

# *Town of Stony Point*

## Department of Planning

74 EAST MAIN STREET  
STONY POINT, NEW YORK 10980

Tel: (845) 786-2716 x 113

[planning@townofstonypoint.org](mailto:planning@townofstonypoint.org)

Fax: (845) 786-5138

### **PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

**February 28, 2013**

**RHO BUILDING at 7:00 P.M**

**Present:**

Thomas McMenamin, Member  
Peter Muller, Member - Absent  
Michael Puccio, Member  
Gene Kraese, Member  
Gladys Callaghan, Member  
Gerry Rogers, Member  
Thomas Gubitosa, Chairman

**Also Present:**

Turner Miller Group, Principle Planner  
By: Max Stach

Kevin Maher, Town Engineer

Kevin T. Mulhearn, Esq.  
Special Counsel

Steve Honan, Esq.  
Special Counsel

### **PLANNING BOARD AGENDA**

**February 28, 2013**

**Pending Applications:**

1. BHS Site Plan – SBL 20.04-11-6 LI District – Site Plan located on the south side of Holt Drive 990 Feet East of Route 9W
  - Site Plan
2. The Rose at Wayne Avenue - SBL 15.01-4-60 RR District – Sketch, Preliminary approval, for minor subdivision located on the north side of Wayne Avenue and McCarthy Circle
  - Two lot minor subdivision
3. Forty Four South Liberty Drive – SBL 20.07-3-63 BU District Site Plan – Site Plan located on east side of South Liberty Drive 725 Feet South of High Avenue intersection with South Liberty Drive
  - Site Plan

**OTHER BUSINESS:**

Cost Estimate – Hudson Bay Complex Building E SBL 20.04-11-2.3

Accept minutes of January 24, 2013

Chairman: First on the agenda is BHS Site Plan Mr. Zigler could you please give me a narrative.

BHS Site Plan – SBL 20.04-11-6 LI District – Site Plan located on the south side of Holt Drive 990 Feet East of Route 9W

- Site Plan

Mr. Zigler: We went for our field trip down there the back of the building which is situated of Holt Drive the fourth lot down third building. We went in there is a gate across the front of the property so I had opened it up prior to getting there. The back of the lot there is half of the parking lot and that is what we are talking about basically taking that half of the parking lot where the stanchions were for the two lights fencing that in putting the gate on both sides one on the east side one on the left side and then from that light stanchion south would be the contractors storage. We went out there and looked at the site and you could see that it was definitely buffered from the school if you stood on the site you could barely see the top of the school. I think it is about a 12 foot difference in elevation from the back of the fence down to the ball field that is directly behind the site. I would not say there are tree rows but there are enough trees along the property line that they are buffered from the neighbors and the only visibility seemed to be from Holt Drive if you came down Holt Drive and you are going to make the left into Shop Rite and you looked over you would be able to see in the back. There was an offer as we were in the site to put privacy slats that can be a solid slats like green or black or it could be a vine on the chain link fence and if you go from the corner of the property the northwest corner of the property or if you looked standing in the street looking at the property it would be the right side. If you go from that post and go 80 foot back that would be blocked if we put those privacy slats in that it would be a blocking agent for somebody coming down the street.

We agreed to that it is in your code it's part of what we have to do to block it from visibility. The other thing was when you left I had to close the gate so if we are going to put those slats in the fence it is going to block your visibility up the street basically I pulled up to the curb line with my truck and I could close the gate behind my truck so it is not going to block your visibility to the left because the fence is that far from the curb line. You could pull up to the curb line get out of your vehicle and close the gate behind you. So that is what we decided on site I talked to the applicant they have no problem doing the privacy slats. The other thing there was a discussion on what would be stored there and it is not an intent to have pipes and things outside because it is a different world right now. If you are a contractor and you go purchase pipe to install it if there is any pipe left over it goes back and you get your money. You don't keep the pipes like you use to because every job has different pipe sizes different styles different makes as far as loose storage let's say gravel or something it does make any sense to have gravel delivered to a site and then load it in a truck and take it out to a site it's just not going to happen you can't make money like that. We have no probably putting a limit on area where cobble stones could be that would be something that you would bring back if he were going to use cobble stones. Basically this yard is going to be use to build big buildings, they built the fire house they built the ambulance building and that is where they are going to put their heavy equipment and they have loaders they have excavators dozers and that sort of stuff the small things their jumping jacks their tampers the things that someone could pick up and leave with are going to be put inside that building. The building is only half rented to the electronics. We had the comments from the county I think we addressed all of them that we could there was one questionable one there on the impact on the school which didn't kind of make too much sense to me and what we would like to do is ask for a Public Hearing. This has to go to the Town Board so if you did set a Public Hearing for this for next month then I would go to the Town Board and ask them to set a Public Hearing after you are finished. The Planning Board Has to go first all we want right now is to set a Public Hearing.

Chairman: Does anyone have any questions on the site visit that we did. I think we are good with the site visit and recommendations.

Mr. McMenamin: I read the responses to the Commission of Planning in Rockland and one of the things he said comment #3 evergreen and landscaping and or vegetated berm must be must be provided along the southern boundary of the property to help shield noise and visual impacts from this proposed storage area. You answered you are going to put slats in the chain link fence I am just worried about that word must.

Mr. Zigler: There is a berm there already if you consider a berm being something that is landscaped or higher than the average elevation in the area that you are standing in to buffer the view from an outside property that is what a berm is to me. When you did a berm on Hudson Bay you created a berm behind the building to block the building from outside properties. I think we got that already.

Mr. McMenamin: I am just asking about the must.

Mr. Zigler: If you believe that existing berm is not sufficient then I would say that I would have to mitigate that but if you believe that existing hill has enough trees on it you have looked into it and you agree with him it is the Boards call. In the code it mentions about being buffered so I think it is kind of there I think it is a physical buffer with that berm from the school.

Mr. McMenamin: We talked about that already and I tend to agree with you I just think that we have to override this.

Mr. Zigler: You think so, OK alright I would say that existing condition does qualify right. What I will do is change this response and ask for an override and highlight it up above like I did on the other ones.

Mr. Stach: I think also with regard to their last recommendation that you have to file with the Rockland County Health department recommendations the Rockland County Health says no storage within sanitary sewers right of way. Now if we look at the plans you are proposing for your gravel to go into that area which would presumable allow storage within that easement. So my question is would you be storing within that easement or does it make sense to move that gravel to the edge of the easement so we don't have to override that also.

