

TOWN OF WARWICK PLANNING BOARD

July 20, 2011

Members present: Chairman, Benjamin Astorino  
Russell Kowal, Dennis McConnell  
Beau Kennedy  
Laura Barca, HDR Engineering  
John Bollenbach, Planning Board Attorney  
Connie Sardo, Planning Board Secretary

The regular meeting of the Town of Warwick Planning Board was held Wednesday, July 20, 2011 at the Town Hall, 132 Kings Highway, Warwick, New York. Chairman, Benjamin Astorino called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance.

**PUBLIC HEARING OF Bonanza Ranch, LLC.**

Application for Site Plan Approval for the construction and use of removal of existing buildings, driveway improvements, and single-family new dwelling, situated on tax parcel S 19 B 1 L 13 ; project located on the eastern side of State Highway 94/17A 200 feet north of Minturn Road, in the RU zone, of the Town of Warwick, County of Orange, State of New York.

Representing the applicant: Dave Getz from Lehman & Getz Engineering.

The following review comments submitted by HDR:

1. Planning Board to discuss SEQRA.
2. Applicant to discuss project.
3. Conservation Board comments: 07/14/11 The CB supports the strict interpretation of the Ridgeline Overlay District in the Town Code.
4. Architectural Review Board comments: 07/11/11 No comments at this time.
5. OCPD GML Review: 06/24/11; advisory comment that stormwater practices should be in accordance with NYSDEC better site design techniques
6. The proxy section needs to be completed on the Application Form.
7. Plans should be revised to note that the septic system was reviewed and approved by the Town Engineer, Tectonic Engineering, and therefore, no soil testing was witnessed by the Planning Board Engineer, HDR Engineering.
8. Applicant will need to coordinate with NYSDOT; current permit expires 07/31/11.
9. Applicant states that the exposed face of the wall will be covered with stone or wood siding; these details (or a note) should be prominently added to the plan.
10. In accordance with the discussions at the site inspection and the July 11, 2011 workshop, the applicant should show the proposed house at a lower elevation on the site plan drawings (i.e., Visual Analysis, Figure V-1).
11. Declarations shall be recorded for the Ridgeline Overlay and Agricultural Notes.
12. Surveyor to certify that iron rods have been set at all property corners.
13. Payment of all fees.

The following comment submitted by the Conservation Board, dated 7/20/11:

Bonanza Ranch, LLC. – The CB recommends that strict compliance with the Ridgeline Overlay regulations be followed.

The following comment submitted by the ARB: None submitted.

Dave Getz: I believe that we all know that the applicant, Larry Mettler had passed away right around the time when we submitted the last information to you a couple of weeks ago. At this time, they would like to put the application on hold.

Mr. Astorino: Ok.

Dave Getz: The only work they would want to do at this time is the DOT driveway improvements at the entrance and go a bit further into the site where the silo is located. They want to clean up the driveway into there. The disturbance would be under ¼ of an acre.

Mr. McConnell: I thought that Ted had said there couldn't be any disturbance once the SEQR process has started. The driveway, because it is the NYSDOT, John do you recall what Ted had said?

Mr. Bollenbach: It is the existing driveway. They do have a DOT permit for the work.

Mr. McConnell: I think it was just for the 50 feet of it.

Mr. Bollenbach: Yes. It is confined to the 50-foot area.

Mr. McConnell: I thought that was what we had agreed to.

Dave Getz: With approval from the Building Department, if they stay under the ¼ acre disturbance, that would not kick them to the site plan application.

Mr. Astorino: They did get a Demo permit to take down the barns and the house.

Mr. Bollenbach: Yes. They did get that.

Mr. McConnell: Ok. I was just trying to remember what Ted had said.

Mr. Astorino: Ok. There will be no public hearing tonight on the Bonanza Ranch application. We have a letter from Lehman & Getz, dated 7/18/11 stating the application has been put on hold. We have that letter for the record. I understand that the Legal Notice did not go out to the adjoining property owners. It was advertised in the Dispatch. This is a public hearing. If there is anyone in the audience wishing to address the Bonanza Ranch application, please rise and state your name for the record. Let the record show no public comment. This public hearing will be adjourned without date. It will be republished. Letters will be resent to the adjoining property owners.

**Mr. McConnell makes a motion to adjourn the Public Hearing without date.**

Seconded by Mr. Kowal. Motion carried; 4-Ayes.

Dave Getz: Thank you.

**PUBLIC HEARING OF Watchtower Bible & Tract Society of NY, Inc.**

The applications of *Watchtower Bible and Tract Society of NY, Inc.*, for Site Plan Approval and Special Use Permit for the construction and use of a campus of eight buildings for religious use on approximately 45 acres of previously developed land on a 253 acre site, situated on tax parcels S 85 B 1 L 4.1, 4.2, 5.1 and 5.2; parcels located on the southwest side of Long Meadow Road 6,000 feet north of Sterling Mine Road (CR 72), in the LC zone, of the Town of Warwick, County of Orange, State of New York. The Planning Board, acting as Lead Agency under the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQR), adopted a Positive Declaration requiring a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) on 10/7/09 and a Final Scoping Document was adopted on 12/16/09. The Planning Board deemed the DEIS complete for purposes of public and agency review on May 4, 2011 and circulated the DEIS to all Involved and Interested agencies on June 13, 2011. The DEIS is available for review and downloading on the Town of Warwick website at [www.townofwarwick.org](http://www.townofwarwick.org). A SEQR public hearing on the DEIS will be held, in conjunction with the public hearings on Site Plan and Special Use Permit approvals, on 7/20/11. The public comment period on the DEIS will remain open and comments will be accepted until August 3, 2011.

Representing the applicant: Bob Kraulik, Attorney. Bob Pollock, Project Manager. Enrique Ford, Architect.

Connie Sardo: Mr. Chairman, we have just received the certified mailings for the Watchtower public hearing.

Mr. Astorino: Thank you. We have numerous comments tonight from HDR. I am sure you are aware of these comments.

Bob Kraulik: Yes.

Mr. Astorino: I am not going through these comments this evening. I believe this is the first time you are seeing these comments. We will list the comments for the record.

