 she's going to get me a draft that they 3 believe addresses all the comments by the 4 third. I believe I can turn around by the 5 seventh a draft that I believe reflects my 6 comments on what has to be improved in the 7 draft scope, and addresses all the comments. 8 And then I think that will give you an 9 opportunity to review it before the 10th, 10 which, by the way, I think you need to extend 11 our time period to respond. We had 12 originally extended it to tonight. I believe 13 tonight we're going to need to get an 14 additional extension on the time to adopt the 15 final scope. 16 The applicant would agree to MS. MELE: 17 that. 18 MR. STACH: Okay, great. 19 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Thank you. 20 MR. STACH: And then I've also told, or 21 it was my suggestion to Ms. Mele, that at 2.2 that meeting, you all may have additional 23 comments or additional changes that you want 24 in the scope. So while it is our objective

to have a special meeting and get this

25

Proceedings

2.0

2.2

adopted there, it may even require an additional extension, I would suggest at the regular meeting in March.

It's very important that this document reflect this Board's desires for the final scope. Once that's done, the applicant can begin to prepare the DEIS, can begin to prepare their own plan materials and develop them; things like elevations, visual simulations, all of those items that will be necessary to convey the plan to the public and to foster comments on the plan and its analyses.

So that's sort of an update. What you've seen today is kind of like a simplified version of responses to comments. It paraphrases these comments very heavily. I think that needs to be expanded a little bit more so that some of the nuance in each comment is present, and I believe that the project sponsor's counsel agrees with me on that.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right, thanks,

Max. Just, I guess put it in layman's terms,

1 Proceedings 2 the scope, the draft scope is just -- you 3 know, we take the comments from the public, 4 from the Board, from all the agencies. 5 These are our concerns, give it back to 6 the applicant, they say all right, we 7 understand your concerns, we're going to 8 answer your questions, how we're going to 9 address them. 10 MR. STACH: The drafts, in layman's 11 terms, in the simplest of layman's terms, the 12 draft scope is the applicant's suggestion of 13 what they're going to put in the DEIS. 14 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Okay. 15 MR. STACH: Then the Planning Board, as 16 lead agency, needs to agree with it, or 17 change it and give it back to the applicant, 18 and say here's what we want to see in the 19 DEIS. 2.0 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Right. 21 MR. STACH: Between the two, you need to 2.2 send it out to all the involved agencies and

allow the public to comment on it. So not

only do you need to consider what you would

like to change, but what all the involved

23

24

25

1	Proceedings
2	agencies and the public need to change.
3	But basically it's, applicant says
4	here's what I'd like to put in the DEIS; you
5	say no, applicant, this is what you're going
6	to put in the DEIS.
7	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Right. And then
8	later down the line, since this is, like,
9	we're still in the beginning stages, later
10	down the line, would we get anything set up?
11	You know, the applicant's going to give a
12	full presentation of the project.
13	MR. STACH: Yeah, so they're going to
14	have to prepare the Draft Environmental
15	Impact Statement, which will be a fairly
16	voluminous document.
17	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Right.
18	MR. STACH: The first chapter of which
19	will be a fairly detailed description of the
20	project.
21	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Right, okay.
22	MR. STACH: And that document will be
23	made available to the public for review, and
24	this applicant will need to present the
25	project and the document together. In other

Proceedings words, the site -- the public hearing on the site plan - CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Right. MR. STACH: -- and the public hearing on the EIS will be on the same date. So they

the EIS will be on the same date. So they will have to present both the plan and the document to the public to foster comment.

Now it's even -- in discussions with the

2.2

project sponsor, it's my understanding that they, before that DEIS is completed, are contemplating going out and doing some outreach with the public. That's not part of the SEQRA process, that's not part of the Planning Board process. But I do agree it's good planning for them to do that.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Right. Because I know there was like -- and I've heard from people there was a misconception that hey, we don't know what's going on down there, why are you throwing this all of a sudden? But it's coming down the line as, we're just -- these are the steps we're getting to get to that stage where hey, now we're ready, they're going to give a presentation of what

1 Proceedings 2 they want to do down there based on 3 everyone's comments. 4 MR. STACH: I think that's a good 5 categorization of it, yes. 6 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: I just want to make 7 sure, because there's been a lot of 8 misconception out there, misleading. And I 9 want to let the public know that, you know, 10 this is just the beginning. There's going to 11 be further steps down the line, where you're 12 going to see a full presentation. There's 13 going to be, you know, the applicant is going 14 to present. 15 You know, I've heard comments from last 16 time that, you know, we didn't see anything. 17 Well, that's not what the scoping was from 18 the beginning. 19 MR. STACH: Yeah, because I think part 20 of what you establish in the scope is how 21 much detail the applicant has to develop and 2.2 provide to this Board and to the community 23 about their project. 24 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Okay. 25