Mr. Zigler: That is thirty feet – The easement itself is thirty foot wide because in the early 1900 hundreds there was a sewer line that went down there from Helen Hays actually before it was called that. It went down to a sewer plant just on the other side of the railroad track from Magee's garages the second good luck auto. Then after that the State came and put another sewer line now the second sewer line is on the south side of that easement so if we store on that easement we are still not on top of the sewer and I think the intention was not to store on top of the sewer main which doesn't make any sense because you drive up and down the street over the sewer main all the time but we are not going to argue with that so we are not on top of the sewer main and I think that was his intent but if you think that is wrong then I would ask for an override on that.

Mr. Stach: I think you probably need to figure out if you are allowed to store.

Mr. Zigler: Absolutely we can we created parking on Town Line on top of it there is no obstruction it is an easement it is an easement for the sewer it doesn't restrict the owner.

Mr. Stach: You can't build structures on it?

Mr. Zigler: Oh no you can you did it on Hudson Grand you build a parking lot and a loop rode around it and on Towline you actually put parking on top of it. We can build on it – it is his property.

Mr. McMenamin: You can't build a structure on it?

Mr. Zigler: But you can build a parking lot on it you can't build a building.

Mr. McMenamin: You show the trees in the thirty foot so the storage won't be up in the trees.

Mr. Zigler: That is what I say we are going to be off the sewer line we will probably be on the easement a little bit but not on the sewer line.

Mr. Stach: But you are going to remove those trees that are shown in the gravel right?

Mr. Zigler: So of them are gone so of them are still there. I actually had to submit that map before we went out there because of the time frame to get it in so it is a little old.

Mr. Stach: County says it needs to be clarified what needs to be removed what is going to stay what is going to be gravel and Rockland County Health said no storage within that so.

Mr. Zigler: So I will show what trees that are going to remain will detail that with elevations so we can see that as a berm and I will also show where the sewer line is within that easement and our limit of parking is and then we will ask the Board to put a double piece of glue on it by overriding the two items but in reality we did do the mitigation.

Chairman: Should we go over the Part II.

Mr. Stach: The Part II and the Negative Deck I gave you are very easy they don't indicate any essential environmental impacts therefore the Negative Deck states that. That there is a workable drainage plan or a drainage plan can be developed, how we are going to deal with screening problems with some (inaudible) brush in the back of the property and by opaque fencing being proposed to being installed.

Chairman: Kevin, you have any comments with the drainage.

Mr. Maher: As long as they address I notice in their comments they didn't say no increase in runoff on the site. It is an industrial area and pretty well developed they can control their runoff on site.

Chairman: I no one objects I will read the Negative Declaration then we will make a motion. The Part II if everyone is ok with the Part II I just need a motion to accept the Part II.

**MOTION: ADOPT THE PART II**

Made by Gerry Rogers and seconded by Gladys Callaghan

All in favor

Chairman: This is the State Environmental Quality Review Negative Declaration

State Environmental Quality Review

**NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

Notice of Determination of Non-Significance

**PROJECT: BHS ASSOCIATES**

**TOWN OF STONY POINT, NEW YORK**

**DATE: FEBRUARY 28, 2013**

This notice is issued pursuant to Part 617 of the implementing regulation pertaining to Article 8 (State Environmental Quality Review Act) of the Environmental Conservation Law.

The Planning Board of the Town of Stony Point, as lead agency, has determined that the proposed action described below will not have a significant effect on the environment and a Draft Environmental Impact Statement will not be prepared.

**Name of Action: BHS ASSOCIATES - SPECIAL PERMIT FOR OUTDOOR CONTRACTORS STORAGE**

**SEQR Status: Unlisted**

**Condition Negative Declaration: No**

**Description of Action: Special Permit and Site Plan approval of an application to use a rear yard of an existing nonresidential use as a contractor's storage yard, a special use in the LI zoning district.**

**Location: South Side of Holt Drive, approximately 1100 feet from east of Route 9W.**

**Reasons Supporting This Determination:**

The proposed action is not anticipated to result in any adverse environmental impacts based on the following:

1. The Town Engineer has reviewed the plan and a workable plan for mitigation of stormwater and erosion impacts has been developed;
2. The proposal will be screened from substantial public view by the existing building, existing brush and elevation differential to the rear and by opaque fencing proposed to be installed.
3. No other impacts were identified.

Chairman: I just need a motion to accept the Negative Declaration.

MOTION: ADOPT THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION  
Made by Gerry Rogers and seconded by Gene Kraese  
Roll call vote all in favor.

Mr. McMenamin – yes  
Mr. Puccio - yes  
Mr. Kraese -yes  
Mrs. Callaghan - yes  
Mr. Rogers - yes  
Chairman – yes

Chairman: I just need a motion to set a Public Hearing for next month which will be March 28, 2013

MOTION: SET PUBLIC HEARING FOR MARCH 28, 2013.  
Made by Gerry Rogers and seconded by Michael Puccio

Chairman: Should I make a motion to send it to the Town Board?

Mr. Stach: I believe this application was already made to the Town Board.

Mr. Zigler: The referral was and it was referred back.

Mr. Stach: So really what you have to do is after you have your Public Hearing then you will give your recommendation to the Town Board so there is no need to refer it to the Town Board.

Chairman: Next on the agenda is The Rose at Wayne Avenue.

The Rose at Wayne Avenue - SBL 15.01-4-60 RR District – Sketch, Preliminary approval, for minor subdivision located on the north side of Wayne Avenue and McCarthy Circle

- Two lot minor subdivision

Mr. Zigler: This map is what we discussed when we were out on site and we did go out since then and locate the trees and we can easily come off McCarthy Way with a dedicated driveway in to the cemetery and have it turn around like you discussed and we can also separate the driveways and have a separate driveway from McCarthy into the house so we can eliminate that existing driveway and that kind of mitigate so of the concerns the County had on that driveway so we can do that. I spoke to Larry Brissing about the driveway and he said that would be great because he really didn't like it he does plow that driveway and fixes that access to the cemetery he said he didn't like driving past the house. I also have drafted a letter because I have to go to the Town Board and ask him to revise the easement to the cemetery because the easement for the Town to travel over the property is that driveway. So I have those two changes and new set of plans you get will so the houses and the septic will be proposed that will be behind the houses back were those shed were when we walked out there we don't have the problem of separation because we have United Water in Wayne Avenue so it would be just two house connections. So with that done we are sort of ready to have a Public Hearing but we are not. I would like to ask the Board if it is OK with them after I submit the maps to you and at the workshop if everything looks go I would like to meet with Larry Brissing to make sure he is happy with the proposed driveway and I have to go to the Town Board if they are even willing to discuss moving the easement or there is not any reason to go any further with this layout. The other thing I have to

do is I have to get Health Department Approval prior to final for this because that is in your code it requires septic right now just recently we could not do soil testing because of the ground. So what I am asking to do is submit the new maps with these revisions that I just discussed to the workshop let the workshop look at it and if they think it is fine then I will go meet with Larry and I will also go to the Town Board informally to discuss moving the easement and then over the next month March we would go out and do deep test holes with the Health Department and design skeptics because without those three things we throw the map away and start over again. So that is basically the revisions on the map you will get on what we discussed in the field and it is just between McCarthy and the existing driveway.