The following review comments submitted by HDR:

**Chapter 3 Geology, Soils, and Topography:**

No.	Date	Comment	Status
1	07/20/11	Four piezometers were installed to monitor water levels and data from two of the locations near the southwestern end of the development exhibit water levels that fluctuated approx. 8 ft (in TB-20) and 4 ft (in TB-11) within a couple months – with seasonal high levels likely associated with a combination of spring runoff and precipitation. An 8 ft seasonal fluctuation is significant and does not appear to be accounted for in the groundwater elevation contour map accompanying Figure 4 in CHA’s report. The Applicant should clarify how this fluctuation will be managed with regard to excavation and the implications after the building is in place given the proximity to Blue Lake and the topographic differences between the lake and the uplands to the south and east.	<b>Incomplete.</b>

No.	Date	Comment	Status
2	07/20/11	The recorded water level in test boring TB-21 also looks to be elevated significantly relative to what is shown on the groundwater elevation contour map – although the value determined from the test boring may represent a perched level and not true static conditions (based on measurements found on the test boring log ground surface is 711 ft and depth to water is 2 ft so water elevation is ~ 709 ft; however Figure 4 has it between 680 & 685 ft GW elev. contours). If this represents the true groundwater elevation, there would be a strong gradient over the relatively short distance between TB-21 area and Blue Lake (709 ft vs. 645 ft GW elevations, respectively). Applicant should clarify these elevations and groundwater contour map.	<b>Incomplete.</b>

**Chapter 5 Air Resources:**

No.	Date	Comment	Status
1	07/20/11	<p>B. Existing Conditions: Page 5-1 –</p> <p>a. 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ particulate matter less than 10 microns is also regulated by federal law.</li> <li>▪ the 2009 PM<sub>10</sub> background value should be listed on page 5-5 and the region that background value is monitored at should be listed in this paragraph.</li> <li>▪ Ambient CO is also monitored in Region 2, which may be closer than Region 4. The “Mobile Source Air Pollution Modeling” report provides a reasoning for using the Region 4 data. This reason should also be provided here, with more detail, for the benefit of the reader, who may not review the appendices.</li> </ul> <p>b. 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph: As stated in page 5-5, the background ozone concentrations for 2009 exceed the standard.</p>	<b>Incomplete.</b>
2	07/20/11	<p>B. Existing Conditions: Page 5-5 –</p> <p>a. The average maximum PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration during a 24-hour period for 2007 to 2009 appears to be 25.2 ug/m<sup>3</sup>.</p> <p>b. As is stated, the NYS DOT EPM requires a PM<sub>10</sub> analysis. The NYS DEC has the following note for the Ambient Air Quality Standard for PM<sub>10</sub>: “Federal standard for PM<sub>10</sub> not yet officially adopted by NYS, but is currently being applied to determine compliance status.” Therefore, since a mobile analysis for the project has been performed, a PM<sub>10</sub> analysis should be included.</p>	<b>Incomplete.</b>
3	07/20/11	<p>B. Existing Conditions: Page 5-7 –</p> <p>a. Table 5-2: the Maximum concentration determined at any receptor should be compared to the NYS DEC Limit, not the average of all the receptors.</p>	<b>Incomplete.</b>

No.	Date	Comment	Status
4	07/20/11	<p>C. Potential Impacts: Page 5-8 –</p> <p>a. Table 5-2 &amp; 5-3: Per the “Mobile Source Air Pollution Modeling” report (pg. 10), PM<sub>2.5</sub> ambient values were obtained from the NYSDEC ambient air quality monitoring results. Since the ambient air quality value for PM<sub>2.5</sub> 24-hour is 25.2 ug/m<sup>3</sup>, it is unclear how the predicted concentrations for PM<sub>2.5</sub> 24-hour are all below 25.2 ug/m<sup>3</sup>.</p> <p>b. Please provide a discussion to explain what factors in the Future Build scenario cause a no increase or even a decrease when compared to the Future No Build Scenario. A discussion is provided in the “Mobile Source Air Pollution Modeling” report but should also be provided in the DEIS chapter for the benefit of the reader, who may not review the appendices.</p>	<b>Incomplete.</b>

#### Comments on Appendix D-1 “Mobile Source Air Pollution Modeling” Report

No.	Date	Comment	Status
1	07/20/11	<p>2.0 Introduction: Page 4 –</p> <p>a. Monitored values for PM<sub>2.5</sub> 24-hour, NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> should be provided.</p> <p>b. Monitored values provided for Lead are in µg/m<sup>3</sup>, not parts per billion (ppb), should revised - quarterly value is 0.069 µg/m<sup>3</sup> versus a standard of 0.15 µg/m<sup>3</sup>.</p> <p>c. Footnote 1: Should add the reason why using a NYC monitoring location is not appropriate for use in the Town of Warwick.</p>	<b>Incomplete.</b>
2	07/20/11	<p>2.2 Intersection Selection: Page 5 –</p> <p>a. As previously stated, the NYSDOT EPM requires a PM<sub>10</sub> analysis. The NYSDEC has the following note for the Ambient Air Quality Standard for PM<sub>10</sub> : “Federal standard for PM<sub>10</sub> not yet officially adopted by NYS, but is currently being applied to determine compliance status.” Therefore, since a mobile analysis for the project has been performed, a PM<sub>10</sub> analysis should be included.</p> <p>b. We believe footnote #3 to be incorrect. MOVES2010 was noticed in the Federal Register on March 2, 2010. Please revise.</p>	<b>Incomplete.</b>

