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Proceedings

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Next item on the agenda is Eagle Bay, and this is the site plan review. Just continuation from what we talked about last week. And this one, Dave, what were we going over this one? The traffic and the sewer?

MR. ZIGLER: Well, I have, I have Shea on just in case you wanted any questions on, had any questions on that fishing pier. I know how that kind of caught you in a rush. So if you have any questions for Shea, he's on. And then if you don't, we could, we could let him go.

And then we also have Mark and Auris on. They changed the west side of the building, if you want to take a look at that. So that's kind of two items that you looked at last month, and I wasn't too sure if you wanted to get an update on them.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Yeah, let's -- if the Board doesn't mind, let's get an update on the two items that you talked about. That would be great. And then we can go from
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there.
MR. ZIGLER: All right. So first would be Shea.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. And this is, this is with the pier, right?

MR. ZIGLER: I think, yeah. Because it looked like you guys might have had a little more questions on the fishing pier, and where the permits, where the permits are right now for the riprap.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right, good.
All right, where is he?
MR. THORVALDSEN: Hi, everybody. I'm Shea Thorvaldsen, here from TMS to give you guys an update on the pier and the riprap.

In the past couple weeks, we've been corresponding with the Army Corps and the DEC with regards to several open items, one of which was the SHPO review. The second of which is the NMFS, which is National Marines Fisheries' review. And the third of which is NOAA, which is also a fisheries review, for US fish and wildlife.

With regards to three specific subjects.
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Subject number one is a moratorium on construction in the river for the pier and for the riprap. A moratorium on construction due to the bald eagles' nests. And a moratorium in the river due to sturgeon and/or winter flounder.

So where we're at right now is two things the Army Corps has pressed on, as well as DEC, that we've been, we've needed to wrap into our planning, strategic planning. One is that construction looks like it will only be allowed in the water, meaning pile driving in the water, in September and October of next year. And that's at no other in water work. So it necessitates that we do the pile driving for the pier and the work behind the bulkhead in that period.

The second thing that they've insisted on, and what we've been unable to move the dial on is we started off with an eight-foot wide public pier. We've been continuing to respond to their comments and questions about the reason for an eight-foot wide pier. And they are continuing to push us to make it
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four-foot wide simply because there's SAV, submerged aquatic vegetation right underneath where that is.

Subsequent to that, we've taken six or eight historic photos, historic SAV, and historic marina photos as to where the pier is located compared to the existing floating docks. We've resubmitted that, requested again an eight-foot wide pier. And they have taken that comment and submitted it back to the consulting agencies, meaning NOAA and NMFS for protection of fisheries and SAV.

The DEC in the same vein pushed back on us working in the water. So that season is going to be limited from September to October. As well as the limitation on the width of the pier being eight-foot wide. We have just gotten a pier with, approved in Upper Nyack at 6.5-foot wide. And we are now in the process of discussing with the DEC whether a 6.5 or an eight-foot wide pier is more appropriate for a public pier here. So both of those items are still in consultation with the agencies.
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And that's it. We've got everything else cleared. We had the clearance for, obviously, the endangered species, for bald eagles. We've set the season for that work. And again, we're waiting -- the SHPO information has been submitted to, through the CRIS system, which is the state system.

And we are waiting for the Army Corps of Engineers to finish their Section 106 process, which is the historical review process. And their jurisdiction for that will be for the bulkhead out. And we're waiting for the DEC to continue with their review on the upland portion of the review process, and take comments from the consulting parties.

And that brings everybody up to date. We do have samples of the light fixtures, the decking, and the railings sitting in our office that we can deliver for review to Stony Point, I assume to the Building Department, if that is so desired.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Right. And I think that -- and I, and I did talk to Dan, the Proceedings

Chairman of the ARB. And he said next month that they're going to get together to start finishing up on just some of the items that are still on hold.

MR. THORVALDSEN: Okay.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Which is good.
John, John O'Rourke, I know you got to go at 7:30. Do you have any questions with the pier before you have to run out?

MR. O'ROURKE: No. We just got to get that resolved before it's final for the site plan, so we have everything on the one plan. But other than that, we're all good with the pier.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. All
right, I'll go to go Board. The Board have any questions for Shea with the, with the pier right now?

BOARD MEMBER ROGERS: Well, not so much for Shea, but maybe for John. At the last workshop, we were talking about whether the decking was concrete or wood.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Right.
BOARD MEMBER ROGERS: And there seemed
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to be some question about which was correct and which wasn't. Is there any update on that?

MR. O'ROURKE: Unfortunately, at this time, no. There was some concrete. And I see, I thought I saw Bill on the line.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: I did see him.
MR. O'ROURKE: Yeah. So there was discussion with what the decking was going to be. Initially, Bill had wanted the concrete, I guess laminated. And right now, I think they're just proposing wood, if I'm correct. So that still needs to be resolved as part of the final.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right.
BOARD MEMBER ROGERS: Okay. Thanks, John.

BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: I have a question, Tom.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Go ahead, Eric.
BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: Who's going to be responsible for the maintenance of the pier?

MR. THORVALDSEN: Maintenance will be vested in Eagle Bay, and the crews that run
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that is not subject to the park.
BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. Do we --
Dave or Steve, I don't know, do we make that a map note? Or is that something in the, something else for the, for the maintenance of the pier?

MR. ZIGLER: That's, that's going to be in the agreement that's being drafted by Amy and Steve right now.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Okay.
MR. ZIGLER: It will probably be a reference on the map to a, some kind of covenant filed, or resolution.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Okay. I got you. So Shea, so basically, it's the Army Corps and the DEC that are, like, I guess giving you the requirements or things that have to be done with the, with the pier.

MR. THORVALDSEN: Correct. We're on the last little pieces. It's really --

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right.
MR. THORVALDSEN: It's really now the width and the SHPO stuff that's holding us
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for the last piece here.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Okay. Thank you. Go ahead, Gene. Go ahead, Gene.

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: I really would
like to see some kind of writing or decision from the Army Corps of Engineers stating why they want it less than eight feet wide. It doesn't make sense if all the marinas up and down the Hudson Valley have floating docks that -- some of them are ten and twelve feet wide. Why at this point are they restricting that to such a small -- I mean, four feet, six and a half feet. I mean, four feet wide, you might as not even build it. It's, it doesn't even make sense. Unless it goes to a floating, unless we go to a floating pier, which at this point they allow up to ten and twelve feet wide. That's just one, one observation I made.

And I agree with Jerry. We have to find out what that deck's going to actually be constructed of.

And I think somewhere along the line, not only with this pier, but with the
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underpass and a couple of other issues that are going to come up with the site plan, that we have to have a formal way to make sure that we know who's going to be responsible for the maintenance and upkeep, a.k.a. snow plowing, replacement of landscaping, maintenance of the fishing pier, maintenance of the walkway, whether it be this owner or applicant or future owners. So I think somewhere along the line we're going to have to have some, one piece of paper we can look at that will kind of guide us that, who's in charge of what.

MS. MELE: If I may, Steve and I --
BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: A letter of rejection from the Army Corps of Engineers, what was that about? I made notes, but I don't remember it.

MR. THORVALDSEN: So the Army Corps of Engineers and the DEC have both issued multiple, what they call notices of incomplete, or notices of objection --

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Right.
MR. THORVALDSEN: -- with regards to
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certain portions of the pier. We can put that in a binder and get that over through Amy to the Board with all the information so you could see the, the actual federal and state judgment on the, on the original designs.

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: I think the Board would be inclined to kind of review that. If not us, then Max or John.

MR. HONAN: Just while we're on that subject, Shea, do you know if one of those notices of objection had to do with the shade covering that was initially proposed for the pier?

MR. THORVALDSEN: You mean the gondola or the canopy?

MR. HONAN: Yeah. It was some kind of covering so people using the shade --

MR. THORVALDSEN: Yeah. Army Corps of Engineers didn't specifically object to that. The DEC did. But it was not necessary as a water dependent use, in that the size of the, the area didn't justify its location in an environmentally sensitive spot.
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MR. LOCKMAN: Shea, am I correct in that the State's reasoning for having differing standards for pier width versus float width is that the piers are there permanently, 365 days a year, and the floats will presumably be taken out half the year?

MR. THORVALDSEN: So there's a lot of, there's a lot of arguments about this now currently, and it has been for several years. Inherently, floatings docks now are limited to four-foot wide. And you have to get special dispensation to make a floating dock wider than four-foot wide. 90 percent of the time, that's based on the stability calculation, you know, floating calculation, and that matter.

From a commercial dock standpoint, they will not let you go wider than eight-foot almost anywhere anymore north of the George Washington Bridge. And that's been in restricted declaration for two or three years now.

The difference between the fixed pier and a floating dock is the floating docks,
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you're actually, they find more detrimental to submerged vegetation and habitat, if the docks start to bottom out on the bottom and wash along that. So it kills portions of that. And it also disrupts fish habitat in, you know, areas where there's foraging.