Mr. Puccio: How did you make out with the County with that wall?

Mr. Zigler: We are going to take it out so it doesn't matter and re-grade that. We will be putting a new driveway on the other side so it is not like we are losing all the driveways we are just going to replace the new house on lot 2 with a driveway. Right now there are two driveways there are one on each side of the house that old house will access off of McCarthy and the new house will have one driveway so there is actually a loss of one driveway that should make the County happy.

Mr. Kraese: Can I ask you a question? On McCarthy Circle the new proposed right of way or road is that before the first house?

Mr. Zigler: The first house property actually starts about 150 foot in it is a little bit of a weird situation because the property and the road is so hugging on side of the property.

Mr. Kraese: People actually go I seen those driveways on both sides of the house do people actually go up there?

Mr. Zigler: That cemetery is in excellent shape.

Mr. Kraese: If I didn't know if it was there.

Mr. Rogers: Who maintains that cemetery?

Mr. Zigler: The Town does.

Mr. Kraese: Are you looking for a stone driveway?

Mr. Zigler: He said he will be happy with the stone driveway. I have to get them to approve it so if he doesn't want a golden highway we would agree to it.

Mr. McMEnamin: So you got a septic system right before you are putting the driveway for the existing.

Mr. Zigler: No that is an old plan the new plans has septic system in the back where the sheds are.

Mr. McMEnamin: The second question is isn't the easement part of the deed?

Mr. Zigler: Yes it has to be changed.

Mr. McMEnamin: how do you get it changed by the Town Board?

Mr. Zigler: Because the Town Board is the recipient of the easement although the owner Angelo would want to change it he has to have the other party to have to change it.

Mr. Maher: You have to vacate all rights and title in the easement and then the property owner writes a new easement description.

Mr. McMEnamin: The property owner so that is the Town.

Mr. Zigler: It will be our owners to draft a new easement to the satisfaction of the Town.

Mr. McMenamain: So legally then that is going to be done by this property owner to give access to the Town's property.

Mr. Zigler: Yes, my only thought is if it is a better access and a better deal I can't see why they wouldn't go for it. What I would do is suggest putting a pipe in it but I really would want to me with Larry on that we probably would put a County swale like in Orange County the swales are next to the road so you put a pipe in it and a driveway over it then put a fence so there is a channel so that is what we would probably do.

Mr. McMenamain: Because that old Rose house is giving up the access to Wayne Avenue.

Mr. Zigler: Yes it is just a better access to it. So that would be my plan if the Board was fine with that.

Chairman: Alright if the Board doesn't have any questions.

Mr. Stach: My only question is the next Town Board Meeting is March 19<sup>th</sup> is that enough time do you want a referral?

Mr. Zigler: I rather go informally to them and most importantly I would like to do the test holes before we get to far down the road to be sure we can fine septic. We have a lot of work to do in March and we will probably miss a meeting or two meetings here. I might come in April and ask you for a referral if they want one. This is the first time we tried to move an easement to a cemetery. I never did this before so we will probably be cutting a new (inaudible) with legal decisions here. I will be getting you new maps and they will land on somebody's desk tomorrow.

Chairman: Next on the agenda is Forty Four South Liberty Drive.

Forty Four South Liberty Drive – SBL 20.07-3-63 BU District Site Plan – Site Plan located on east side of South Liberty Drive 725 Feet South of High Avenue intersection with South Liberty Drive

Mr. Zigler: This was our second trip that day when we were on a mission and doing our field trips we were lucky enough to have both Boards there doing our field trip. Since that time we have done a lot of work. Basically the Board was able to see how the building was going to sit on the lot and a couple of ideas brought up some other problems and we had to meet with the owner. What we are going to do is that we are going to get an easement from the people in the back which is actually the same person I am working for so we can grade across the property line. The curb that is in the shopping center in the back we are going to match that curb so it will become flatter between them and we are going to be able to landscape it. Because there were thoughts when we were out there about having landscaping down that common property line because if you are coming from Town Hall and going south on 9W you can almost see the back of that building the new 7 Eleven. So when you suggested that when you were out there my plan really couldn't do that because I had a grade in there I had a little bit of a drop off so we are going to get a grading easement and then we will be able to put curb on the gas station side the 7 Eleven side equal to the curb on the shopping center side make it flat and then we will be able to plant a row of tree or evergreens that would block the back of the building. The other thing we did we have the information for the ARB we have that in and with the signage I am still waiting for the lights because it is a unique site it is like a triangle it is very hard to put lights on it so it hits it perfectly so I am not ready for that. We are in for the ARB for the building itself and the signage. The next thing is the variances I think we need about seven variances most of the have to do with the proximately to that real property line it is very close we also need variance to the Monty side the south side because our curb is pretty close to the property line we have to have a separation of 10 foot we just don't have the room to do that. So we need variances for those things they are bulk variances the last variance we are ask for is the pylon sign by the code the sign can only be 80 square foot which is 40 on each side. This sign which isn't big is 100 square foot and that is even smaller than Provident Bank was more than 100 CVS was more than 100 square foot. So it is not that big just bigger than the code allows so we are in so after tonight we are going to file for the variances tomorrow or Monday for that. So that is the three things we have there and the last thing is just the drainage itself now that we have the grading situated I have to meet with Kevin and actually Ryan will come up and meet with Kevin and discuss the

drainage. We have verbal approval to hook to the drainage in the shopping center so if we have to put a system it or if we have to do something for mitigation or water quality or whatever we would be able to do an overflow pipe rather than just have it spill out. I know if we grade it and have it tilt towards 9W the State won't be happy so that is our next step so the last thing is of course the sewer we have a right to hook the sewer the sewer is in the shopping center also so our utilities is regular sewer connections there is nothing special with the water the sewer or the utilities. So that is where we are on that we are going to the ARB next month and the ZBA next month and probably have a Public Hearing the following a Public Hearing in April I don't know if they will do it in March so with that I would rather have the first Public Hearing here so I am requesting to have a Public Hearing with the Planning Board next month by that time I am going to know how the ARB is. We will have discussed the drainage with Kevin and will know how we are doing with the signage if you have a Public Hearing next month we will be asking you to continue it till the next month while we process the variances.