<b>No.</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Status</b>
3	07/20/11	<p>3.1 Microscale Dispersion Modeling: Page 7 –</p> <p>a. Table 1: The surface roughness should be 175 cm. Background PM<sub>2.5</sub> 24-hour value should be 25.2 ug/m<sup>3</sup>.</p> <p>b. Table 1: Wind speed appears twice on the table, line 3 and line 9, not necessary.</p> <p>c. Table 1: Ambient levels for CO are only in 1-hour and 8-hour. Remove “year” from “CO-(year – 1 hour – 8 hour) in the Input column</p>	<b>Incomplete.</b>
4	07/20/11	<p>3.2 Emission Rates: Page 8 –</p> <p>a. The first paragraph states that “Cruise and idle emissions are calculated by use of the U.S.EPA MOBILE6.2 model as modified by NYDOT,” however, emission rates used in the input files do not match the MOBILE6.2 Emission Factor Tables provided by the NYDOT. Please provide table with emission factors used for CO and PM and language on how these values were achieved.</p>	<b>Incomplete.</b>
5	07/20/11	<p>4.1 CAL3QHC Results: Page 12 –</p> <p>a. In paragraph 3, sentence that reads “The peak PM<sub>2.5</sub> results for one hour with the project constructed...”, should say 24-hour not one hour.</p>	<b>Incomplete.</b>
6	07/20/11	<p>5.1 Construction: Page 14 –</p> <p>a. Additional measures to reduce air emissions should be provided, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the implementation of a diesel emissions program, including using grid power for construction equipment as early as practicable;</li> <li>▪ The use of diesel particulate filters (dpf’s);</li> <li>▪ The use of ultra-low sulfur diesel (“ULSD”) fuel (i.e., fuel having less than 15 parts per million (15 ppm) sulfur content) for all equipment having diesel engines; and</li> <li>▪ Limiting idling.</li> </ul>	<b>Incomplete.</b>

**Noise Comments:**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Status</b>
1	07/20/11	The Applicant should clarify if blasting will be included since the construction includes buildings with basements and tunnels.	<b>Incomplete.</b>

<b>No.</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Status</b>
2	07/20/11	The Applicant should clarify if a noise assessment was performed to show compliance with the DEC noise policy and the Town of Warwick Noise Code by addressing noise emissions from 1) construction and 2) operations related to the HVAC system and power generators and vehicles traveling to and from the site.	<b>Incomplete.</b>

### **Chapter 6 Terrestrial and Aquatic Ecology:**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Status</b>
1	07/20/11	USACE must verify, through their Jurisdictional Determination process, that the two cited ephemeral streams are in fact ephemeral and not subject to their jurisdiction.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
2	07/20/11	The Applicant should clarify if there has been any feedback from USACE since their 9/21/10 response on the Jurisdictional Determination application. The Applicant should verify with USACE if any supplemental information is needed to conform to the current delineation protocol as described in the October 2009 document "Interim Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Northcentral and Northeast Region." It was also noted that the wetland delineation took place outside the regional growing season for vegetation and thus the herbaceous species may be under-represented.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
3	07/20/11	There is no definitive statement in the DEIS on whether or not the project as proposed is expected to require wetland/watercourse permits from USACE. USACE is not included in Table 1-2 (Required Approvals) in the Executive Summary. There is a statement (Page 7-2 of the October 2007 PS&S report) that the "project will impact less than one acre of USACE-regulated wetlands".	<b>Incomplete.</b>
4	07/20/11	The 11/30/09 NYSDEC letter in Appendix A-4 cites the need for an Article 15 (Protection of Waters) permit based on the project's proximity to Sterling Forest Lake. Article 15 does not appear in Table 1-2 in the Executive Summary. If the Applicant does not believe an Article 15 Permit is needed it should be stated in the Summary.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
5	07/20/11	There is no comprehensive plant list for the site. Blooming purple loosestrife is apparent in Photograph 6 (Appendix E-3) in the Indiana bat report yet the species does not appear on the plant list. Additionally, there are several plant species (red maple, jewel weed, broadleaf cattail, nut sedge, skunk cabbage, and purple loosestrife) that are cited in the text of Jurisdictional Determination Report that are not cited in DEIS Table 6-1.	<b>Incomplete.</b>

No.	Date	Comment	Status
6	07/20/11	There are several references in the text to improvements that will be made to the Blue Lake Dam, though the need for an NYSDEC Dam Safety Permit is not included in Table 1-2. Applicant should verify if the proposed actions will trigger the need for a Dam Safety Permit.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
7	07/20/11	The Wetlands Map (Sheet WT-1) in Appendix C-2 cites a wetland acreage of 1.051 acres; the DEIS text on Page 7-1 and the updated Ecological Resources Report cite an acreage of 2.9 acres.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
8	07/20/11	The Wetlands Report in Appendix C-2 cites that the wetlands field work was conducted between March 24 and July 30, 2010. The delineation data sheets all cite a date of 24 March and the Photograph Log cites a date of 25 March 2010 (Appendix A-5). The Applicant should clarify what wetlands work was conducted during the balance of the spring and early summer of 2010.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
9	07/20/11	We disagree with the statement on Page 4-7 that “the red-shouldered hawks are relatively tolerant of human disturbance.” According to the species dossier on NYSDEC’s website ( <a href="http://dec.ny.gov/animals/7082">dec.ny.gov/animals/7082</a> ) “Disturbances from humans in the form of off-road vehicles, hunters, horseback riders, and suburbanites in general have pushed red-shouldered hawks in the deepest, wildest areas left. Although some members of the species seem to be unaffected by humans most are secretive and avoid inhabited areas.”	<b>Incomplete.</b>
10	07/20/11	The text on the first page of the Wildlife section of Appendix E-3 states “Wildlife species expected to be found and observed on the Site are listed in Tables 2 through 4”. Tables 2 and 4 cite observed species; the Applicant should clarify is there were additional species expected (such as muskrat, gray fox, ad flying squirrel) but not observed. Clarification is needed on why these regionally common species were not expected to occur on the site.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
11	07/20/11	The scientific names need to be checked in the text and tables. As examples, the scientific name for the red-tailed hawk appears on Pages 1-14 and 6-16 where the scientific name for the red-shouldered hawk is intended. The scientific names for the rainbow trout and yellow perch are also incorrect.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
13	07/20/11	Eastern red bats are cited as being captured (Site WT-01) in the 2010 bat survey, but the species does not appear in Table 4 in Appendix E-3. Additionally, the text on Page 6-15 cites the bat survey was done in 2009 while the bat survey report cites 2010. No bat species are listed in Table 6-2 in the DEIS.	<b>Incomplete.</b>