Piers are better in the fact that they reduce shading. They're higher, they allow more light underneath. However, they've been limiting that to, you know, six and eight-foot wide simply because of the -- in the areas where there is submerged aquatic vegetation, the wider the pier, the less the vegetation will grow.

The studies from the Army Corps and from the DEC are fairly clear on that, and they've been pushing this agenda for a couple years now to make sure that they maintain widths. They've gone so far as to actually take satellite photos and use that data on the existing docks around, up and down the Hudson to rebuke any other owners that want to go wider. And they've been approving smaller and smaller docks years after year here. So
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inherently, it's because in this location, submerged aquatic vegetation, sturgeon habitat, flounder habitat, and it's actually a fairly robust ecosystem, so they're protecting this more than anything else. MR. LOCKMAN: Thank you. CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right, thanks. All right. Anyone else have any other questions on the pier?

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: Tom, I hate to say this, but I'm not happy with his answer. I hope we see something in writing. I, you know.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: From the D --
BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: I mean, from being
in the business years ago, and the world has changed, I understand that. But I mean, they seem to be dictating so -- the Army Corps is dictating so much that, you know, it almost, it gets to the point you don't even want to build.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. So, like --

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: Unless it's a
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four-foot wide -- a four-foot wide fishing dock is, come on, that's ridiculous. You know. Not to put a canopy over the end. I just don't understand where they're coming from. I just, I personally just find it hard to believe. I'm not saying it's not true. But I would like to see some documentations to the Board.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Yeah.
MR. THORVALDSEN: I just emailed it to
Amy, and Amy should be able to forward it to
you. It's pretty clear from them.
BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right, thanks.
Thanks, Amy. Thanks, Shea. Thanks, Gene. Yeah, you're right. As long as, if we see something from the Army Corps and the DEC, you know, they're the ones that are, you know, looking at all of this in the water. So we need, we need something from them, something in writing that's $I$ guess guiding them or telling us what they're doing. I agree.

MR. HAGER: Is there any accessibility

Proceedings
issues with the width of that? Can you hear me?

MR. THORVALDSEN: There is a significant accessibility issue, which is why we've pushed back so hard. And we've put enough data in to prove that even eight-foot, when you talk about benches or people standing around, that that gets a little tight, which is why we continue to maintain the eight-foot discussion with them. At six-foot-five wide, it's technically the absolute minimum we can do if you want to pass two wheelchairs --

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Right.
MR. THORVALDSEN: -- didn't have an attendant. So that's, and that's the route of our argument with the Army Corps, that if you're going to insist on something smaller than that, then you're talking about ADA accessibility guidelines that are going to be violated. And at that point, everybody's right. It's worth, it's not even worth building it at that point.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. Yeah. John, John Hager, that was you commenting
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before, right?
MR. HAGER: Yes.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right, good. Thanks, John.

MR. HAGER: You're welcome.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. I guess, Gene, once we get that documentation, we can at least, we can review it and see if there's something, if we have to reach out or -thanks. Dave, what was the other thing you said you have?

MR. ZIGLER: Mark, Mark and Auris have the west side of the buildings. They revised it and would like to show it to you.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: No, that would be good, because $I$ know that was a big point that we talked about on, at the workshop. So if they could show that, that would be great.

MR. ZIGLER: You're up, Mark.
MR. O'ROURKE: And Tom, this is probably a good time for me to bow out. So John Queenan will be here to answer any questions. But I think for the rest of the presentation, it's mostly for the Board. So I think we're
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going to leave it.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Right. All right, good. Thanks, John.

MR. O'ROURKE: Good luck tonight. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Go ahead, Mark.
MR. SCHULMAN: Hi, folks. Auris is going to share his screen. And we can show you based on the meeting we had last week, or workshop, there was some concern about the west elevation of the buildings. So we have developed an alternate design. Can we get permission to --

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Steve, who do you have to give permission to? Auri, is that who?

MR. SCHULMAN: Auris, yeah.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Auris. I'm sorry, I just saw -- okay, Auris.

MR. SCHULMAN: Yeah. A-U-R-I-S.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: I see that. My -his $S$ got cut off when $I$ was on the other screen.

MR. SCHULMAN: Okay.
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CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: I think Steve's going to give you access.

MR. SCHULMAN: All right. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. Steve, you see Auris, right? I see him over there. Oh, there it is. Thank you. Got you.

MR. SCHULMAN: Okay. All right. So if we -- all right. So right now, this was the current building configuration and design.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Right.
MR. SCHULMAN: And again, just a real quick history. So this is on the west side of the building, faces the tracks, and faces the neighbors on the other side of the tracks. And there was concern that there was, I guess the elevation, a little bland. Obviously, we're trying to minimize, we've got some sound attenuation issues that we're trying to deal with. And we have -- the only windows up there are in the center of that space that are for the, the exit stair that comes down and exits out onto the sidewalk on that location.

So that's, that's where we came from.
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And now we, we'll show you what we tried to do here.

So essentially what we tried to do is break up that massing a little bit. And I think, very simply, we're trying to take some of the bricks, some of the accent brick that we're using on the, on that north to south elevations. We're wrapping that around on that west elevation, help break up that massing somewhat.

Again, store more windows, we've slid the banner centered in that, sort of that base facing to the right. And again, we're maintaining that larger, heavier stone base, but we're bringing that brick all the way down to, basically down to sidewalk.

So this is, this is void of any
landscaping. We're not showing that right now because this is really about architecture. But again, we've got a coping and a rail on the top that copies the same detail around on that, on that south elevation as well.

So we think it's an improvement. We
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think it looks better. I'm curious to get some feedback from you all.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. The Board, Gene, I know you had, you and I know Mark had some questions over there.

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: Well, the only question $I$ had, and they've kind of addressed it, and I'm kind of liking what $I$ see, I just didn't like the fact that the four buildings from the people, whoever they may be or wherever they may be, would be looking at a drab wall. But this is definitely an improvement. I know we had a comment from some resident that said they should put some pictures of ships or whatever on there, but that's, that will fade away. This is a more permanent, eye pleasing, I would call it. So I'm satisfied with that.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. Mark, that brick is the same as the one in front, correct? The one that's --

MR. SCHULMAN: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Right.
MR. SCHULMAN: That's correct.
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MR. SCHULMAN: Yes, that's correct. And I'll show you. So the buildings have different colors and different accent brick.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Oh, okay, yeah.
MR. SCHULMAN: We'll just show you the other building as well.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: No, that would be great. Thank you.

MR. SCHULMAN: So, that was the other buildings got the lighter gray, dark gray. Then it's got a much richer, almost a cherry red. It's a little bit hard to see in this detail. But again, we've gone through all these colors with the ARB. So this is the alternate side. So it's not the same on every building.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. I know it looks -- yeah, Gene's right. It looks a lot more eye pleasing than what we've seen before.

MR. SCHULMAN: Yeah, I -- you know what, I think it was a good call. And I think the
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building has improved with the, with the change.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. What does the rest of the Board think? Mark, I know you had, you had some questions, too. BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON: I think that's much better.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Yeah.
BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON: I mean, it adds a little depth to it. I mean, before, it almost looked institutional.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Yeah.
BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON: But it's got much more, much more depth and character to it now.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: No, I think you are correct.

BOARD MEMBER ALESSI: I agree, I think it's an improvement.

BOARD MEMBER ROGERS: Yeah, definitely looks good.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: And it looks a lot better. Now, Mark, the windows, they're not the one -- they're going to be reflective,
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right, that you can see out but not in? I'm just wondering. It's not a big deal, but. MR. SCHULMAN: Yeah. It's a stairwell. CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Okay. MR. SCHULMAN: So we don't expect to have anybody, any occupants in there. I think more than anything it might make sense to have a little bit of reflectivity there just so that we don't get a lot of solar gain on that side, on the, you know, on the west. But honestly, I don't -- yeah. I think there will be enough -- it's not a large space. It's a stairwell.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Yeah. No, that's it. It's a lot better than what it was. Yeah.

MR. SCHULMAN: Good, good.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Thank you.
MR. SCHULMAN: Yeah. And then let's see, what else. We also, I think the other comment is that there was a request for a couple more ground signs. That came out of that meeting as well and --

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Yeah, I think to
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direct people, like, to the, $I$ think it was, like, to the eagles or where the, I guess people pulling in could go.

MR. SCHULMAN: Yeah. And it was coming in. So as you come in under the tunnel there, so we've added a ground sign there.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Right.
MR. SCHULMAN: 2B. And that gives people direction on, on which way to go. It was even some, there was some -- yeah. So as you come in, again, off to the -- so we, it was river port before. We've changed the name to riverfront. Yeah, I think it's, I think it's better. Riverfront, marina, pier, and then the observation deck to the left, which takes us over to the, that deck on the north side.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Okay.
MR. SCHULMAN: And I think, and quite frankly, I think as we get out there and look around, and if it, you know, again, may be determined down the road that hey, we really could use another sign over here to get people from -- you know, we have almost a
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quarter mile of riverfront there. And it's a, it's a large site, so. I think the concept of what we have here in terms of how we're handling way finding signage is good. And if we need to add another couple here or there down the road, I think, you know, at least we have that, we have the structure for that.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Oh, good. Thank
you. All right. How about the other -anyone else from the Board or both -- well, I got three Johns. So I'll go John Hager, the Building Inspector. John, any comments on this?