Chairman: Question with the parking variances is that us.

Mr. Zigler: Yes, we left it at 25% and that was a decision we discussed at the work shop.

Mr. Kraese: So you are looking for a 25% waiver on the parking.

Mr. Zigler: Yes.

Mr. McMenamain: It says 21 % in the drawings.

Mr. Zigler: It is 25% now there will be a slight difference in the new drawing you will get next month. We are short 5 spaces it's 5 spaces whatever the math is. We need variance for coverage and impervious coverage of the site and bulk of the building and for the signage and we are asking the parking be a relief from the Planning Board because it is a design and in the package next month you will get traffic study more like a parking study of the 7 Eleven on Central Highway for a 12 hour period we have exactly the same amount of spaces so we had someone sit there and count every 10 minutes how many spaces were open for 12 hours. So you can see that the site works with the amount of parking we have there.

Mr. McMenamain: You talking about your existing?

Mr. Zigler: I am talking about the parking lot in 7 Eleven on Central Highway.

Mr. Stach: I am a little confused why are you asking for a 25% waiver is that because you require 20 spaces?

Mr. Zigler: Whatever math is yes, I think 20 we are required 20 and we have 15.

Mr. Stach: So you rounded down now you rounded up.

Mr. Zigler: Because you told me to I always listen to you.

Mr. Stach: Is it 2,400 or 2,500?

Mr. Zigler: It is 2,400 on the narrative it says it says 2,500 plus or minus it is 2,400. Also on the map you will have a breakdown of the building which breaks down the use inside the building and you will see instead of requiring 20 it probably requires 17 less because when you do your parking you do it wall to wall outside to outside inside this 7 Eleven there are freezers and areas that people can't get to but we show both ways we show code wise we need twenty and we show a practical so you have a bases to make your judgment if you so agree for the waiver.

Mr. McMenamain: Talk to me about monitoring wells.

Mr. Zigler: They are dead they have to go to Rockland County Health Department and get a permit to kill them.

Mr. McMenamain: There are six of them and that was from the prior gas station.



Mr. Zigler: Yes from the testing. What happened was they took the tanks out but that was prior to you being required to get a permit. You just can't fill a well any more it is against the Rockland County Health Code, you need a permit and you have to follow specific requirements.

Mr. McMenemy: But these are for monitoring (inaudible) .

Mr. Zigler: A well is a well same thing they had to do down in stop and shop there were wells in there from years ago from lead contamination and they had to draw a permit on them and you have to decommission them by the code.

Mr. McMenemy: That doesn't make sense because he is saying if the existing monitoring wells are to be decommissioned now you are saying they are going to be.

Mr. Zigler: I am not saying there was a building permit pulled on them and prior to coming to the Board the first time they had to apply for a C of O those tanks were taken prior to, maybe 2 years ago so if you were drawing a permit today to take the tanks out you would also have to draw a permit to take all those wells out.

Mr. McMenemy: But the wells are there to monitor pollution that exists in the ground.

Mr. Zigler: They are dead.

Mr. McMenemy: Does that mean that the DEC or somebody has said.

Mr. Zigler: The Rockland County Health Department has said that.

Mr. McMenemy: They have?

Mr. Zigler: Yes it's dead, deader than a door nail it is in the file.

Mr. McMenemy: He goes on to say on to say that the Rockland County Sanitary Sewer would have to approve the removal of the monitoring wells.

Mr. Zigler: Don't you think the planner would look that up before he would go through all this.

Mr. McMenemy: I don't know.

Mr. Zigler: We went through this actually I was going to have to withdraw it because they didn't pull a C of O on the tanks but they have to be decommissioned period. And there will be a note on the map to that effect.

Mr. Stach: As a point of information you are going to have to override anyway because of no uncertain terms they said that you would have to make your building smaller. Are you going to be ready for a Public Hearing next month?

Mr. Zigler: I wanted a Public Hearing here before we go to the ZBA and have a Public Hearing and the ZBA going to set a Public Hearing for the first Thursday in April.

Mr. Stach: There is no SEQRA required so you could.

Chairman: I just need a motion to set a Public Hearing for next month.

**MOTION: SET PUBLIC HEARING FOR MARCH 28, 2013**

Made by Gene Kraese and seconded by Gerry Rogers

Chairman: Next on the agenda Cost Estimate for Hudson Bay Complex Building E, Kevin you got that and everything

Cost Estimate – Hudson Bay Complex Building E SBL 20.04-11-2.3

Mr. Maher: The only change I see in that is the plan says 12 inch storm sewer pipes going to the site the estimate says 8 to 10 if he is going to go with 12 (inaudible) that's all.

MOTION: APPROVE COST ESTIMATE FOR HUDSON BAY

Made by Tom Gubitosa and seconded by Gerry Rogers

Hudson Bay Complex Building E  
Town Engineer's Estimate of Infrastructure Costs  
February 15, 2013

DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY	UNITS	UNIT COST	TOTAL COST
<b><u>Site Preparation &amp; Erosion Control</u></b>				
Silt Fencing	1000	LF	\$ 3.00	\$ 3,000.00
Construction Entrance Road	1	EA	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00
Inlet Protection	24	EA	\$ 150.00	\$ 3,600.00
<b><u>Roadways &amp; Parking Areas</u></b>				
Commercial Road	400	LF	\$ 230.00	\$ 92,000.00
Parking Lot Paving & Striping	2020	SY	\$ 40.00	\$ 80,800.00
Curbing	1300	LF	\$ 12.00	\$ 15,600.00
Shade Trees	9	EA	\$ 275.00	\$ 2,475.00
Shrubs	70	EA	\$ 115.00	\$ 8,050.00
<b><u>Storm Drainage</u></b>				
Standard Catch Basin	10	EA	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 30,000.00
15" HDPE Pipe	598	LF	\$ 50.00	\$ 29,900.00
<b><u>Sanitary Sewers</u></b>				
4" PVC SDR-35	98	LF	\$ 30.00	\$ 2,940.00
6" PVC SDR-35	553	LF	\$ 40.00	\$ 22,120.00
6" Clean-out & Cover	1	EA	\$ 250.00	\$ 250.00
Sanitary Manhole	1	EA	\$ 2,800.00	\$ 2,800.00
<b><u>Landscaping</u></b>				
Topsoiling & Seeding	2200	SY	\$ 3.00	\$ 6,600.00
<b><u>Miscellaneous</u></b>				
Fencing	950	LF	\$ 8.00	\$ 7,600.00
<b>Total Improvements Cost</b>				<b>\$ 310,735.00</b>

Chairman: Next on the agenda is CSX Haverstraw track upgrade project, Max could you give us a narrative.