<b>No.</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Status</b>
14	07/20/11	We assume that the NYSDEC Breeding Bird Atlas was the source for the bird list in Table 3; though there should be a footnote to the table and/or citation in the References (8.0) for the source and Breeding Bird Atlas database (1980 – 85 or 2000 – 05) used.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
15	07/20/11	A detailed tree survey and mapping effort has been conducted for the site and is presented in Appendix E-4. The 8 March 2011 response letter (from PS&S to Watchtower Bible and Tract Society of New York, Inc.) cites that 16 – 17 acres of forested habitat will be cleared for the proposed project. Have the number and species of significant trees proposed for removal and to be retained been quantified? USF&WS typically requires this information to assess potential impacts to Indiana bats, as summarized in their September 2010 “Indiana Bat Project Review Fact Sheet”.	<b>Incomplete.</b>

**Chapter 7 Traffic and Transportation** (these page numbers may be from the DEIS dated March 15, 2011):

<b>No.</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Status</b>
1	07/20/11	Section B, Page 7-1 – The Applicant should clarify which Institute of Transportation Engineering standards is being referenced.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
2	07/20/11	Section B, Page 7-5 – The applicant did not provide a clear quantitative basis for the sensitivity analysis assumptions (including the office trip generation reduction to 60% of the total and the residential generation reduction to 40% of the total). According to the documentation, these estimates are based on “engineering judgment and knowledge of the Project Sponsor’s Patterson facility.”	<b>Incomplete.</b>
3	07/20/11	Section B, Page 7-5 – The revised LOS table would be clearer if the main street left-turns were labeled (e.g. SB-left). That would differentiate them from the side-street stop controlled movement.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
4	07/20/11	Section B, Page 7-5 – The applicant did not provide the requested non-residential (e.g. office space) information for the Patterson, NY facility. Instead they state that, “Since residents work and live on the site, no additional traffic is generated by the office space. The number of residents and dwelling units provide a more accurate basis for comparing site-generated traffic.” Therefore, given how the facility functions, additional information may not be required.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
5	07/20/11	Section B, Page 7-7 – The revised text does not directly address what the proposed public transportation demand is expected to be.	<b>Incomplete.</b>

No.	Date	Comment	Status
6	07/20/11	Section B, Page 7-7 (Accident Data)— a. The Applicant should clarify how many of the accidents occurred along each roadway. b. The Applicant should clarify how many accidents occurred within a 12-month period. c. The Applicant should clarify if there are any roadways that should be considered a high accident location. d. The Applicant should clarify what the accident rate is when compared to other similar roadway facilities. e. If accident rates are above the NYS average, then what appropriate improvements in the roadway should be included, and how much of anticipated reduction will the proposed improvements would make. f. Table A in Appendix F-1 does not provide a summary of the accident data. A summary should be included. g. Paragraph 2—Minimal change in LOS between No-Build and Build may or may not affect the number of accidents. Additional explanation should be provided to justify the following statement, “It is not believed that the Project Sponsor’s project will affect the number of accidents in the area since, as shown in Table 7-2 and Table 7-3, there is minimal impact to the LOS at nearby intersections.”	<b>Incomplete.</b>
7	07/20/11	Section C, Page 7-7 to 7-8 – While text has been moved and adjusted, there is still somewhat limited information provided with regard to the trip generation for the sensitivity analysis.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
8	07/20/11	Section D, Page 7-8 (Mitigation Measures)— a. Provide information regarding the amount of construction truck traffic that would be routed along the specified roadways. b. Provide information regarding construction truck traffic distribution produced by the site during construction period.	<b>Incomplete.</b>

**Appendix F-1: Traffic Impact Study (TIS) by John Collins Engineers, P.C.**

No.	Date	Comment	Status
-----	------	---------	--------

No.	Date	Comment	Status
1	07/20/11	<p>Section 1, Subsection A (Project Description and Location)—</p> <p>a. Paragraph 1—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Typo, 12 building to 12 buildings (plural form), revise text.</li> <li>▪ In the DEIS, Executive Summary, Page 1-3, Proposed Action states that there were eight (8) buildings are proposed. This is inconsistent with the 12 buildings mentioned in the TIS. Clarify and revise text.</li> <li>▪ The number of proposed buildings and square footage area in TIS do not match the proposed buildings and square footage area contained in the DEIS Exec. Summary, Page 1-3. Clarify and revise text.</li> </ul>	<b>Incomplete.</b>
2	07/20/11	<p>Section II, Subsection A (Description of Existing Roadway Network)—</p> <p>a. General Note: Include the field notes/pictures/back up information as to where the descriptions of the roadway were derived.</p>	<b>Incomplete.</b>
3	07/20/11	<p>Section II, Subsection B (Year 2010 Existing Traffic Volumes)—Clarify and revise text.</p> <p>a. Paragraph 1, Page 6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Sentence 1—DEIS section stated that data was collected and analyzed during the Saturday peak, but not listed in this section.</li> <li>▪ Sentence 2—describe the location of ATR along Long Meadow Road and Sterling Mine Road.</li> <li>▪ Sentence 3—If ATR counts were conducted during April and May 2010, include May 2010 in Section B, Page 7-5 of Chapter 7 of DEIS.</li> <li>▪ Six of the seven intersections analyzed are listed in this section. Include the missing intersection of Sterling Mine Rd (CR-72) &amp; Sister Servants Ln/Eagle Valley Road mentioned in DEIS.</li> <li>▪ If the Saturday peak hour was determined to be between 12:30 pm and 1:30 pm and the counts were conducted between 9:00 am and 12:00, explain how the Saturday peak hour counts were determined. Clarify and revise text.</li> </ul> <p>b. Page 7</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Paragraph 2—Saturday Peak Hour should be included in this paragraph.</li> </ul>	<b>Incomplete.</b>

