

STATE OF NEW YORK : COUNTY OF ROCKLAND

TOWN OF STONY POINT : PLANNING BOARD

- - - - - X

IN THE MATTER
OF
LOVETT SUBSTATION

- - - - - X

Town of Stony Point
RHO Building
5 Clubhouse Lane
Stony Point, New York
August 25, 2022
7:06 p.m.

BEFORE:

MARK JOHNSON, CHAIRMAN
KERRI ALESSI, BOARD MEMBER
MICHAEL FERGUSON, BOARD MEMBER
JERRY ROGERS, BOARD MEMBER

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

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

Proceedings

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: First on the agenda this evening is the Lovett Substation.

MR. SINSABAUGH: Good evening, Chairman, Members of the Board. My name is Brian Sinsabaugh. I'm an attorney with Zarin and Steinmetz law firm, 81 Main Street, White Plains, New York, on behalf of the applicant Orange and Rockland.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Just give us a brief rundown of the status. I know you guys just were up in front of the Zoning Board, correct?

MR. SINSABAUGH: Yes. We were previously up in front of the Zoning Board. We did a brief presentation then. I did schedule a public hearing, which we have for September 1st.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay.

MR. SINSABAUGH: And we did receive comments back. We have an August 10th letter from John O'Rourke. We received letters today from Nelson, Pope and Voorhis, and I've reviewed that. I think simply today, what

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

Proceedings

we're here for today is to request that a public hearing be scheduled on this matter.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: All right.

THE CLERK: I didn't have the review, review of the project first.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay, yeah. Give us just a brief overview of the project for the Board that's here and the public that's here.

MR. SINSABAUGH: All right, certainly. So what we're proposing here is there is a parcel that was previously utilized by the Lovett Substation. We're now proposing to develop that parcel with what's called a GI substation. That's gas insulated substation. It's going to increase the output capable of coming from the station if there's a peak need and we need to increase that output.

It's been a request by the New York, NYISO it's called. And that's a request for the substation to be increased just for the northern Rockland area, for their benefit.

The substation itself includes a building as well as a transformer that will be located on the parcel. The parcel does

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

Proceedings

have access, there will be an access road as well on the area. And what's being proposed includes structures. We do have some grading as well being proposed on the site for the benefit of some of the neighboring property owners.

That's a brief summary, but sums up where we are right now.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Max, I saw you had some comments today.

MR. STACH: Yeah. So I did update our memo review. The applicant had addressed several of our comments from our previous review. We had requested some additional clarification on some of the other points.

I think the main point that we wanted to bring to the Board's attention is that we're asking the applicant to do a little more research as to potential flooding elevations based on some flood studies that were done by FEMA after Hurricane Sandy that resulted in what are called advisory base flood elevations that have been adopted by the Town. So as part of that SEQRA review, they

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

Proceedings

would review those and see if that required any adjustment of the project, or explain why it doesn't require adjustment of the project.

That said, I did talk to John O'Rourke just before this meeting, and he said he's satisfied with all the engineering. We have reviewed all the other sections of the EAF and find it satisfactory. So except for that one issue of flooding, I think we're ready to move on to a neg dec. And I think that could happen at the next Planning Board meeting. Other than that --

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: You still have feedback regarding the flood elevations?

MR. STACH: I think they should be able to address those. It's not a significant -- it's a significant issue, but it shouldn't be difficult to address. It's either a concern and they adjust the project, or they explain it's not a concern and they don't adjust the project.

I think the only other thing is that I did note -- and I don't know if the ARB noted, they got already referred to the ARB

1 Proceedings

2 earlier -- they did submit some mechanical
3 engineering drawings that have elevations as
4 part of them. But I wasn't sure whether the
5 ARB was going to accept those.

6 THE CLERK: They haven't come to the ARB
7 yet.

8 MR. STACH: Okay. They're going to need
9 to go to the ARB before they can get their
10 approval anyway. So that's something that we
11 won't be holding them up by doing the neg dec
12 next month because they're going to have to
13 go to the ARB, which is usually one to two
14 month process. That's pretty much an update
15 of where we are.

16 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: All right. Now, do
17 we need to do, do we need to wait for the
18 neg dec to set the public hearing or no?

19 THE CLERK: No.

20 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Does any of the Board
21 Members have any questions? And John, you're
22 good, according to Max?

23 MR. O'ROURKE: I never spoke with Max
24 today. Yeah, no, we're generally good.
25 There was a couple minor comments, but they

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

Proceedings

addressed all the storm water comments satisfactory, so we're generally satisfied with the existing site now with no major issues. So we're generally satisfied. So I have no problem scheduling the public hearing. And as Max says, once they resolve the issue with the flood elevations, more for themselves than for us, I think we're good.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: All right. Steve, any comments?

MR. HONAN: No, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: All right. All right. Can we do the public hearing?

THE CLERK: You have to make a motion.

BOARD MEMBER ROGERS: I make a motion, Mr. Chairman.

BOARD MEMBER ALESSI: Second.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: I got a motion and a second for a public hearing. And we'll do that at next month's Planning Board meeting.

THE CLERK: September 22nd.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: September 22.

THE CLERK: I'll be sending you all the information.

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

Proceedings

MR. SINSABAUGH: Thank you.

(Time noted: 7:12 p.m.)

oOo

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

Proceedings

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



Jennifer L. Johnson