MR. HAGER: On the signs, no.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. How about -- and the, I'll go to Jonathan, too. You're all right with -- I know Max was a big deal with the signs, so.

MR. LOCKMAN: You know, I don't, I don't know what, you know, whether Max, I can't speak for him. But $I$ don't have any comments.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Yeah, on this one is
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good. All right. Eric, Mike, you guys, everything look good from what we went through on the workshop?

BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: Looks a lot better.

BOARD MEMBER FERGUSON: Yes, the structure does.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Oh, good. All right, good. It looks good, Dave.

MR. ZIGLER: I don't know. Did you want to see the commercial building? Because there was changes done to that after the ARB because of the ARB comments.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Yeah, let's see that, let's see that, too.

MR. SCHULMAN: That did not change since the workshop last week.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Didn't change since the workshop, okay.

MR. SCHULMAN: No, no. That -- but there were, there were significant changes from the original design through our process with the ARB, just for clarification, so. And those were incorporated into what was
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presented last week. But we're happy to show you what we had before and what we came up with. You can, you know, you can see for yourself what the modifications were. It's up to you.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Yeah, show them.
Let's just refresh our memories. It's always good.

MR. SCHULMAN: Okay. Do you want to -yeah. Do you want to see the before or -CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Let's see the before and then we'll see the after.

MR. SCHULMAN: All right. So this
initial design, so again, we were sort of contrasting, again, a sort of a warehouse type structure and warming it up with a, with a, what was a sort of a wood siding. But I think the Board reacted negatively to essentially what is a corrugated metal facade. It's very, you know, it's very contemporary and used quite a bit these days. But wasn't something that they liked. So they asked us to go back and take a look at essentially a material change on that. And
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when we did that, Auris can show the revised, the revised scheme. So essentially --

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Much better.
MR. SCHULMAN: Yeah, yeah. And that's, again, that's what we presented last week.

But that is --
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Right, right. Okay, good.

MR. SCHULMAN: Yeah, a little bit more refined.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: No, I think -- yeah,
from the workshop and with these revised, it
looks a lot cleaner, a lot more eye pleasing.
Yeah, that's good. Thank you.
MR. SCHULMAN: Yeah, sure.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right, thanks.
Dave, what's, what do you have next?
MR. ZIGLER: Ron, traffic.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Yeah.
MR. ZIGLER: Ron's out there, I seen
him.
MR. RIEMAN: Hi, Dave. I'm here.
MR. ZIGLER: All right. I guess you
want to put up the intersection.
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MR. RIEMAN: Oh, that's -- I wasn't
prepared to put the intersection up. Talking
about the signal?
MR. ZIGLER: We, we have it.
MR. RIEMAN: Okay, good.
MR. ZIGLER: Somewhere.

MR. RIEMAN: Yeah, it's Page 290 of the FEIS, if that helps.

MR. ZIGLER: Yeah, I keep missing it. It's right there. All right. Steve, can we share? Can we -- can you see that,

Mr. Chairman?

MR. HONAN: Yes, we can.
MR. ZIGLER: All right. There you go,
Ron.
MR. RIEMAN: All right, Dave. Thanks. I know Dave has, you know, probably discussed this at some of the workshops and past meetings. But $I$ guess one of the big concerns that, you know, the Board had was the operation of this intersection with the overpass.

And while it's not a, quote, you know, capacity problem with traffic, it's more kind
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of a safety issue. So in conjunction with, you know, a review with your, you know, traffic engineers and discussions with the County, we came up with this conceptual design plan to signalize the offset intersections, and that will help with the narrowness of the bridge and improve safety.

So I think that's pretty much it in a nutshell. And like $I$ said, I know this has been discussed by Dave with you guys before. And I think this was, like, the last piece of a puzzle. And it made its way into the findings that the applicant, you know, will be, you know, installing a traffic signal at this location.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Sorry, I was on mute. So the County's been looking at this, too, right, correct?

MR. RIEMAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Does the -- now, where is the, the light? I'm just, I'm trying to --

MR. RIEMAN: Yes. It's where the arrows are. You have a light at the --
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CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Oh, okay.
MR. RIEMAN: So it's going to be a set of, series of two lights. They're going to operate off set at the intersection of Hudson, Beach, and Tomkins to the east. And then the intersection to the west, I think that's Depot Place. So on either side of the overpass.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. I got it now.

MR. RIEMAN: And we've all been through, you know, some of these one way underpasses where there's signals on either end. And you know, instead of stop control, where everyone is, one car goes, another car, you know, proceeds each direction, this is more controlled, obviously. And also considering that there's, you know, a couple of side streets there, you know, Depot Plaza.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: I got you. All
right. I know the Board had some questions. I'll let them ask. Gene, Mark, I know you guys had questions on this.

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: If no one else is
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going to speak up.
BOARD MEMBER ROGERS: Go ahead.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: No, I'm going to -go ahead.

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: Who is going, me or Jerry?

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: You can go, Gene. Go ahead.

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: Well, I mean, Jerry brought up most of the questions. I don't want to step on his toes. Let Jerry go first.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right, Jerry, go ahead.

BOARD MEMBER ROGERS: Well, basically, this addresses the concerns I had and the Board had about controlling traffic through things without just signage. And this does speak to a controlled environment where I think the safety of the people coming in and out is primary, and you wouldn't want to have accidents there. So, you know, it's very good that the applicant decided to do this and put this in, you know, to govern that.

Proceedings
So I'm well pleased with that. And I think the rest of the Board, if $I$ can speak for them, probably is, too.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Yeah. Go ahead. Go ahead, Gene.

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: Well, I'm just mirroring what Jerry just said. Yeah, I'm kind of happy that we had something. And let me refresh my memory, that's going to be done after the second building is --

BOARD MEMBER ROGERS: No, the first
building, I think. Right?
MR. ZIGLER: Prior to the second $C$ of $O$.
BOARD MEMBER ROGERS: Right.
MR. ZIGLER: That's Note, that's Note 15.

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: All right. Prior to second $C$ of $O$, okay.

MR. ZIGLER: Right. Residential C of O, yes.

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: Okay. One of the questions I had, I honestly believe you have a 50-foot right of way coming from your property down Hudson Drive. I would
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personally, I think would make a safety feature would be to have two lanes exiting, one making a right and one making a left, and one lane entering. That would help some of the confusion with everyday life of people exiting or entering your, your property.

And number two, God forbid if there's a serious emergency, we at least have two lanes exiting on Hudson Drive besides the tunnel area. So I think it's something maybe you should consider. I mean, I'm kind of feeling kind of strong because you got 50-foot right of way there. So instead of having, it looks like some sort of a planting for something in the middle, maybe you could do something at the end, if there's a sidewalk or whatever. So it would be something you guys, if you could, could you consider.

MR. ZIGLER: I guess I'll speak up on that. Basically, we have a 50-foot right of way with a 30 -foot pavement, which means two lanes at 15. That leaves 10 on each side, usually for plantings and utilities. It could be changed to three lanes at 12. 12 is

## Proceedings

a normal width of a lane by state standards, all standards. So you could have three lanes of 12 , which is 36 . And then, of course, you'd have seven-foot on both sides for utilities and trees.

So it's something that could be done. I don't know if you really want to do it the entire length. But I mean, if you did it the last three or 400 -foot of the south end of Hudson Drive, it could be made to look nice.

MR. RIEMAN: Dave, I'll jump in. You know, this is something as a team we could discuss. But my initial reaction would be it's not necessary for some of the reasons you just mentioned. We have a 30 -foot wide roadway. So that, again, two 15-foot lanes, so in case of closure, you do have, like, emergency access, et cetera. Also, there's a thought that -- well, the amount of traffic that we're anticipating coming out, you know, one lane is probably more, you know, it would work. And there's another rule of thought that sometimes one lane is more feasible where you don't have --
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PUBLIC SPEAKER: Hi. What are you guys talking about?

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Oh. Steve, can you mute people?

MR. RIEMAN: Okay. So again, you know, something as a team we could discuss. But there's, you know, some thought where when you have two lanes, somebody making that right turn, their views are obstructed from the person making the left. Less in this case because you have a signal there. But that's something we could discuss, you know, as a team again.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. That sounds good. But I think, like Jerry and Gene said, this is -- I know that we talked about this in the very beginning, and to have something like this, which is good. And the County is okay with this, too, correct?

MR. RIEMAN: The initial reaction, yes.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Okay.
MR. RIEMAN: And they've seen the plan, correct.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. What
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does the rest of the Board think? Mike, Eric, Kerri, Mark.