CSX Haverstraw Track Upgrade Project LWRP Consistency Review

Mr. Stach: This was an application that the Town received on referral from the Department of State and CSX as the railroad owner is proposing track improvements north of the Battlefield there essentially proposing to put in a second line, historically there were two rail lines going up the west shore they want to reinstall the line it is several thousand feet to allow for trains to pass.

Mr. Puccio: There was an existing one there that they took out.

Mr. Stach: If you look at the aerials it is clear there were two - it kind of appears and disappears but it is not active so they want to put a switch in and put another track and they also want to fix up two culverts. Now this review is a review from an engineering stand point from the Town but what we did is we reviewed it in relation to the Town's local waterfront revitalization plan which is a study that the Town had prepared back in 1994 as part of the State's coastal zone resources program it is actually operated through the Department of State and what that program does is it set forth several policies that all development within what is called the coastal zone has to adhere to. Stony Point takes a look at these State coastal zone and makes refinements to those policies and says we agree to these policies or we are going to adopt these policies for our coastal zone which is what the LWRP does so when a state or local agency proposes things within those coastal zones they have to get a consistency review and that is something the Department of State does for State and Federal actions but they write down to Stony Point and say we want you to give us comments on this because you have a locally adopted LWRP. When the LWRP was adopted there was a Board appointed at the time called the Waterfront Advisory Board that Board has not met now probably since 14 years or so years ago, shortly after it was created. I talked to Bill and based on Bill's knowledge is when that consistency review has been required subsequent to that Board it has been the Planning Board that has done these consistency reviews and that was something that the Town Board authorized several years ago. This is not something that needs to be formally reviewed under the LWRP this is what the DOS has referred to the Town for comments I was going to originally write my comments to the Town Board but since they are only going to have one meeting in March I asked them if I could ask you as the serving Waterfront Advisory Board to hear my comments and pass them on to DEC and I have heard back that it is ok that they would like you to do that since they won't have time before the deadline to take this up.

Now DOS sets a thirty day deadline this was referred to the Town on the 15<sup>th</sup> of February so they want it back by March 16<sup>th</sup> or 17<sup>th</sup> and the next Town Board Meeting is on the 19<sup>th</sup>. Basically they have set forth how they make the policies and just have two discrepancies or two disagreements with how they say they are meeting the policies. The more salient point that is in my memo is the fact that the very first policy in this LWRP and in this coastal zone document is that when Federal or state agencies spend money or undertake improvements within this coastal zone they are supposed to consider the economic development needs of the Town. They are supposed to consider investing this in a way that will help to revitalize the area. I am making the case here in my review that not only are State and Federal permits needed but it is quite likely since CSX is doing these upgrades that they are using Federal money to do it. So what I am suggesting that comment be to DOS is that there are at least two improvements that the Town has been looking at having CSX make for some time now. The bridge at Tomkins Avenue and the at grade crossing at Holt Drive have come up before this Board at numerous times in association with various development projects within the coastal zone as being impediments to economic developments so what I am suggesting the first recommendation be is that the State if there are in fact public monies going to fund these infrastructure improvements consider prioritizing those improvements as helping aid economic development. I also talked to the gentleman doing the coastal zone review in DOS and I ran this past them and he said that was something appropriate that he would try and negotiate on behalf of the Town but you get no guarantees that he will be able to accomplish that. The second is smaller and minor matter is that there is a recommendation or policy that when government spends money within the coastal zone they should be looking to make it as survivor able as possible. After Sandy FEMA has released some advisory flood elevations which maybe the prelude to actually increasing the 100 year storm elevations along the Hudson it is not sure it is something that they are not really saying how they are going to use these but they are advisory. So my second recommendation is that CSX at least be made aware of the advisory elevations when they design these track improvements. So those are the two areas which I felt what they are proposing may be inconsistent with the LWRP if this time if the Planning Board agrees with me you can adopt my comments put them in Town Letter head and send them to the Town to be forwarded to DOS but I suggest that if you do that you still send it the Supervisor's office.

Chairman: With your two comments I think that like you said the two things that been in front of the Board for years Tomkins Avenue and Holt drive those crossings so I think your working is good and you are on top of this. Does the Board have any questions?

Mr. Kraese: I do if you are going to go that far with Tomkins Avenue and that private crossing by Holt Drive then I think you should look into the underpass that is between the private owner's property where he is looking to build condos and the street on Hunter Place. You are talking

about raising the 100 year flood plan then maybe they should be made aware of or possibly closing up that tunnel which is not suitable for any kind of passenger vehicles to go through. Now going back maybe 10 – 15 years ago there was another underpass like that not far from that location and for the want of CSX they completely closed that up.

Mr. Stach: I can certainly add that I was not aware of that particular issue.

Mr. Kraese: It has always been there but the developer the owner of the private property has made the attempt to clear away debris and fence it and made it an access for whatever reason for the public or whoever to have access to Hunter Place from private property. The applicant that came originally to do condos which has been in the background for a while I am assuming that he is going to come back so it will have to be addressed then too.

Mr. Stach: So I can certainly add that your request would be to under fill that under pass, remove that egress through the area.

Mr. Potanovic: Is that LWRP available for the Board to see I know it has been a long time since and probably since all those documents were online, is there a copy which the Board can have access to.

Chairman: Which one is that?

Mr. Potanovic: The Local Waterfront Revitalization Plan I was on that committee it was about 14 years ago because more things will come up. Can you get DOS to give you an extension on the period base on the timing of the Board meetings just to have a chance to look at it more closely?