No.	Date	Comment	Status
4	07/20/11	<p>Section II, Subsection C (Accident Data)—</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. General Note—Additional information is described in the DEIS that's not presented in this section. Please clarify and revise text.</li> <li>b. Sentence 2—indicates the accident data collected along three (3) roadways. Provide information regarding the segment(s) of each roadway, where the accident data was obtained.</li> <li>c. Sentence 3—states “Table A which summarizes the accidents”. Table A indicates the details of each accident, include a summary of the accidents (i.e. total each year, total of type of accident, etc.)</li> </ol>	<b>Incomplete.</b>
5	07/20/11	<p>Section II, Subsection D (Public Transportation)—</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. General Note— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Include the frequency of the trains and buses during peak periods.</li> <li>▪ Include the anticipated number or passengers/person trips generated by the project site that would utilize these public transportation modes during which peak hours.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<b>Incomplete.</b>
6	07/20/11	<p>Section III, Subsection A (Year 2010 No-Build Traffic Volumes)—</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Paragraph 1, Page 9—the text indicate a 2% growth rate annually, based upon a review of the background volumes, the rate may be lower. Clarify and revise the text. Also, if the background volume is confirmed to be lower, explain any impacts on the analysis.</li> <li>b. Paragraph 1, Page 9—Describe in further detail the “other” developments in the area.</li> </ol>	<b>Incomplete.</b>
7	07/20/11	<p>Section III, Subsection B (Site Generated Traffic Volumes)—</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Trip generation was based on an existing facility at Patterson, NY, but how were the rates developed (shown in Table 1, HTGR*). Include additional information regarding size of facility, number of buildings, area of office space, number of dwellings, etc.</li> <li>b. The proposed Warwick facility may have more visitor traffic and deliveries as the World Head quarters than the Patterson facility, which is an education facility. Applicant to clarify.</li> <li>c. If the ITE Trip Generation was not utilized, state the reason why they were analyzed.</li> <li>d. What is the percentage of trips internal to the site?</li> <li>e. How was the data collected at the existing Watchtower Farms facility referenced/used?</li> </ol>	<b>Incomplete.</b>

No.	Date	Comment	Status
8	07/20/11	Section III, Subsection C (Arrival and Departure Distributions)— a. Describe how the expected travel patterns for this facility were calculated/derived. b. Describe why the majority of the trips originate from the south.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
9	07/20/11	Section III, Subsection D (Year 2015 Build Traffic Volumes)—See comments from Subsection B & C.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
10	07/20/11	Section III, Subsection E (Description of Analysis Procedures)— a. General Note—State the name of software and version that was utilized to perform the capacity analysis.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
11	07/20/11	Section III, Subsection F (Traffic Impact Analysis Results)— a. Page 13, Paragraph 2—AM Peak hour operates at LOS C and the expected LOS for PM, Sat and Sun is LOS B and A, which is not “similar” to AM Peak. b. Page 17, Paragraph 1, Sentence 2—Only PM Peak has overall LOS B and AM, Sat, and Sun operates at LOS A. c. Page 17, Paragraph 2—misspelled acronym, ASSHTO should be changed to AASHTO. Furthermore, the acronym should be defined including the version and title of publication. Include the analysis/calculation to determine the sight distances. d. Page 18— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Describe the planned development Radha Soami Society/Sister Servants development.</li> <li>▪ Confirm that this intersection was analyzed with a separate left turn lane on County Road 72 and include the direction of the approach.</li> <li>▪ Paragraph 2—there was an overall deterioration of LOS between No-Build and Build. State the deterioration and describe in the text.</li> </ul>	<b>Incomplete.</b>
12	07/20/11	Section III, Subsection G (Results and Recommendations)— a. General Note—Describe the supporting statements why the recommendations are necessary. (i.e. were there any preliminary studies indicating this such as a Signal Warrant, providing a jitney due to a growth in ridership by XX% from existing).	<b>Incomplete.</b>

No.	Date	Comment	Status
13	07/20/11	<p>Section III, Subsection H (Sensitivity Analysis)—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. General Note—Describe why a sensitivity analysis was conducted.</li> <li>b. If it was necessary, describe the results of the analysis.</li> <li>c. Table 1-A—Entry Volume Column (Residential Dwellings)—describe why the peak hour of Adj Street was used rather than the Peak Hour generator.</li> <li>d. Table 1-A—External Trips were calculated to have 60% office space and 40% residential drawings. This is inconsistent with Note 2 and what was mentioned in the TIS and DEIS. Clarify and revise text and analysis.</li> </ul>	<b>Incomplete.</b>
14	07/20/11	<p>Overall General Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Construction Phasing or Activity was not described (i.e. the year or date when the construction would begin, the period of construction, how many truck trips would be generated due to construction, what routes they would take, etc.)</li> <li>b. Appendix C should include field notes and/or plans containing field geometry, signal timing, manual counts.</li> <li>c. Pedestrian and Bicycle activities should be included in the report.</li> <li>d. Describe any parking displacement or existing parking conditions.</li> <li>e. Describe any anticipated special events throughout the year and frequency of events of the site. If there are events, describe the change in overall traffic pattern and operations at the intersections.</li> <li>f. The additional special event text does not provide a quantitative analysis. The study could assess the impacts of special events to determine if traffic mitigation is needed (such as off-duty police officers to direct traffic); however given only three Saturday events per year, a one-hour critical arrival window with 311 inbound vehicles, and dispersed departures, it may not be necessary to do a more detailed analysis.</li> </ul>	<b>Incomplete.</b>
15	07/20/11	<p>Indicate the current land use of the facility. If the Watch Tower decides to sell the property, the trip generated may increase significantly under the tenant. As such a sensitivity analysis should be performed to better understand the full impacts of the proposed square footage of the building(s) and residential dwelling units. Furthermore, the sensitivity analysis should include a scenario without an internal trip generation credit or at a minimum utilize the trip generation credit based upon the ITE Trip Generation Manual.</p>	<b>Incomplete.</b>

No.	Date	Comment	Status
16	07/20/11	There was not a discussion about any possible access improvements to Sterling Mine Road; the Applicant should clarify if any site access improvements (such as turn lanes) are required by the County due to speed, functional class, and volume.	<b>Incomplete.</b>