BOARD MEMBER ALESSI: One concern I have, and I don't know that this is so much an applicant issue, I'm concerned about school bus stops being in this sort of very busy intersection. And that may be more of an issue for, you know, the school district's transportation department. But you know, is the -- are we envisioning school buses going into the property, into the complex? And if so, is there a place for a bus to be able to turn around? Or otherwise, are kids going to have to be standing out in this, you know, sort of congested area where we're going to have a lot of traffic?

MR. ZIGLER: We've, we got in touch with North Rockland, and they've changed their protocol on going into a cul-de-sac. So a school bus will be able to enter Hudson Drive and go into the site where there's a cul-de-sac large enough for a school bus or a fire truck to turn around. In addition, we are proposing a bus stop on the right side as Proceedings
you enter the cul-de-sac.
So we've looked into it. And the basic thing is a lot of the kids are now being picked up by the vans, other than a bus stop, a big bus. But no, the school has given permission to other cul-de-sacs, and this exceeds most of the other ones.

BOARD MEMBER ALESSI: Okay.
MR. ZIGLER: In width.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Oh, thanks, Kerri. Yeah, I think I'm, we're good. I'm trying to think what else.

BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: I have a question. Dave, did you say that they're planning on having just the vans coming there? Because I mean, I'm at school --

MR. ZIGLER: No, no, no. What I said is most of the kids -- if you go by Zeh's bus garage down in Haverstraw, it used to be if you were older, you would see more buses than vans. The vans are a majority of the pick up now because they're taking kids from different areas to different schools. But this cul-de-sac will allow either a bus or a
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van to make a turn in it. So it fits both.
BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: Okay. Because I
mean, I'm at Farley every other day, and the big buses outnumber the vans four to one. MR. ZIGLER: All right. So I go up to Jay Street, and up there, it's mostly vans. BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: Okay. Thank you. MR. ZIGLER: To each his own. CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: And I know, I know the Fire Inspector has looked at this, also. Correct, Dave?

MR. ZIGLER: Yup, yup. And the Fire Inspectors, and we've also made a turning radius for --

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: To get the fire
trucks.
MR. ZIGLER: For them to redo.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right.
MR. ZIGLER: That's on Page 21 and 22.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right, got you.
BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON: As far as the
timing of the lights on that, you know, $I$ realize it's, it's a little early to try to figure that out, but are you going to do a
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traffic study to try to time those out?
Because seasonally, the traffic patterns are going to change drastically at that intersection.

MR. RIEMAN: Yes. I'll answer that. So we did run an analysis with, you know, timings for the four conditions we analyze in the report. Typical weekday as well as, you know, summer conditions. So the signal will be actuated. So we'll take into consideration any, you know, seasonal fluctuations, daily fluctuations as well.

BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON: Yeah. Because, like, summertime Saturdays are going to be quite, quite busy.

MR. RIEMAN: We took that into consideration in our analysis.

BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON: All right.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. And
Mark, I think the one big difference here is that they won't be able to load their boats here or --

BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON: Right, right. But there still is, there's still the other
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marina on this side of it, yeah.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Yeah. No, you're right. Correct. All right, good.

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: Hey, Tom?
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Yeah, Gene.
BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: Who's going to -is the County going to or the Town going to maintain that traffic situation, the lights, after the -- I'm in the assumption that the applicant is paying for it, but that doesn't matter to me, either, who pays for it. But who's going to maintain that? Is that going to be the Town, or the County, or -- I don't think it would be the applicant.

MR. RIEMAN: No, it would be the Town would maintain it. The County doesn't maintain the traffic signals.

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: All right.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Thanks, Gene. All
right. I guess the -- who else? I guess the Johns. John Hager, you have any comments?

MR. HAGER: No, I don't have any comments about the traffic signals.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right, good.
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And I know the other Johns, probably we'll wait for Max. But I think we're good from what I see. And, like, same with Jerry and Gene also said that, you know, they were, this was a lot -- this situation, the way they have it planned out, is a lot nicer than what we've looked at before, so. Does any other Members from the Board have any other questions on this part?

BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON: Just a real quick question, looking at the map here. Where you've got the traffic light situated, we're looking at, like, a boom that's hanging out across the road, and the arrows are the actual positions of the lights themselves?

MR. RIEMAN: Yes. They'll be mast arms, and those arrows are the heads, correct.

BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON: Okay.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Oh, good. All
right. All right, good. All right, I guess we're good with that. I guess we're good with that part, with the traffic there, just from what we're looking at for now. All right, Dave, what's next? What do you have
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on --
MR. ZIGLER: We can go, we can go to the site plan, Page One. The first few pages have a lot of details on it. If you want, we could start right here and go over some of the things we're actually talking about.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right, yeah. I mean, I know we're not going to get through everything tonight. We could start, you know, going through some of the, the pages, and then at least have a starting point.

MR. ZIGLER: All right. Well, if you look at the, what's up on the screen, that's actually Page Drawing One. And that's -excuse me.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: We still have the traffic up.

MR. ZIGLER: Excuse me?
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: We still have the traffic up.

MR. ZIGLER: Hold on. There.
MS. MELE: Also, Dave, I'm sorry to interrupt, but were we going to get to offsite before we got to site plan, or we're
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going to do that at the next meeting? I was just trying to follow the emails of what was on the agenda.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Were we going to do offsite stuff?

MR. ZIGLER: You could do that now, which includes the sewer and the water, or we could do it at the next meeting. Whatever you --

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Let's get all this out of the way. Let's do the offsite, like Amy said, because $I$ know we talked about it at the workshop and some of the emails. So we could go, we could do the offsite stuff.

MR. ZIGLER: You want it, you want -- so as you know, we've have agreed to do the sewer in three spots where there seems to be a leak. In one spot, there seems to be no pipe. So that's going to be detailed on the plan list.

It's called the offsite plan. That's on the bottom right. It's going to show the three areas. One is south of our site. It's a ten-inch main. And one is underneath the
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railroad trestle. And then the third one is over on Tomkins where the pipe is gone. The applicant agreed to fix those three areas.

The other, the other thing that Jason, who is online here, has been working on is the offsite water. If you want to update on that, I would recommend Jason getting on, and explaining where we are, and why it's taking us so long to get it completed. But Jason?

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Yeah, we're good. Jason, go ahead.

MR. BUELL: Yes, hi. Hello, Board Members and attendees. You know, there's the -- the offsite run is about 2500 feet of water main that needs to be upgraded due to Suez requirements to make sure you have adequate flows and pressures at the site.

I'm nearly done with my design in that case. The delay was due to the fact that there was a stretch of sewer line about 300 feet that was missing or unaccounted for that we needed to obviously figure out what was happening to it. We can't really, you know, start designing a water main around a
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sewer that is kind of ethereal, let's say. So I'm nearly done with that.

And I've spoken to Frank McGlynn over at Suez. And now we're just trying to figure out the tie ins for the parts in which the new water main will exist. And it will be a 16-inch main for, as I mentioned, about half a mile.

We anticipate that it, the construction of said main will require the use of some sort of MPT, some sort of maintenance and protection of traffic for, to make it to be one, one lane for the process of the construction. But they go through linear feet in an installation process like this pretty quickly. So we don't think it will take very long. But in any case, the actual finalization of the design is being worked out currently with Frank McGlynn at Suez.

And that's --
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. Good.
All right. So, Dave --
MR. ZIGLER: The second thing Jason can explain to you is where we're at with the
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Hunter Place replacement. He -- I'd rather have him discuss that. Jason, would you explain to where we are?

MR. BUELL: Yes. So the Hunter Place, you know, we got a couple test pits on either side of the trestle, just to see where the pipe was. If you can imagine it's kind of on the north side of the trestle. The pipe was originally expected to be on the south side, but the actual -- we did the actual test pits. It's on the north side. It's an eight-inch main. It's in good condition. It's a ductile iron pipe. And the depth of which is deep enough such that I believe that there's some anticipation of lowering the, the ground level or the road level to assure, you know, proper clearance.

And that clearance, that additional clearance will -- it's deep enough such that site clearance will not require us to install a new main. We'll continue to use the Suez main as is. And it will have enough cover to ensure that water does not freeze when it needs to be, and that will just happen to it
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on the east side of the trestle as we expected.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right, good.
MR. BUELL: That's it.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. Does the

Board have questions for Dave or Jason with the water or sewer? Dave, I know you've been working with the Town Board, right? Dave?

MR. ZIGLER: The Town Board with what?

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: With the, with the sewer.

MR. ZIGLER: Yes. Yeah. Actually, Amy's working with Steve right now for the agreement. Amy's online, if you want to.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Oh, there you are,
Amy. Go ahead.
MS. MELE: Well, I was going to save this kind of for the conclusion, but let me assure everybody now. I'm working with Steve on the sewer improvements, which include the three offsite improvements that Dave and Jason just outlined, as well as the $\$ 40,000$ contribution to the Town to help fund its sewer study. And Steve and I are talking
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about how to memorialize that.
And while I'm on the topic, I just want to assure everybody, because I know there's been a lot of questions about this. So let me just explain. The agreement to maintain all of this is going to be set forth in a recordable easement that's going to include a maintenance agreement, that's going to include a provision that it will be the obligation of any successor or assigned to this applicant.