Chairman: I will find out.

Mr. Stach: The DOS did say that they would extend it but they are not going to extend it significantly.

Mr. Potanovic: What about 30 days?

Mr. Stach: I did not get the impression that they wanted to extend it another 30 days.

Mr. Potanovic: They do it they don't want to but they do it and it gives the Board a chance to really look at it. It is good that you did your work.

Mr. Stach: I went through the entire list I really did and they actually went through a number in their report that actually list them. The only that I came up with that applied these were the two that were listed in the local water front that they didn't even address because they said were not relevant but I thought they were relevant.

Mr. Potanovic: Obviously we (inaudible) advantage of an opportunity (inaudible)

Mr. Stach: Because they are looking to do only the minimum that they need to accomplished their business needs but it is public money it ought to be spent the way it servers the community's needs .

Mr. McMEnamin: Did they submit plans?

Mr. Stach: They submitted this document here.

Mr. McMEnamin: Does it have drawings in there?

Mr. Stach: Yes not very good drawings.

Mr. Maher: I have got a newer version more plans.

Mr. Stach: It is very (inaudible) in what I review it was actually hard to figure out what they were doing cause they actually don't put it on a aerial it kind of took me going back and forth .

Mr. McMenamin: I don't really understand what is going on here. The CSX people have to improve their tracks north of the Battlefield that is what this is all about.

Mr. Stach: Yes.

Mr. McMenamin: You are trying forcing them to look at things way south of the Battlefield.

Mr. Stach: Correct.

Mr. McMenamin: You think they should fix other things that they have no intention of working on.

Mr. Stach: I am suggesting that they look beyond their plans, yes.

Mr. McMenamin: So the area where they plan to do their regardless of what we think they should do down south what is the impact of that?

Mr. Stach: Kevin has reviewed as the engineer.

Mr. McMenamin: It goes by Tilcon and it goes by the Lovett Plant.

Mr. Stach: I don't know if goes as far as the Lovett Plant.

Mr. Maher: I think it stretches up.

Mr. McMenamin: You guys don't have any plans do you?

Mr. Stach: I don't have any detail plans no.

Mr. McMenamin: There is pollution all over the place up there it is the water front district I had that document at home I am going to take it out and read it again but I think what they are really asking you to do is they are not going to listen to you if we tell them to go down by Holt Dive. They want you comments where the work is that they are planning on doing and I would like to know what is the implication of what they are doing on our waterfront district.

Mr. Stach: you talking about the LWRP.

Mr. McMenamin: You said in lieu of having a Board that does that the Planning Board would do that. So I don't see is it in their right of way are they clearing waterfront property are they going to affect pollution on the side.

Mr. Stach: They are laying track within there right of way.

Mr. McMenamin: I think you should focus on the location of their plans of where they are going to do their work. Then see in that area in the Battlefield and north from where ever that is then see what the impact of that on Stony Point.

Mr. Stach: Which I did and frankly it is going through Tilcon area.

Mr. McMenamin: You got the battlefield right there you got.

Mr. Stach: No it is pretty far north of there if you were ever in the Battlefield Park when you go up and look north you see all and I would be interested in finding out the affect this work is going to have on the view from the battlefield even though it is a State Park. That to me would be something of interest here.

Mr. Stach: Understood and I think as I said....

Mr. McMenamin: They are going to come here and work and it is going to be seen from Stony Point.

Mr. Puccio: Again we don't have a map but you did say there is an existing track that they are going to replace.

Mr. Stach: There are two lines there now.

Mr. McMenamin: So how much property I don't know because I haven't seen any...

Mr. Stach: You would have to ask Kevin he spent a little more time with the construction and engineering details.

Mr. Puccio: What Tom is trying to say you are asking us to put blindfolds on and say yes go ahead and do it or ask them to do other things. So what he is trying to say is present us with what you want to do and we can professionally answer those questions.

Mr. Stach: I still don't understand.

Mr. Puccio: We don't know what is going on or what they are doing.

Mr. Stach: You want to see the plans in front of you.

Mr. McMenamin: Then I want to take a look at what you think the affect of the work they are doing. I would assume they are going to put a siding in which will be long and wide for them to pass trains near the river.

Mr. Stach: You did have two lines.

Mr. McMenamin: It looks to me that they would have to widen it.

Mr. Puccio: Could we write back to them saying we would like to see what they are doing.

Mr. Stach: You can tell them you would like more time to review it again when I asked previously my impression was he said if you need a couple of more days.

Chairman: This went to the Town Board right we have had it for a while.

Mr. Stach: Not that long I got it at the February 19<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Mr. Puccio: So what exactly are you asking us to do?

Chairman: We have to give him the approval to send these comments to the Town Board he will give them to the Town Board and Jeff then they to forward them off.

Mr. Puccio: So what are they asking us to do because we don't know what is going on.

Chairman: Because the Town Board does not meet until the March 19<sup>th</sup> meeting so by time they look at this it will be too late.

Mr. Kraese: Can I just say something here first of all in my opinion right now CSX has not been the best neighbor of Stony Point. The Town is battling this power line and in no time in the last couple of months with all the Public Hearings and with all the people coming down about this express line they want to put on their right of way have they made a comment to us. First of all they should have been partners with us in the Town knowing how we felt. That power line is going under their property they are doing what they want to do and now it seems to me that they are just saying we are going to give you thirty days and do what you have to do. Tom has a good point we are trying to make these people who are negative to our Town we are trying somehow to force these people to wake up and consider us. Right now they are not appeasing this Town at all I see no reason to really deal with them. They are going to do what they are going to do I feel we are being forced to come back with a comment that they are not going to listen anyway.

Mr. Stach: You may be right they may not care they may not - what is here today is an opportunity however because the Town does not have any review authority for CSX if there was no LWRP consistency review I am not sure that we would have any approval authority.

Mr. Kraese: It is not that I am against let me rephrase that – I like the comments you made with the addition of the comments I made. We would like them to be better neighbors to the residents of the Town of Stony Point it is not going to happen let's be realistic. I am just not happy because we just can't get it to the Town by the 19<sup>th</sup> they are going to give it to us more time we are not comfortable with it obviously, by some of the comments here tonight I know I am not comfortable and I know some of the others may not be. We are under the pressure to do something and if we don't do it they are going to do what they want anyway. I would like to put it in writing that you are going to get it but we are not thrilled over this that is my opinion.