#### Chapter 8 Community Services and Facilities:

No.	Date	Comment	Status
1	07/20/11	Table 8-1- Add distances to the parks in the table.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
2	07/20/11	Table 8-1 – Section D suggests that Blue Lake may be used for non-motorized boats. Add this resource to Table 8-1, including a distance to the public access. It does not appear that any access to Blue Lake will be provided from the Watchtower site.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
3	07/20/11	Section D- Recreation. Suggest listing the comparison of the suggested amount of recreation and the proposed amount provided. Suggest similar comparison for all of the alternatives, Chapter 16.	<b>Incomplete.</b>

#### Chapter 9 Infrastructure and Utilities – Wastewater Management:

No.	Date	Comment	Status
1	07/20/11	Chapter 9, Page 9-2, last paragraph. Provide minimum sewer slope to be used. Design must ensure that an appropriate slope is used so that required pipe flow capacity and minimum velocity of 2 feet per second recommended in Section 33.41 of the Ten State Standards for Wastewater Facilities are met.	<b>Incomplete.</b>

#### Chapter 13 Visual Character:

No.	Date	Comment	Status
1	07/20/11	Provide sample images of the rooftop platforms for cellular/two way radio and dish-type receiver.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
2	07/20/11	Figure 13-14 & 13-16 – landscaping shown does not match that illustrated on the landscape plan. There seems to be a significant amount of trees filling in the corner, when the plans show all landscaping behind the existing storm drain outlet. Are these trees in the right-of-way? Do these plants affect the storm drain outlet in this location?	<b>Incomplete.</b>
3	07/20/11	Figure 13-14 & 13-16 – Applicant to clarify if the center island is anticipated to be visible from this location.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
4	07/20/11	Figure 13-16 – it appears that there is a light pole, or something similar along the north side of the road, is this correct? Lighting Plan shows light pole in the center island. The same pole is not in Figure 13-14 or 13-18.	<b>Incomplete.</b>

<b>No.</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Status</b>
5	07/20/11	Figure 13-24 - Much of the landscaping illustrated in the simulations looks to be fairly mature. Applicant to clarify how many years to achieve this amount of screening. Consider showing conditions closer to construction growth.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
6	07/20/11	It is stated that the site plan preserves as much existing vegetation as possible. The methods proposed to be used (i.e. provide tree protection details, soil preparation, avoidance of soil compaction) should be clarified.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
7	07/20/11	The Landscape Design section should note anticipated, typical soil preparation for planted areas within disturbed areas (i.e. topsoil, organic matter supplements, soil preparation from construction compaction).	<b>Incomplete.</b>
8	07/20/11	Town Code §164-43.4 requires certain lighting levels: For parking lots with low activity, levels are as follows: 0.8 average illumination, 0.2 minimum, and 4:1 uniformity ratio. Local road illumination of 0.3 - 0.8 average and 6:1 uniformity ratio. a. Add uniformity ratio to Table 13-3. b. The minimum of 0.01 foot-candles for pedestrian walkways is not sufficient. Placement of bollard lighting should maintain adequate pedestrian walkway illumination while not creating glare for drivers on adjacent roadways. c. As the lighting plan may change during site plan approval process, provide design minimums, averages and uniformity ratios to be maintained.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
9	07/20/11	Building entrances are required to have 5 foot-candles at active entrances and 1 foot-candle at in-active entrances.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
10	07/20/11	Page 13-24, first paragraph references Figure 2-6 as SWBP and 700' Ridgeline Overlay District. That is not the case, please update.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
11	07/20/11	Architectural Renderings in Section 2 should be referenced in the Visual Section, as they represent the architectural style of the buildings. Applicant should provide references to the renderings for the parking garage and residence building.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
12	07/20/11	Page 13-45, statement that IBM site employees and visitors are present during daylight hours is incorrect. Winter conditions would include darkness during a typical work day.	<b>Incomplete.</b>

**Chapter 16 Alternatives:**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Status</b>
------------	-------------	----------------	---------------

No.	Date	Comment	Status
1	07/20/11	Section 11, Page 11-1 states 2008 EPA average of solid waste is 4.5 pounds per capita per day. 2009 rates were 4.34 (of which 1.46 is recycled) pounds per capita per day. Updated figures and sources should be used. Table 16-1 should note average pounds per capita per day used in calculations.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
2	07/20/11	Table 16-1 should include solid waste calculations for the No Action alternative. Educational Facility Alternative, explain use of 5 lbs/day over EPA national average of 4.34 lbs/day. As of Right Alternative, verify that 88 tons of disposed solid waste is correct, appears to use total solid waste including recyclables. All calculations should be consistent (either to include recyclables or not).	<b>Incomplete.</b>
3	07/20/11	There are no estimates of recreation space provided in the Educational Facility (Kings College) Alternative. Provide area provided compared to estimated need based on population.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
4	07/20/11	Provide all references for EPA and County based informational statements (i.e. statement that the solid waste generated under Educational Facility Alternative is less than one-half of one percent of solid waste in Orange County).	<b>Incomplete.</b>
5	07/20/11	There are no estimates of recreation space provided in the As of Right Alternative. Provide area required and estimated need based on population.	<b>Incomplete.</b>

**Appendix M: Technical Review of the Preliminary Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (issue date March 15, 2011)**

No.	Date	Comment	Status
1	07/20/11	SWPPP document needs the stamp and signature of a New York State Licensed Professional Engineer.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
2	07/20/11	Each plan sheet requires the stamp and signature of a New York State Licensed Professional Engineer.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
3	07/20/11	Appendix A – Provide a copy of a filled out and signed Notice of Intent (NOI) Form. The NOI should also have the signature of the NOI preparer (NYS Licensed Professional Engineer).	<b>Incomplete.</b>
4	07/20/11	The Applicant should provide an MS4 Acceptance Form with the appropriate information filled-in.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
5	07/20/11	Page 2-8 of the SWPPP (Sequence of Construction) – The SWPPP states that “total disturbance will be kept at a 10-acre maximum at any given time, based on NYSDEC regulations”. Part II.C.3 of the SPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges (GP-0-10-001) states “The <i>owner or operator</i> of a <i>construction activity</i> shall not disturb greater than five (5) acres of soil at any one time without prior written authorization from the Department.” This will impact the Applicant’s current proposed phasing for the site.	<b>Incomplete.</b>