And that's going to be approved by the Town Board. And that's going to reference the site plan. In fact, it might even attach the site plan. And then there will be site plan notes, also, that reference it. And those notes will reference the actual materials that you guys approve, and the ARB approve.

So there will be a series of checks and balances. So that if plants die, or a bench needs to be replaced, or something like that, it's our obligation. We know what make and model number to replace it with. There will
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be a responsible financial entity who has an income stream to fund that. So, you know, I know that comes up at a lot different meetings. And I just kind of wanted to assure everybody that that was going to be the case.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Oh, good. Thank
you, Amy.
MS. MELE: Sure.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. I know the Board had some questions.

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: All right, let me ask a couple of questions. Amy, thank you. I mean, when I brought that up earlier today, all I wanted it to be a fact stated that on the record that you were going to do what you just said, you know. I had all confidence that the applicant will do that. But we just wanted to make sure on the record that that was stated.

On the offsite plan with the three sewer pipeline failures, where were they? Were they on -- Dave, were they on Jackson Drive.

MR. ZIGLER: No, no. The offsite -- two
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is offsite. One I call on-site. One is underneath the railroad trestle.

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: On Hunter?
MR. ZIGLER: Yes. And one -- yes. And one is just south of our site, where the sewer main bends and goes back out to Hudson Drive. That's a 12-inch main. Underneath Hunter, it's ten-inch. And I believe it's either a 10 or 12 in Tomkins.

If you go out to, out Hudson and make a right and go up Tomkins, it's about the third house on your left. There used to be a big tree there. And when Lanc and Tully ran their cameras through, there's no pipe there. So that's a pretty serious one.

The other two are just transporting water. It's very wet in our area. So I think if we, if we can fix those, that will eliminate a lot of problems with on-site infiltration. And the other one is going to eliminate the dirt that seems to be collecting down in the main line, going to the pump station.

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: So he was saying,
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he's saying something about 300 feet of pipe missing, sewer pipe. That's the one on Tomkins, I would assume.

MR. ZIGLER: I don't know if it's 300 . But it's, it's enough. They couldn't tell exactly. It's probably, it's probably at least 100.

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: Okay. Now, he also mentioned a 16-inch water main. Where is that going to be?

MR. BUELL: That's going to be on Main Street. It's going to be going from --

MR. ZIGLER: Reservoir.
MR. BUELL: -- Reservoir down to past Cricketown, up to Orchard, heading east.

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: That's all the way out at -- okay.

MR. BUELL: Yes, yes.
BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: Now, Hunter Place, you say you have an eight-inch water main coming through there, and you say how deep is it down, that it won't -- what you're planning on, taking down about two feet, from my understanding.
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MR. ZIGLER: About a foot.

MR. BUELL: About a foot.

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: You're going to, they're going to do a foot?

MR. ZIGLER: Yeah. The finished grade would be a foot. Probably take it down two-foot, then fill it with gravel and pave it. But it has to, it has to meet the clearance when we're finished.

MR. BUELL: That's correct.
BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: Okay. And is there going to be any drainage there? How are we going to alleviate the water situation there? I mean, if you look at it, only because if you look at it today and you look at the applicant's property, it looks quite high.

MR. ZIGLER: It is.
BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: I know. I mean, you know, from a layman's point of view.

MR. ZIGLER: Basically, when they, when they did the test holes on the south side of -- I'm sorry, the east side. A boy scout that don't know his directions. On the east
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side of the railroad, they found a under pipe. In other words, when they put sewer lines through wet areas, they have to drain it first. They can't lay a sewer line in water.

So what they do is they put a French drain below the sewer line and hook it up to what they call a sump pump or a well, just like you would have in your basement. Well, that's what they did to lay that pipe from now Eagle Bay out to Hunter. And when they were doing the test holes, they hit that thing and it's, and it just blew water out.

I think if we can tap that existing under drain into the drainage line, our directly to the Hudson, we're going to drain a lot of that underground water that seems to be affecting all the pipe. And I would almost bet you we'll find the same thing down at the south end where there's a problem, because that area is wet. I mean, it's part of a swamp. And as the neighbors had said previously that live on the west side of the railroad, the back of their yards are wet.
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So I think what would happen is we're going to be able to drain that.

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: Okay.
MR. ZIGLER: At about six, seven-foot down. You know, we have drainage, surface drainage. But I'm talking about pulling it out six or seven-foot down, which I think that would be a -- I think that would be great. You know, there's something we found when Jason was up there doing test holes.

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: Okay. Any word on the railroad? They're giving you the right of way to work there?

MR. ZIGLER: The railroad has been, as I've said from the beginning, whatever utility's going to be replaced has to be permitted by that, by that company. So if we're replacing the water line, which we thought, that would be Suez. If we're replacing the sewer, the Town makes the permit.

And it's a utility permit. It's not a big deal because the utility is there. It's not like you're digging something new.
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You're going and replacing and fixing something.

So it's just a repair that has to be a permit by the Town. But of course the applicant's contractor can do the work. And when he's doing the work, the railroad will have inspectors out there, and flagmen, and watch the work being done.

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: Okay, very good. Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON: Dave, this is Mark. What's, what's the current elevation of the water and the sewer going under that, the Hunter Place underpass there, currently and what's it going to be once you lower the underpass?

MR. ZIGLER: Well, if we go to our maps, on Page 15, we have all your answers.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Page 15.
MR. ZIGLER: Yup. We're trying to put it up on the screen for you.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right.
MS. RAMANATHAN: Is it visible to everybody?

Proceedings
MR. ZIGLER: Can you see it?
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Yeah, we can see it. Just make it a little bigger.

MS. RAMANATHAN: Sure.
MR. ZIGLER: All right. So if you look, the grade, the grade we're going to is 8.4, elevation 8.4. The current water line is down, down below five. And the current sewer, the sewer line's down at two. So one's four-foot in the ground, and the sewer is six-foot in the ground, underneath the railroad.

BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON: All right. And, and you're planning on excavating a foot below current level?

MR. ZIGLER: Taking a -- yeah. A foot out of the current grade. And well, actually, more than a foot. Then replace it with pavement. And then the grade goes up at four percent to our existing road. And then we also have drainage there. We have drainage on both sides. And we're going to put a under drain. So it's going to be better than it is, and it's going to meet the
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requirements for height as a second access. Alternate access.

BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON: And the water line will be at least 12 inches below grade, final?

MR. ZIGLER: More than that. About, probably about four, four-foot.

BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON: Okay. All right.
MR. ZIGLER: Yeah. And that's an eight-inch, eight-inch. You know, in the beginning, we heard it was a four. Then we heard it was a six. So just recently, we heard it was, you know, after Jason went out there and did the test holes with Suez, they found out it's an eight.

BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON: Do I hear a ten? All right.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Oh, good. Thanks, Mark. Any other Board Members? Go ahead.

MR. ZIGLER: And also on Page 15, down at the bottom left, you'll see that there's a, there is a gate. So this is, this is not going to be a access other than pedestrian. And then that gate would have a knock box on
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it and be available for emergency situations.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. And I
know, like, Tommy, that Tommy's been looking this, too, right? The fire, they've been going through everything, too.

MR. ZIGLER: Yeah. You know, I believe this is the gate that Tommy wanted. And of course, they'll put a knock box on it. They, they didn't want it to be a, you know.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Just go down a little further.

MR. ZIGLER: It will be a fire gate, not necessarily blocking everybody because you're going to get people that want to bike and everything else, so.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Right. Just go down with the screen just a little bit on the, on the gate there.

MR. ZIGLER: Right.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Down, down, down. I
know, it's awful. Just a little more.

MR. ZIGLER: There you go.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: There you go. All
right. Oh, I see it over to the left. Okay.
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MR. ZIGLER: Yes. Yeah.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: And $I$ see it in the plans, but $I$ just wanted to make sure, yeah. MR. ZIGLER: Yeah. We don't have a gate on our side. But $I$ don't know. It's something I was thinking about. Nobody ever said anything. But it's a possibility that we might put a sliding gate or something on our side because we don't want people hanging a left or hanging a right or coming out of the parking lot and go straight through, either.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Straight through because they think it's a tunnel. You're right.

MR. ZIGLER: Yeah. Yeah.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right, got you.
All right.
MR. ZIGLER: So you want to go back to Page One?

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Yeah. If the Board doesn't have any other questions, or if any of the -- if we can go to Page One, we could just get started for now and go over some
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things.
BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON: One more quick question, Dave.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Go ahead.
BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON: Sorry about that.
You were talking about missing or
unidentified sewer up on Tomkins?
MR. ZIGLER: Yes.
BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON: About a hundred feet of questionable sewer existence.