Mr. Stach: Well why don't I ask how much time they will give us can't imagine that you are going to get to much more than this from the DOS. This is the joint application to the Army Corps of Engineers and DEC I don't think you are going to get much more than this and what Kevin has already gotten on drainage. However if you were give copies of this as well copies of LWRP to review it yourself how much time would you think you would need to do the consistency review?

Mr. Kraese: At least a month.

Mr. Stach: At least a month I can ask him how much time we can get.

Mr. Kraese: Give us this information and the LWRP and digest this in three days is unreasonable. I am not disagreeing with the whole concept here I would like to see these people do something about the three issues that are on the board because I know when the applicant did something on Holt Drive with that crossing they would not cooperate at all. That is the problem they want us to jump now but when we ask for something they fluff us off.

Mr. Stach: I think they always expected a private land owner would pay for any improvements to the track.

Chairman: Max why don't you go back and see if they would give us a thirty day extension of time. If not we will have to send this to the Town Board like last time they asked for an extension and they said no and the judge did that hearing in the middle of the holidays.

Mr. Kraese: Give us enough extension to go back to the Town Board and let them know.

Mr. Stach: This is an application really to DEC and Army Corps that is getting referred here.

Chairman: Reach out and if we don't get the approval to send this if we do not get the 30 day extension at least send them something.

Mr. Kraese: I think the biggest problem here right now is let's send them something but let's get them to do something for us.

Chairman: Let's try for the extension if they say no at least we could approve this that something gets to them with a comment on there that we need more time but this is what we have work out the verbiage or something.

Mr. Kraese: Somewhere along with that comment maybe you should address the fact that we were not give enough time to digest the information given to us and we are resultantly given you our comments.

Mr. McMenamain: I would not do that they could possibly go in there and destroy our waterfront and we are given nothing to work with.

Chairman: They are going in there any way and doing it.

Mr. McMenamain: Who is with me? I want to be a fighter we will start with an Article 78 against the State they are going to destroy our waterfront and we have no idea what they are doing.

Mr. Stach: I would suggest you would probably need to go to the Town and see if they will fund this Article 78. I don't think the Town....

Mr. McMenemy: There used to be a sandy beach right there in front of the Tilcon property in the 40s were you could swim.

Mr. Honen: Do you know LWRP what are the contents of it because basically that is the review - that document is giving us the ability to review this work.

Mr. Stach: The LWRP is the Town's the Department of State has a coastal zone plan then the Town takes that coastal zone plan and out of the 40 - 50 some policies in that coastal zone plan it says we agree with the following policies it sets forth what developments are proposed on the waterfront what uses are proposed what the Town will locally implement those items and how we would do consistency reviews for project within that area going forward set sets forth all these recommendations. Now essentially when any state action happens they have to address not only the coastal zone plan of the State of New York but Stony Points refinements of that coast zone plan which is that LWRP.

Mr. Honen: I guess that what I was wondering what is an actually Stony Point's. What provisions did Stony Point say is important to them? Don't we have to compare what is in our plan with their proposal and their proposal was for a small portion of track going through the Town.

Mr. Stach: They are proposing only a small portion of upgrades because that is all they want and that is all they need they just want to pass the trains.

Mr. Honen: And our comments are outside of that and you are saying if you are going to spend money in Stony Point a priority should be these other improvements. Which is outside of what they are asking to do?

Mr. Stach: Which is outside of what they are asking.

Mr. Honen: It doesn't hurt to ask but I also think there is certain skepticism among the Board members that they will spend money outside the area of what they are working on if they haven't been good neighbors up to this point.

Mr. Stach: No it depends on how much of a hammer the State has to make them spend money elsewhere on the request of the Town.

Mr. Honen: And if we don't ask for that we certainly will not get it.

Mr. Stach: You are probably not going to get it even if you do ask for it.

Mr. Honen: Probably not.

Mr. Maher: (inaudible) I don't know if it is on the County web site or CSX's web site they have the quite zone and Holt Drive is listed there for about a quarter of a million dollars committed for the Holt Drive crossing and it is committed for late 2014 so they can use that for an excuse to you off.

Mr. Stach: The County is paying for that right?

Mr. Maher: I don't know it might be CSX all I know is that it is part of the quite zone project. Haverstraw is phase one and we are phase two.

Mr. McMenemy: Is this drawing on their web site.

Mr. Maher: This stuff is not on there the only thing they show is the Holt Drive crossings the one up by Iona island the one by the Battlefield the security gate they want to put there so they have access onto the rails. Then the Tilcon one there is a gate there and Iona Island there is a gate there.



Mr. McMenemy: Why are they not required to come for a Site Plan to us.

Mr. Maher: Good question.

Mr. Stach: I am pretty sure DEC regulates this Site Plan like with mines.

Mr. Maher: It is kind of like your utilities. They don't have to come for Site Plan approval but they have to come to me for storm water management issues.

Mr. Stach: As the DEC has relegated that review authority to the localities.

Mr. Maher: I have serious questions on what they propose to do they are claiming to go under the general construction permit I think they have to go under the multi sector permit I consider this is an industrial not residential for general construction.

Mr. McMenemy: Just like to know the impact on our waterfront is that all what it is. A visual would be nice.

Mr. Maher: There should have been some type of visual.

Mr. McMenemy: That is what our job is by the way.

Mr. Maher: Basically what they are doing is they are going to put track back where they took it out years ago.

Mr. McMenemy: You say that fine if that what you say. We want to know how it will impact us and we should find out but we have to see that to determine it.

Mr. Maher: There are sections in here and that what it shows.

Mr. McMenemy: Is there any clearing?

Mr. Maher: They are going to take out some old culvert pipes that is the reason for the storm water management take them out and re-construct them. There is minor clearing.

Mr. McMenemy: Is there clearing on the waterfront side.

Mr. Maher: Not the waterfront side the land side.

Mr. McMenemy: Can you comfortably say there is not going to be any impact on the view for the Hudson River by the drawings that you have seen.

Mr. Maher: I just got them I can't honestly say right now.

Mr. McMenemy: Do you have any visual that is what we look at in SEQRA the visual impact from major things like the river.

Mr. Stach: This SEQRA is being done by DEC this review that you will be doing is under the LWRP the policies are rather pointed as to what is supposed to be achieved. Now I am not saying you couldn't sort of figure out a way to say it the visual impact happens that it could affect the marketability or the economic development of your water front.