MR. STACH: You are going to have, when

1 Proceedings 2 this final scope is done -- and the other 3 thing to realize is the draft scope was 4 prepared by the project sponsor. We did give 5 them some suggestions, but it's the project 6 sponsor's document. And it is therefore --7 it's very simple, it's very basic. 8 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Right. 9 MR. STACH: The final scope is going to 10 have a lot more detail in it as to what you 11 want to see in the DEIS. 12 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Okav. 13 MR. STACH: For example, with visual 14 simulations that are going to be prepared, 15 what perspectives do you want to be taken? 16 Do they have to consider -- well, they'll 17 have to consider from the battlefield, that 18 was in the scope. 19 But there has been some suggestions that 20 they might need to include visual simulations 21 from Hunter Place. They may have to consider 2.2 it from the middle of the Hudson River. 23 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Right. 24 MR. STACH: So you're going to have to 25 specify that in the final document, and

13 1 Proceedings 2 they're going to have to provide that 3 information for review by the public. 4 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Good, good. Thank 5 you. 6 PUBLIC SPEAKER: Is there a timetable 7 for this? 8 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: John, any comments? 9 MR. O'ROURKE: No, we've been 10 coordinating with Max for comments into the 11 scope. 12 Bill, any comments? CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: 13 MR. SHEEHAN: No, same thing. We've 14 been going back and forth, still going back 15 and forth. 16 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Steve, anything? 17 MR. HONAN: No, no comments. 18 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. What I'll 19 do is --2.0 BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: Can I just say 21 something? 2.2 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Yeah, yeah. 23 BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: So we extended 24 this time period to yesterday or today? 25 MR. STACH: Today.

1 Proceedings 2 BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: And now you want 3 to extend it to December 10th? 4 MR. STACH: March 10th. 5 BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: I'm sorry. 6 MR. SHEEHAN: Not for public, for --7 CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Just for us. 8 BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: I understand that. 9 Reading off what I've gotten in the last week 10 or two from all these agencies, what happens 11 if we're not satisfied on March 10th -- why 12 do I keep saying December -- on March 10th? 13 MR. STACH: The way the SEQRA process 14 works is that you're required to adopt a 15 final scope within 60 days. If you don't 16 adopt the scope within 60 days, this 17 applicant is authorized to submit an EIS that 18 doesn't meet that scope. 19 They can prepare a EIS of their own sort 20 of content, using their own sort of guide 21 without consideration of the scope. You 2.2 still get to say whether that EIS is 23 sufficient or not. You just won't have a 24 scope to guide you in that discussion. 25 it's --

1 Proceedings 2 BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: So I feel at this 3 point I'm being pushed by a time constraint, 4 when we're trying to solve some of these --5 there's a lot of issues here. And none 6 brought up by me, brought up by everybody 7 else. You know what I'm saying? 8 I just don't feel that -- I don't know 9 if I'm stepping out of bounds -- I don't feel 10 we should be pushed into making a decision. 11 And all I'm asking for is what if March 10th, 12 we don't have that -- someone here is not 13 happy with what's going on? 14 MR. STACH: You can ask the applicant to 15 extend it. 16 BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: And if he doesn't 17 want to do it? 18 MR. STACH: Then he can submit an EIS 19 without a scope. 2.0 BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: Who decided this 21 on March 10th? 2.2 MR. STACH: The March 10th date was 23 established at the TAC meeting as a date when

the public, when this Board could meet.

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE:

24

25

I'm just not

2.2

2 comfortable, to be honest with you.

MR. STACH: Now it's --

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: Only because of the volume of stuff that's been presented to this Board, to me personally, and the rest of the Board. The volume that we have, there's a lot of questions. We've gotten nowhere tonight, in my opinion.

MR. STACH: I agree.

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: So now you just want to go off for a couple weeks, which is about 11 more days, and nothing's been answered to begin with.

MR. STACH: I think you have to recognize some things, you're not looking for answers. You're looking for questions. The only thing you have to decide is the questions that you've received from the public, if those questions have to go in the scope or not. You're not looking to answer them.

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: I understand that. But we didn't get that far yet. That's 11 more days, you're looking for us to make a

2 decision.

2.2

MR. SHEEHAN: No, I think what's going to happen, Gene, is on the tenth, you're going to get another scope.

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: Correct, I understand that.

MR. SHEEHAN: If you're satisfied at that point that all your questions that have been submitted are satisfactory in the scope, then you can adopt it. If not, or if the Board's not happy with it, I think you're going to have to ask the applicant for an extension.

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: That was the question I wanted to bring out, thank you. That was a long way of me doing it. But you understand what I'm saying.

I don't know what these gentlemen feel next to me, but I actually read most of these. A lot of repetition, a lot of the same issues. And a lot of issues, more than I thought we had to begin with. I just want to be comfortable that the first step is the right step.