MR. ZIGLER: Yeah. That's what the cameras found when Lanc and Tully did the sewer report, yes.

BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON: A hundred feet.
MR. ZIGLER: Well, it's quite a bit.
BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON: I mean, and all that's coming down Tomkins toward the site, right? Toward the, toward the underpass.

MR. ZIGLER: There's not, there's not that much. Let's, let's prove how old we are, right. When, when Pete Anderson was in, they went up on Jay Street, and they moved some sewer lines so that more sewer went down in the swamp than they did, that went down
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Tomkins because they had a problem with
Tomkins back when Pete Anderson was in. So there is a big line in there. But there's not as much sewer going through it that, you know, if you analyzed it now, you might make it a smaller line. But it's just not flowing as much as it used to. There's actually more flowing out of Hudson than there is coming down Tomkins, almost.

BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON: Okay. But if there's missing pipe or unidentified, I mean --

MR. ZIGLER: Yup. Well, it's --
BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON: Whatever is
coming that down that line is going somewhere.

MR. ZIGLER: They ran into a tree, tree roots. So something's gone, something's been squished, something's been broke.

BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON: And they're going to replace -- or that's the plan, is to replace the hundred feet of missing line coming down Tomkins?

MR. ZIGLER: They're going to replace,
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fix whatever's broke there, yes.
BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON: In that section, okay.

MR. ZIGLER: Yes. That's the agreement.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Oh, good. All
right.
BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON: That's all I got.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Good. All right, Dave. You're back.

MR. ZIGLER: If we go back to Page One, basically this spells out all the details that's going to be on, or within, or in your resolution the day this is finished, if approved. And up at the top, you'll see that we have building sizes and square footages so people understand what size the buildings are, and each floor.

To the left of that is the bulk table up on the top, up here. We're trying to get it up there. There you go. That's the bulk table. And just to the right of that you'll see the building square footage.

And then if we slide down to the left, you'll see that we have the details for
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parking and the parking table. Now, you know a lot of times we hear that we don't have enough parking. But the fact is we have parking for every user. We did not ask for shared parking, or we didn't ask for part time parking because this is a commercial. Maybe these people won't be home.

We have enough parking for every user on-site. It meets the code and -- which is 611, 611 parking spaces. And we also have areas within the site to gain another 20 parking spaces if we want.

I really think that before final, we're going to ask for reserved parking along the railroad. And if it's needed, we would build it. But that's something for later on.

The parking itself is centered around the user. So what, what we did was we took the front and back doors of the buildings and we made that many parking space be accessible without a long walk. That's why, that's why you'll see between Building One and Two a large parking area because you have the clubhouse there. And then you'll see between
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Buildings Three and Four, we have a large parking area in between the doors, the main doors because behind Building Four on the north side, we don't have that much parking. And then, of course, down at the commercial building at the south end of site, you'll see that we have direct parking. And we kind of segregated it by putting a curb in, and tried to keep, like, the commercial on one side and then residents on the other.

And then we did face a lot of parking towards the Hudson on the first parking lot. That's the one between the commercial building and Building Number One and the clubhouse, because we figured that's going to be where people want to park to maybe walk or whatever. We also increased the parking on the north end because of Max. He wants people to be able to get access to the eagle deck there.

So on the left, we have the summation of the parking, the units. You have an odd situation with this code, that one bedroom is one space, two bedrooms is two spaces, and
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three bedrooms are three spaces. And so we have 24 units with three bedrooms. So that's 75 parking spaces.

So I believe you're going to see that most of these users are going to be, what do you call it, snow geese. They're going to be like Gene, they go south for the winter. So I think what you'll see is a lot of people that only have one car, and we're going to see that we have too much parking. But too much is better than not enough.

If you continue down on the left, we have, besides the owner and all the listing of the tax lots, we have development details, which ends up being 9.1 units per acre, and that's the buildable acreage. The buildable acreage is right above that. And that's the town code. It's the same here as it is everywhere else in the town that we've been doing for the last 25 years, I think, or 30 years, where you break down the slope area of water area, area of wetland. And in this case, the water includes the Hudson because the owner owns a track under the Hudson. So
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that's how we come up with the unit counts.
Then we go to the right, the general
notes. The first 14 notes. The last one is, or the one we just had a question on, proposed bus stop locations subject to the North Rockland School District approval. And that bus stop is in our cul-de-sac on our property.

Note 15 has to do with the traffic light and the electronic sign for road flooding. It does say $S P 21$, and that's the wrong number. We have to correct that. And somebody just moved my map.

MS. RAMANATHAN: Sorry about that.
MR. ZIGLER: Okay. The next, the next note, 16 , is post construction. The applicant will monitor the 9 W as we agreed to do on traffic.

17 has the water main improvements on West Main Street. And it tells you what pages that's on. That's on the offsite. That water main has to be approved by Suez, and then it goes to, goes to the Health Department.
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And the water main, the water main is not designed just to service this site, because the site is designed for everything to be on at one time. A lot of people don't understand that, but it -- you have to have enough water for every user to be using water in the building, and all the sprinkler systems to go on at the same time, and the fire hydrants.

So the water, when you start doing that times two, because you have to hundred percent extra, that's how we got out there on Main Street, and we have to increase the pipe size. So that larger pipe on Main Street's going to fill your new system that you have there on Hunter and Tomkins, and they've been working on for the last two years.

Number 18, Note 18 is a Rockland County note because in this zone, you have a right for other uses. You know, other than this. I mean, it could be a full marina, a marina use. And then you have boats coming out. You'll have people getting maintenance of boats. You'll have a possible oil or gas
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service. And you'll have a launching of
boats. And you'll also have boats and trailers.

Well, the County brought that up. So we added this note that none of that's going to happen on this site. That's what agreed to, and that's -- it basically can't be done. So we're, the use that we're proposing and the design of this site is not going to allow maintenance or things that you would normally see in a, in a marina.

BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON: And real quick, Dave.

MR. ZIGLER: Yes.
BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON: I'm sorry.
That's, you know, say the current applicant chooses to sell, that goes into effect for, for the subsequent owners as well?

MR. ZIGLER: Same as if Shop Rite was sold to another company. It's still under the same site plan approval. That's when your attorney should read that one. But whoever owns this piece of property is under that use because that's what this Planning
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Board will approve, if they approve the site plan, is that those items, A through E, will not occur on the site.

BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON: All right.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Hey, Dave.
MR. ZIGLER: Yes.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Going back to, like, 18 again. They use water craft, but then they use boats. Could that be all the same, water crafts? Because then when you say maintenance of repair of boats, what if they have a jet ski, that's a water craft, right? It's not a boat. Is it the same thing?

MR. ZIGLER: You know, you know what I would do? I think what $I$ would do is I'll put water craft or boats, and I'll put that on both $A$ and $B$ so it's very clear.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Yeah, $I$ know it's a stickler. But $I$ know someone will say well, it's not a boat, it's a jet ski.

MR. ZIGLER: Yeah, I understand.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right.
MR. ZIGLER: We'll cover both of those.
We'll just put a slash and cover both.
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CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: No, I'm good.
BOARD MEMBER ALESSI: How do they get
into the water if there's no launch?
MR. ZIGLER: They don't.
BOARD MEMBER ROGERS: I was just
thinking the same thing.
MS. MELE: They have to go to another
marina --
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: They have to go to
the other marinas and --
MS. MELE: -- for the launch, and then actually navigate the boat over.

MR. ZIGLER: Right.
MS. MELE: To take it out of the water during the winter.

MR. ZIGLER: There is no launching of boats on this site.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: The town park has one, right? Clark Park has the -- they can use boats there.

MR. ZIGLER: They could go right next door and, you know. They can't keep the -if they want to take the boat out of the water, they'll have to go to another marina
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and rent space, so. This is just a parking marina. That's it.

MR. HAGER: Dave, can I ask a question?
MR. ZIGLER: Sure.
MR. HAGER: You know, related to what you're talking about, if there was a future owner, they're all subject to this site plan. I'm just curious about, there's three current tax lots. Is there an intention for these to be combined into a single parcel at some point?

MR. ZIGLER: Yeah. That's basically on Page, I think it's on Page Three and Four, yes.

MR. HAGER: Okay. Thank you.
MR. ZIGLER: I don't know what the tax lot number would be, but they're going to be merged.

MR. HAGER: Thank you.
MR. ZIGLER: Note 18 is just the, the use datum. That was another County request, which is intelligent. We should have had that on there, anyway.

And Number 20 is what we discussed at
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the ARB. It's the actual color of the pavement that's going to be on the promenade. It's not going to be black. It's going to be this gray. And all the details are right there, including the company that makes it.

Note Number 21 has to do with the benches and the trash receptacles. That's the actual numbers, and the company that make it, and the items, and the color. Which, they're both green. I would call them, like, a kelly green or forest green type. And we had those shown on the plan where they'll be.