Mr. Kraese: I have a comment on this, Kevin do you know how far these 3100 linear feet what the northern most point that would be? There is existing two tracks there they were there for years they took them out.

Mr. Maher: I did find a location here looks like they are bring the line here and pass Tilcon that is what I get from..

Mr. Kraese: My question is this is this 3100 linear feet going to go all the way into Bear Mountain?

Mr. Maher: No absolutely not it is not going to make it that far up they are going basically from the top side of Battlefield Park to...

Mr. Kraese: Jones Point is that two tracks or one?

Mr. Maher: One.

Mr. Kraese: So all those people there in the future will probably see a second track the train is going to sit there and the diesels are going to be running in front of their house there will be an impact on every resident, sound, air pollution.

Mr. Maher: If they run a second rail that far up it is going all the way to Bear Mountain. That will be one track going north and the other track going south. (Inaudible)

Mr. Kraese: What is going to happen is these people that have this waterfront property on Jones Point they will be looking at trains.

Mr. Maher: Yes in the future there is a very likely chance in my opinion.

Chairman: By next month's meeting it might be too late to comment. So you call tomorrow.

Mr. Stack: I think I need to call DOS and see how much time.

Chairman: See how much time if not then can we give Max approval to send this to the Town Board because by next meeting it is going to be too late.

Mr. Stack: It depends on what they say.

Chairman: That is what I a saying depending on what they are say, if they tell you no you have until March 5 or 6 you have to send them something I will talk to Geoff tomorrow.

Mr. Stach: I would indicate you're dissatisfaction with the length of time allotted.

Chairman: And the issues like Tom said the visual impact on the water front.

Mr. Kraese: If they are going to give us 3 or 4 days it goes back in the hands of the Town Board.

Mr. McMenamain: These drawings shows a construction pad on the river side that all clearing on the riverside and I guarantee you can see that from the Stony Point Light house.

Chairman: The Town Board doesn't meet till the 19<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Kraese: He needs an answer by the 16<sup>th</sup> or 17<sup>th</sup> for the thirty days so if he gets few.

Mr. Stach: I can definitely get an extension through the 19<sup>th</sup> the next Town Board meeting. Be advised that they are going to be just as informed as you guys are.

Mr. Kraese: I am not against your comments Max I agree 100% at the least which we should do.

Chairman: So we will have Max as for the extension.

Mr. Rogers: Any chance we could take a look at this part that they are looking to develop.

Mr. Stach: To look at what.

Mr. Rogers: Where they want to develop this 31,000 feet could we get a chance to look at that.

Mr. Stach: Like a field trip.

Mr. Rogers: If we want to go out and take a field trip.

Mr. Stach: I don't think you have access rights to all the properties.

Mr. Maher: I am looking at the plan right here and if you go to the (inaudible) line right here on the river that is where the project starts. This is the indication this is siltation screening out into the river.

Mr. McMenamin: Where is the construction pad?

Mr. Maher: It is here.

Mr. McMenamin: They are coming here from Tilcon

Mr. Maher: Right here and you go another couple of pages up now you are going towards.

Mr. McMenamin: They are going three quarters of a mile.

Mr. Honan: Do they say what they are going to use it for just a bypass or storage.

Mr. Maher: Bypass and storage trains what they are basically saying is the amount of train traffic they have got now in order to accommodate more.

Mrs. Callaghan: Will it eventually become a commuter line?

Mr. Maher: I don't think so.

Mr. McMenamin: Are the tracks in this piece here?

Mr. Maher: They are in here this is their right of way.

Mr. McMenamin: Is there vegetation on this side of the tracks?

Mr. Maher: Probably very little because you are almost right on top of the river. (Inaudible)

Chairman: What we will do is see if you get the extension if we get the extension.

Mr. Stach: I will talk to them and see how much time we can get.

Mr. Kraese: Try for it.

Chairman: Call me tomorrow and we will go from there.

Mr. McMenamin: I think we should make a resolution that we should reject this request until we get enough information to do it properly I make that motion.

Mr. Stach: If you do that you may get a non response.

Mr. McMenamin: The bottom line is it is a interstate thing that we have jurisdiction on they are going to do whatever they want on it.

Mr. Stach: I don't think it is an interstate thing I think it is something that the State maintains similar to the mining and power plant reviews the State DEC handles those development reviews.

Mr. McMenamin: So DEC is doing the SEQRA.

Mr. Stach: It is actually a Federal it is a joint application. Because we are not an approving agency the only way we are involved is DOS has asked us for our opinion.

Mr. McMenamin: We could be an interested party and have comments to their SEQRE.

Mr. Stach: That would certainly give you more information.

Mr. McMenamin: So where are they in SEQRA process?

Mr. Stach: That I don't know.

Mr. McMnamin: So you can ask that guy tomorrow when you speak to him.

Mr. Stach: They will be doing the SEQRA it is something that if you do SEQRA it satisfies the requirements but the Federal requirements supersede the State requirements.

Mr. Honan: They didn't notify us as an involving agency.

Mr. Stach: We did not get notified by DEC except for the MS4 we got notified by DOS because DOS when they have an LWRP ask for your comments. They are really the one that is supposed to be doing consistency we are being asked only because we are an LWRP but they are responsible for issuing the notice of consistency with the coastal zone.

Chairman: Then let's try for the extension.

Mr. Stach: I will try and ask for 3 to 4 months or as long as we can get and ask about the interested agency status figure is doing the environmental review.

Chairman: Accept Minutes of January 24, 2013.

**MOTION: ACCEPT MINUTES OF JANUARY 24, 2013**

Made by Gene Kraese and seconded by Gerry Rogers

All in favor

Chairman: We got a letter from the supervisor this is from United Water of New York, Inc – Haverstraw Water Supply Project Intake Pump Station Site we need to send this to Kevin for his review. We need a motion to send to Kevin the information about the pump station for his review.

United Water of New York, Inc – Haverstraw Water Supply Project Intake Pump Station Site

**MOTION: REFER THE UNITED WATER OF NEW YORK, INC. HAVERSTRAW WATER SUPPLY PROJECT INTAKE PUMP STATION SITE TO KEVIN MAHER, TOWN ENGINEER FOR REVIEW.**

Made by Tom Gubitosa and seconded by Michael Puccio.

**MOTION: CLOSE PLANNING BOARD MEETING**

Made by Tom Gubitosa and seconded by Gerry Rogers

Respectfully submitted,  
Mary Pagano, Clerk to the Board