No.	Date	Comment	Status
6	07/20/11	<p>The Applicant should provide full-size plans for the pre and post development drainage areas. The full-size plans should contain the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Drainage area name and size</li> <li>b. Time of concentration paths broken up by flow type.</li> <li>c. All reaches and ponds in the HydroCAD analysis should contain the same naming on the Drainage Area maps, for ease of reviewing the HydroCAD analysis.</li> </ul>	<b>Incomplete.</b>
7	07/20/11	<p>The Grading and Drainage Plans included with the SWPPP should include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Legend</li> <li>b. Each of the drainage structures should be named, and contain information for the rim elevation, and inverts. This information could also be provided in table format.</li> <li>c. Pipe materials and sizes should be clearly indicated.</li> <li>d. Locations of all proposed stormwater management practices (including green infrastructure practices)</li> </ul>	<b>Incomplete.</b>
8	07/20/11	<p>The Applicant should include Detail Sheets in the SWPPP which include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Catch Basin Detail</li> <li>b. Pipe trenching detail</li> <li>c. Representative cross-section and profile drawings of ALL proposed stormwater management practices and conveyances (e.g., Green Roof, Riparian Buffers, Porous Asphalt, Permeable Pavers, Stormwater Planters, Sand Filters, Bioretention Areas, Water Quality Units, Detention Basin, Infiltration Chambers, etc.). The details should be specific to the application, and include inverts, and water surface elevations for design storms (if applicable).</li> <li>d. Specific maintenance requirements for each of the proposed stormwater management practices should be provided.</li> <li>e. Details for all proposed erosion controls (e.g. silt fence, stabilized construction entrance, diversion swale, soil stockpile, sediment trap, etc.)</li> </ul>	<b>Incomplete.</b>
9	07/20/11	<p>The Applicant should provide profile drawings for the drainage system.</p>	<b>Incomplete.</b>
10	07/20/11	<p>Provide a copy of the logs for the soil borings and infiltration tests conducted on site in the SWPPP.</p>	<b>Incomplete.</b>

No.	Date	Comment	Status
11	07/20/11	SWPPP Table 3-1 (pg. 3-19) – The table indicates only one Drainage Area to DP-3, which is DA-3. However, Figure 3-9 as well as Sheet C-007 of the plans show three sub-areas (DA-3A, DA-3B and DA-3C). This table should be updated to show how the WQv for these sub-areas have been met or exceeded.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
12	07/20/11	SWPPP Table 3-1 (pg. 3-19) – The table is unclear in indicating the <u>required</u> Runoff Reduction Volume for each area. This should be clearly provided in the table, and followed by the <u>provided</u> Runoff Reduction Volume.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
13	07/20/11	The Applicant should provide supporting calculations for <u>each individual</u> stormwater management practice to show how they meet the Water Quality Volume or Runoff Reduction Volume requirements. Right now, the SWPPP only shows how the required amounts are exceeded with a brief explanation of how the requirements were met. For example, there are several green roofs proposed. Calculations should be provided for each one to show how much Water Quality Volume or Runoff Reduction Volume it provides for the drainage area it is located in.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
14	07/20/11	The Applicant should provide supporting calculations to show how the Channel Protection Volume requirements have been met for the site.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
15	07/20/11	Appendix D (Pre-Developed Conditions Analysis) – Reach 2R: Storm System is not modeled with any defining characteristics (pipe sizing, slope, inverts, etc.). However, page 3-24 of the SWPPP indicates a storm system containing pipe diameters of 15” and 24”. If the existing pipe system runs full for any of the design storms, the peak runoff to the design point could conceivably change. The Applicant should accurately model this reach in HydroCAD.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
16	07/20/11	Appendix E (Post-Developed Conditions Analysis) – The Applicant is using the following Curve Numbers (CN value) and should explain how each of these have been selected:  a. CN of 48 for the green roof b. CN of 74 for the pervious pavers c. CN of 61 for bioretention sand soil medium d. CN of 61 for storm planter e. CN of 74 for porous asphalt	<b>Incomplete.</b>
17	07/20/11	The Applicant should specify in the landscaping plans the planting types that are to be used for each green roof.	<b>Incomplete.</b>

No.	Date	Comment	Status
18	07/20/11	The Applicant is using Stormwater Planters in several locations. The Applicant should indicate how much impervious area is being directed toward the planters. Page 5-100 of the NYS Stormwater Design Manual (August 2010) indicates that stormwater planters should not receive drainage from impervious areas greater than 15,000 square feet. Additionally, the Applicant should provide a means of directing excess stormwater flow to a secondary treatment system or storm drain system.	<b>Incomplete.</b>
19	07/20/11	Page 5-101 of the NYS Stormwater Design Manual indicates that all stormwater planters should be located a minimum distance of 10 feet from structures. Several of the stormwater planters shown on Sheet C-007 show the planters to be immediately adjacent to structures and should thus be relocated.	<b>Incomplete.</b>

The following comment submitted by the Conservation Board, dated 7/20/11:

Watchtower Bible & Tract Society of NY, Inc. - The CB will submit any comments it has separately on or before the August 3, 2011 deadline. The CB has been impressed with the quality of the site visits, the outreach to the PB, CB and ARB, and the comprehensiveness of the DEIS.

The following comment submitted by the ARB:

Watchtower Bible & Tract Society of NY, Inc. – None submitted.