And then Number 22 has to do with the lead agency's findings and the adoption. And then Number 23 explains that we actually had more parking available if we take the islands out on the, on the west side.

So any, any other things that come along, like let's say this agreement with the sewer, and we have a resolution, or the agreement with the common area, if we have a resolution, or any other details, they're going to be placed on map notes. And that's
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what the, that's what the Building Inspector lives by years down the road, is to come back look at the map notes, and that explains what was the thought was. And if we don't get enough room on this first page, we'll just go to the second page and just continue the map notes.

So this, this front page just explains, shows you overall picture. And it shows you what's going to be the use of the property, and hopefully how it's legally explained.

Moving on to Page Two. Page Two is nothing. It's just as it exists today. It's not a, you know, usually it's woods we're working with, or a vacant lot.

But this is a -- there's a use out there now, so that's all explained. There's easements out there. There's rights. We have dedication information there on Hunter Place.

We show the site as it is today, and then the different -- go down to the bottom here -- the different uses and historical permits that the Army Corps have given the
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site. And it also mentions the grant in which this parcel underneath the river was given to the owner back a long time ago and carried through within the deeds. A lot of times that's not carried through. In this case, it's carried through, and it was recognized by the Army Corps.

Going on to Page Three and Four, this is what you're, you're talking about. It's the existing easements that will be abolished or eliminated. And it's also showing the new easements. And it's two pages because we started out at the Beach Road, and we come in off of Hudson Drive. And then we show the easements that we're making, including the public access.

If you look on that middle of the map, that, that worm looking thing is the covering of the promenade. And that continues all the way back, and that's the public access. So the promenade access doesn't cover the riprap. It doesn't cover anything. But let's say the walking area that a person could be on, it doesn't cover anything that,
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other than that.
And you could see below that to the east is the riprap. And then, of course, we have the easement going out into the river with our fishing dock. And then we have an extension of our promenade by easement all the way to the south line in case that, in case that ever gets changed to the south to a different use and they want to continue that promenade.

We also did that on the north, which Max was very much into, is a 50 -foot easement off the parking lot going up to the railroad and going north to, I think that's actually the PIP property there. There's three, I think there's, like, three different owners of that area around the battlefield. But whatever. That goes up and it touches that with a 50-foot right of way. So those would be a granted use for the public. That's Page Three and Four.

And then when you get to Page Five, you start to get into the really detailed stuff of grading. And just to give you a summary
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of that, the buildings are at Elevation 14 , the finished floor of the buildings. That's almost a 500-year flood. So it's not a hundred year. It's above the hundred year. In this area, the hundred year has to be, we have to be above it with the structure of the floor.

So our elevation on the floor is 14 on the buildings. So that means the parking lots are around, I'm going to say 12. Some of them are 13, but very few. Most of the parking lots are 12 and 11, with the low areas at 10, all which are above the hundred year. And as I've said before, when you get on the promenade, that breaks down and is very flat at Elevation Eight. So the site is stepped in elevation with the promenade, promenade at eight, and the parking lots will stay at 10 .

And then the railroad tracks, which I had a discussion with John O'Rourke and he was correct. So I guess the second John here is correct, too. That's at elevation about 22, 24. So this, this whole thing is stepped
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from the river side all the way up through the site.

And the drainage is going to be collected in the parking lots in the center. And then each one of the parking lots and the Buildings, One, Two, Three, Four, have their own biofilters. The biofilters are that pool looking thing at the end of the building, in between the building and the river. That's the biofilters.

MR. LOCKMAN: Hey, David?
MR. ZIGLER: Yeah?

MR. LOCKMAN: I have a question. In the corner of the sheet, you've got a diagram about the height of the river with mean higher, high water.

MR. ZIGLER: Yes, it's an, it's an --
MR. LOCKMAN: So that's the same datum.
And you said the promenade -- well, the buildings are at 14. So that would put the buildings at 10 feet above the, of the usual high water.

MR. ZIGLER: Yes.

MR. LOCKMAN: Am I reading that right,
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is that the same datum?
MR. ZIGLER: Yeah, the high, the high water in this area at Haverstraw is 3.2 , yes. Yes. You're correct.

MR. LOCKMAN: Okay. So, and you said the -- it's about the 500-year storm.

MR. ZIGLER: The 500 is a little above 14. We're very close to it, yes.

MR. LOCKMAN: Yeah, because I'm only -I'm not -- I'm a little more familiar with Haverstraw than Stony Point. But I think in Sandy, the river was, like, 10.2 or 10.6. Do you happen to know the Sandy elevation, how bad it got in Stony Point?

MR. ZIGLER: It was at least that high. In some aspects, when they had waves, it was up around 11. I think, I actually think that the Stony Point Bay in the area that we're talking about and just, just to the south was hit the hardest. And there's pictures of it coming up through some windows and things which are definitely around 10 or 11 . So the waves were intense coming across into this area.
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So that's, that's one of the things that we took and we changed because we learned a little bit from Ginsburg down there, the problems he had when they did have a storm come up over the top. And that's, we were explaining two weeks ago how we have a underground retaining wall to hold that esplanade and back up the riprap.

So the whole thing is set up to break the waves, then have the waves settle into that biofilter area. They'll never go up under the parking lot. And if they do, it would be just a few inches at most because it -- somehow a wave, a road would go that high.

But basically, we're breaking the waves with the riprap and holding it from washing completely back into the river. The promenade is actually tilted inland. So when the water comes washing back, it's going to just return into that biofilter system and be filtered out into the river.

MR. LOCKMAN: Thank you.
MR. ZIGLER: So this also details the
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new breakwater. And it shows the length of the riprap with those pools that Shea was speaking about, the tidal pools. And then it details also the sewer. This site will have a new sewer line along the west side for the buildings, and then a new water line with hydrants.

You also have on the, on the west side of each building is a fire zone, so that a fire truck could come in and park. It's either on the north side or the south side. On Drawing One, it's the north side. That's a fire lane. And then matching on Drawing Two so they're facing each other. And then you have the same thing on Building Three and Four. That's, that's about the details of that.

And then what happens is further on, as you go into the other pages, it takes it from this very small scale and we go to larger scales. And larger, broken into basically three sections.

You'll have the utilities, with the pipes. The dark lines you see there are
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drainage pipes. And then you'll see more elevations. Yeah, you can keep going. And that's the center section showing the details. And then, of course, the last section.

We also have some improvements that we have on Hudson. That's on Page Nine. Hudson Drive comes in, as you're about halfway in, there's a drainage line underneath there. It goes from -- well, if you're looking at this, you're leaving the site. On your right, there's a, there's a house. We're right next -- just north of that house is actually a drainage retention area. And there's a pipe underneath the ground, underneath the road and going all the way through to the river.

And the Town asked us to replace that. Since we're going to put a new road in, we would replace that. And the applicant has agreed to do that, that offsite improvement, which I don't think anybody realized, but it's part of the, what the applicant has agreed whenever asked.
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Going to Page Ten, is profile --
BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: Can I ask you a question, Dave, before you get any further?

MR. ZIGLER: Yes.
BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: Two things. The
first thing is I'm familiar with that drainage by, from that retention --

MR. ZIGLER: Right.
BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: -- by the river.
Are you just going to improve the area on the, under the roadway? I would assume from the retention pond, the east side of your right of way, you're not going to go beyond that.

MR. ZIGLER: No. No. We're going to, we're going to replace the entire pipe. Unless the owner doesn't allow us on the property, the intention is to replace the entire length of pipe from the retention to the Hudson River.

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: Okay. Okay, that's the question I had. Getting back to before that, on the previous map, on the north side of the breakwater, right about
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here, what -- the breakwater ends somewhere around the eagles' nest viewing, I assume.

MR. ZIGLER: No. It actually goes a
little past that, and it would be right where the existing bulkhead stops. We're a little bit west of where the existing bulkhead starts to break down.

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: My question is what's going to -- from where you're stopping the riprap seawall --

MR. ZIGLER: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: -- or breakwater, whatever you want to call it, going west, what's going to prevent the surge of, from water? Is the elevation there higher?

MR. ZIGLER: Yes. If you look, if you look at the end of our riprap and going to the right, you'll see that there's two, four, six, eight, there's at least eight-foot of grade change. And then that's up, that's up where he had parked boats, and he had the fire truck back there. That's a much higher grade. That's why we stopped there.

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: Okay. Okay. I'm
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good.
MR. ZIGLER: The profiles. These are just a series of plans which, engineering-wise, show that the grades of the pipes and the separation of the pipes, including the sewer and the water and the drainage, and shows the layout within the site. It's engineering mapping for John to review and for the Town to review for sewer. The Health Department will review it for sewer. And the water will be reviewed by Suez and also by the Health Department. So the final say on the improvements really come, for the sewer and water, come out of the Health Departments. The other ones are prior, but the final say is the signature by the Health Department.

And again, that's just profiles going through the site. The main road, I call that. That's the road coming in, the cul-de-sac. And then along the west side of the buildings, all the way up to the last parking lot.