2.2

MR. STACH: And the most significant one we got was yesterday, frankly. The DEC letter had a lot of content in it. And that's why it's almost not worth going through what we've already gotten tonight because -- and the other thing I think, frankly, is the format that the applicant has provided. It really doesn't foster a lot of understanding, and how are we addressing these questions.

I think how the applicant gives you the next draft on the third, after I look at it, is going to be much clearer as okay, here's a comment, here's what the draft scope used to say, here's what it now says, in order to address this comment.

And it will be much easier for you to go through comment by comment, through the -- we probably have about 30 pages of comments now to go through, and say yes, we hit every comment that was of substance that needs to result in a change to the scope.

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: All right. I just wanted to get the impression that we're

```
1
                 Proceedings
2
    coming back on March 10th, and this is going
3
    to be it because --
 4
          MR. STACH: No. And frankly, you know,
5
     even if the applicant doesn't extend your
6
     time period -- I mean, the law says you
7
     should try and get it done within the time
8
     frame.
9
          But even if this applicant -- I
10
    apologize to you, Amy -- even if this
11
    applicant decides not to extend the time
12
    period, you will still ultimately have a say
13
    on whether the DEIS that they prepare is
14
    complete or not.
15
          BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: All right.
16
          CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right, thank
17
    you.
18
          MR. STACH: Is that good?
19
          BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: It's good enough
2.0
    for now.
21
          MR. SHEEHAN: I think, Gene, I think
2.2
    what really needs to happen is that it's up
23
    to the applicant to put a document together
24
     that satisfies this Board, that every comment
25
    has been incorporated, or if not, why, in a
```

1 Proceedings 2 format that everybody can understand. 3 that's achieved by the applicant, then the 4 Board might not have an issue on the 10th. 5 BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: I'm not saying the 6 Board is going to have an issue. 7 MR. SHEEHAN: I know. 8 BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: All I'm saying is 9 it's been extended from the 9th to the 24th 10 to the 25th. 11 MR. SHEEHAN: What I'm trying to say is 12 the onus is on the applicant to provide all 13 that information to satisfy the Board that 14 all the comments have been incorporated, or 15 if not, why not. 16 BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: It appears to me 17 that if the way Max put it out, the 18 clarification would be acceptable to the rest 19 of the Board, or to me, or to whoever. 20 like I said, you went from the 9th to the 21 24th, and we didn't do anything tonight, 2.2 except get letters. 23 So it's really not been addressed. 24 only concern was -- I'm not saying right or 25 wrong -- my only concern was it's only about

2.2

11 days. And we're going to have a lot of stuff done in 11 days. Stuff keeps coming in every day of the week.

MR. SHEEHAN: Well, they can't come in anymore. The comment period's closed.

MR. STACH: The other thing I wanted to stress here to the Board is that if you have comments on the draft scope, those also need to be addressed.

And that's the one piece that we haven't talked about here, is you have comments from the public on how they think the scope needs to be changed. But you guys ultimately decide what's in the scope. You may have personal feelings on things that need to go into the scope.

I think you can bring them up on the 10th. But I think it's even better if you guys had some ideas on what needs to be changed in the scope that you start to let us know, so that when we get to the 10th, we have those in mind, and we can incorporate them.

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: I'm not trying to

```
1
                 Proceedings
2
     change something I didn't hear about.
3
    answers may be sufficient for me, or for
 4
    anybody.
5
          MR. STACH: No, what I'm saying, the
6
    public gave us 30 pages of comments, but they
7
    may have missed something that you thought
8
    of.
9
          BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: I don't think they
10
    missed very much. And that's a great thing,
11
    that's good, don't get me wrong. I'm not
12
     trying to stall this any further.
13
          MR. STACH: Understood.
14
          CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Any other Board
15
    members?
16
          All right, so what I'll do is, I need a
17
    motion to set a meeting March 10th for --
18
    what are we going to call it, a special
19
    meeting to review the scoping?
2.0
          VICE-CHAIRMAN MULLER: I'll make that
21
    motion.
          BOARD MEMBER FERGUSON: I'll second it.
2.2
23
          CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All in favor?
24
          (Response of aye was given.)
25
          CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA:
                              Opposed?
```

		23
1	Proceedings	
2	So we'll set for March 10th, 7:00, this	
3	building. We'll get it posted on the website	
4	and see if we get it in one of the papers.	
5	But March 10th, and we'll just this	
6	is where we'll go over the scope. Right,	
7	Max?	
8	MR. STACH: Yup.	
9	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: And this is just a	
10	review, it's not a public hearing; right?	
11	MR. STACH: Yeah, this is a I would	
12	say this is a meeting to consider a final	
13	scope.	
14	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Right. All right.	
15	MR. STACH: Okay.	
16	CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: So we'll see you on	
17	the 10th.	
18	MS. MELE: Thank you.	
19		
20	000	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

THE FOREGOING IS CERTIFIED to be a true and correct transcription of the original stenographic minutes to the best of my ability.

Jenniffer∕L. Johnson