And that's, that's half. I don't know
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if you want to go through the other half or have questions.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: I'll see if the Board wants questions. We can probably, you know, go through this, go through that half. And then maybe the next half we move to the next meeting. I don't know if the, how the Board feels, if they want to continue or just want to, you know, digest what we've seen. Any questions, get them together for the next time.

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: I'd kind of like to digest what we got so far.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Yeah.
BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: Not that I -- at this point, I really don't have too many issues. I just --

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Yeah.
BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: -- like to go over my notes and rewrite some of them.

MS. MELE: We have a workshop in between, don't we?

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: We could have one.
MS. MELE: We could, if there were
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questions on what you've seen already.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Yeah, we could do --
MS. MELE: We could attend your next
workshop.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Yeah. We can probably put questions.

MS. MELE: That's, of course, up to you, if you have questions.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: We could do that.
BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: Hey, Tom, let me ask you a question. Do we, do we need a workshop, or is there that many issues that we have to deal with, or could we handle this at a TAC meeting?

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: No, we --
BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: I don't like a TAC meeting because we're all not there. That's not fair. I rescind what $I$ just said.

MR. ZIGLER: That was quick.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: No, maybe you're right. We could probably just digest what you've gone over.

MS. MELE: You can let us, you can let us know, you know.
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CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Well, we could probably -- do we -- Steve, could we tentatively set one up, like, in April, like the 12 th or the $19 t h ?$ Like, Mondays usually work.

MR. HONAN: Yeah. I think what we did last time was pretty good. We started a little bit early, and we got a good couple of solid hours in. And $I$ think it really
helped. And plus, with the workshop meetings, it tends to make some continuity because we're looking at this on a more regular basis. I think it will ultimately result in a quicker conclusion of the site plan review. So I'm all for that. What we could do is maybe tomorrow circulate a proposed date and time, and set it up.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Yeah, we could do that. Dave, what we'll do is, just like we did last time, we'll go through everyone, see what the -- and I think Mondays were usually good because everyone's usually got something on a Tuesday and Thursday, and then we could just go over things that, so that we have the
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whole Board, and we could do, Steve could do the, the webinar again.

MR. HONAN: Yes, I could do that.
MR. ZIGLER: That's fine.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. We could do that for the next one. But Dave, like, I know I'll, you know, just what Gene and Jerry said, you know. One thing we, that was we liked is the map notes. I know we talked about that a lot and getting a lot this stuff in the map notes. And, you know, thanks to the applicant for some of these offsite improvements like that, the one you just did at the end, that drainage for that one pipe going to the Hudson. You know, it wasn't in the plans, but it's something that they're going to do. And something with the sewer line on Hudson, you know. You know, I thank the applicant for that, you know, finding that hundred feet that was missing.

MR. ZIGLER: Well, we don't know exactly how many feet, so don't be --

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: No, we'll say --
MR. ZIGLER: A lot of feet.
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CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: A lot of feet. All
right. So what we'll do is, you want to do
that? We'll just circulate, tomorrow we'll circulate dates for a webinar. And then we'll set something up. And then for the next -- what do you want to do for the next Planning Board meeting, just go over some more reviews?

MS. MELE: Well, if I could,
Mr. Chairman, just a sec.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Yeah.
MS. MELE: I was hoping that at this Planning Board meeting we could set the public hearing for the next Planning Board meeting --

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Oh, okay.
MS. MELE: -- and get that process
started.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right.
MS. MELE: That's one. And then two
other just quick housekeeping comments.
Number one, $I$ just sent Mary a Dropbox link to all of Shea's correspondence back and forth with the DEC and Army Corps about the
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issues that were raised earlier. So it's a large file. But the meat of it is in the, is in the emails. So I'll ask Mary to circulate it to the Board. But you have that now. CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right.

MS. MELE: And finally, I just wanted to mention one thing because $I$ just don't want anybody to be under a misapprehension. After the last meeting, you know, there was a little bit of talk about the gate house, and the residents could show, you know, whatever, and go to the eagle observatory. I spoke to the client afterwards. We haven't exactly figured out, like, the mechanics of the gate house. There may be times when it's manned. There may be times when it's not.

But what we will agree to is that if it is not manned, it will certainly be open to members of the public and signed to go forward to the observatory so that they won't be blocked. So, you know, the manning of that is $I$ think more of a resident issue. But in terms of the public, you know, it will be accessible to that north end of the site.
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CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Oh, okay, good. Thanks, Amy. So I'll go to the Board. Should we -- what do you think about a public hearing for next month, Gene?

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: Well, my opinion is, I mean, things are getting a little easier there. My understanding, there's no more quarantine when you come back from out of state. But it would really be nice if we could have these public hearings in the real world rather than by what we're doing here now with Zoom and webinar.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Right.
BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: It would be nice, you know. I don't know if we're going to be done by next month. But things are easing up there in New York. And maybe we could have a --

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Yeah.
BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: We could have a public -- I mean, this is a big project. It's gone on for years. I mean, I just think, I mean, they've done a fantastic job of getting this act together.
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CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Right.
BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: And getting us
everything we wanted, and they have a lot of good clarifications --

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Right.
BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: -- on what they're doing. And I think the public has a right to hear it.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Right.
BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: And to dispel any apprehension that they may have. I mean, it is what it is. If you have a right to do something, and you cross the $T$ s and dot the Is, so be it.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Right. You know what, Gene? Yeah --

BOARD MEMBER KRAESE: -- do everything here with a webinar. That's just my personal opinion.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: No, you're right. And what I'll need to do, if we can't do it in April, what I have to do is just check with the Town, with the Town, because I know at one time they were trying to set up the,
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the senior room, which is a much larger facility, like, area. But $I$ don't know if they had -- they were setting up with the acoustics and the seating. So I don't -they were working on it. So I don't know if they ever did it.

But $I$ can follow up with that to see if that's something if, you know, if it's good for April. If not, we could do it for May. But just so that we have a safe environment for those people that, you know, aren't comfortable. I think an issue is there's some people that are still uncomfortable going out in public. So we might have to do both, you know, like if we do in person and also webinar. So $I$ still have to, I'll have to talk to the Town with that, and Steve. MS. MELE: Can we at least set it? CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Yeah, we could probably --

MS. MELE: And then logistics. And then, you know, if we have to continue it, we continue it.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Yeah. All right.
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Gene, what do you think? How does the Board feel about getting started on the public hearing next month, just to start getting comments?

BOARD MEMBER ROGERS: I'm in favor of that.

BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON: Yeah, I'm, I'm in favor.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. So I'll
make a motion. I need a motion to set the public hearing --

BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON: I'll make it.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: -- for next
available, which is April $22 n d$, correct?
BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON: I'll make that motion.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: I got a motion. I
need a second.
BOARD MEMBER ROGERS: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. Motion, second. All in favor?
(Response of aye was given.)
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. So we'll
set the public hearing for the 22 nd. As of

Rockland and Orange Reporting rowork@courtreportingny.com - (845) 634-4200

Proceedings
now, we'll do it as a webinar. If I can -if we don't do, you know, in person, we'll set it up as a webinar. And once we get that information, you know, we'll post it.

And the public hearing will be just like every other public hearing, is that we'll start it off with the site plan. We'll, you know, when people raise their hand, we'll recognize them, put on their mics, their things. And, you know, we'll keep it to three minutes so that we can keep things focused and precise. So we'll do it like that. And then tomorrow, we'll find out, we'll get dates, Amy, for our date for the workshop.

MS. MELE: Fabulous. Thank you so much.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right. So we'll see you next, I guess we'll see you next month for the public hearing.

MS. MELE: Great.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Dave, anything else you need, or are you good?

MR. ZIGLER: Yeah. We'll see you at the workshop, also.
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CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Yeah, we'll see you at the workshop. And, you know, thank

Mr. Herskowitz, you know, for the map notes and those offsite improvements that, you know, that we were working on, and with the sewer with the Town Board. So thank you.

MS. MELE: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right.
MR. ZIGLER: We're still waiting for
John O'Rourke to finish his review. But that's something we have to address when he gets finished.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right.
MR. ZIGLER: We'll probably have plenty of things to clean up on the map. So thank you.

MS. MELE: And we'll try and pop in to the ARB also during that timeframe.

CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: Oh, that's right.
And I did speak to Dan this evening. About five, he called me. And he said he was, he was in contact with Mary and the rest of the Board, and they're trying to do some, when they're going to do some meetings next month.
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So they're going to, you know, get through
all that to look at some of the items on
their agenda, so.
MS. MELE: That would be great. I'd
even do it outside if they had a quorum.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: I think he's looking
to do it outside, so.
MS. MELE: Fine.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: So be looking for
that. So thank you.
MS. MELE: We can do it at the site.
We'll bring down a picnic table.
CHAIRMAN GUBITOSA: All right, good.
All right. All right, thank you.
(Time noted: 8:48 p.m.)
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