Mr. McConnell: This SEQR comment has been prepared by Mr. Ted Fink, dated 7/18/11: Here are the procedures that should be followed for the public hearing on the Watchtower DEIS:

1. *The NY State SEQR environmental impact statement procedures are being followed for the proposed Watchtower project. This included issuance of a Positive Declaration by the Planning Board on October 7, 2009, meaning that the applicant was required to prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Identifying the full scope (or contents) of the DEIS was conducted with a public scoping session on November 18, 2009. Interested and involved agencies were invited to provide input on the DEIS scope, and the Planning Board, after carefully reviewing the document with its consultants, then adopted a Final Scoping Document on December 16, 2009.*
2. *The applicant prepared the DEIS, based upon the Final Scoping document, submitted it for a completeness review, and after providing modifications requested by the Planning Board and its consultants, accepted the DEIS as complete on May 4, 2011. The DEIS was then distributed to all Involved and Interested agencies for comment.*
3. *The DEIS comment period will close on August 3, 2011. Any oral comments made tonight can be supplemented by written comments until the close of the comment period.*
4. *The Public hearings held tonight include a hearing on the DEIS (which will be closed tonight), as well as the proposed Site Plan and Special Use Permit applications. The*

*Planning Board will determine whether the two public hearings on the Site Plan and Special Use permit applications will be adjourned or closed tonight.*

5. *Following the close of the public comment period on the DEIS, a Final Environmental Impact Statement will be prepared that will include a response to all comments on the DEIS and any modifications or corrections that need to be made to the DEIS. There will be a period of public consideration of the Final EIS after this document has been prepared by the Planning Board and adopted.*
6. *After the period of public consideration of the Final EIS, the Planning Board will prepare a Findings Statement. This is a written finding that certifies that all appropriate environmental review procedures have been taken and that the environmental impacts of the project have been avoided or mitigated to the greatest extent practicable.*
7. *After the SEQOR review process concludes with the adoption of the Findings Statement, then the Planning Board will proceed with its review of the proposed Site Plan and Special Use Permit applications.*

Mr. Bob Pollock: (He gives a presentation of the Watchtower project by showing renderings of the buildings and site.) Pointing out on the site rendering, it shows where the project is located. It illustrates some of the areas around the site for instance; the Sterling Forest State Park, Tranquility Ridge, and the Ringwood State Park in New Jersey. Then, there is Tuxedo Park, Woodlands Development, IBM which is across the lake, and then there is a small residential development on top of Sterling Lake. Looking at the rendering, the property that is highlighted in red is the property in question that we are talking about. Looking at the project, there are about 75 acres on the northeast side of Long Meadow Road. A portion of the property is quite steep. A streamline runs through a portion of the property next to the road. It is the same side of the road where the Woodlands Development is located. What we are going to be concentrating on is a portion of the approximately 175 acre parcel on the southwestern side of Long Meadow Road where International Nickel had their operation for a number of years. This property has had quite a history in the last 25 years with DEIS being prepared. Back in 1989, there was an approval for 150-lot subdivision. After the DEIS, a Findings Statement was prepared for that. Then it was purchased by Kings College to redevelop the property for a 1500 student college with about 220 teachers. Of this 168-acre lot, it would have covered about 102 acres. Then before that was brought to fruition, it was then sold to Touro College who then assembled this property with the property across the street. Although they came up with several plans to expand, none of them was actually formally submitted. Watchtower has now purchased the property. We purchased the property about 2 years ago. We have been working towards a development on the property of a World Headquarters of Jehovah's Witnesses. When we started analyzing the property, it became evident why that it had so much attention over the years. It has been identified in the County Plan as a place for future development. The chief reason for that is that it has great availability of water and municipal sewer. The water facility is capable of producing about half million gallons per day. The project that we are proposing, which would be a move in of about 850 people, would use a significant portion of the allotted water and sewer that was deeded to the property years ago. What is proposed is a development of buildings for a living and working arrangement. When we first talked to the Planning Board about it, we mentioned it would be about 850 people. Then the question came about what would happen if we grow? When we started analyzing the environmental sensitivity of the site, looking at the rendering, you would see an overlay of a number of those sensitivities. The largest overlay is the Wallkill Southern Bio-Diversity Overlay. It covers this portion of the main 168-acre property to the other side of the road and to the lake itself. The Town has a Ridgeline Overlay. Then, there are some steep slopes. Then, there is an easement setback at the end of the property line

away from the lake. When you take all of those things away, what you would have for reasonable development is the area that we are developing. What we had done in developing the DEIS is determine that because this is a compact site, design the expansion into the building. Although the move in is 850 people, we designed it so that it could expand in the future as needed to 1000 people without building more buildings. All of the facts and figures in the DEIS are based on the 1000 figure, not the 850 figure. There is quite a bit of capacity to the water plant. There is a certain amount of water allocated to this property, 140,000 gallons per day. Our estimated average is about 85,000 gallons per day. We do expect that there may be peaks at 140,000 gallons. We will be using most of the water that has been allocated to the property. Similarly for the wastewater plant, it is capable of handling about 150,000 gallons per day. Right now, they are only operating with about 20,000 gallons. This would add about 80,000 gallons to that. It would bring it up closer to where the operation would be more regular for that plant. As far as the development, in addition to having this developed with buildings for this World Headquarters, there is going to be a number of remediation points. The old INCO facility had a very responsible use of the land. It was a lab that dealt with metal and they had an onsite sewage treatment plan. There were some contamination found in this area regarding the metal. As part of this, all of that will be remediated. The soils would be dug up and removed. It would be carted off to a safe facility. It would be replaced with clean soil. In addition, there are a number of unsightly and dangerous areas around the site. Here is a picture of the old treatment plant. In the picture, there is an old water tank that INCO use to use for their firewater. Now, it is no longer needed. United Water has a half a million-gallon tank at the top of the hill. It would take care of both the fire and the needs for the site. Looking at the photo, along the electric ROW, there is a big old sub-station that INCO used. We talked to the power company. They agreed that they could remove that. They could give us a sub-station more to the size of what we would need. The buildings themselves have been an attractive nuisance for vandals for the last 2 years. We have secured them and made those buildings water tight for the present time. Those buildings would also be removed for this development. I would like to draw your attention to the buildings that are there now. They are very a light cream color. What is interesting in the wintertime, when you look at them from across the lake on how they appear. I just wanted to mention that to you so you could remember that in the future. As the site is developed, one of the other benefits that is going to be brought to it is that it is going to affect it in a positive way is drainage for the site. Right now with the existing facility, there is about 7 acres of impervious surface. With the addition that we are planning, that would go from 7 acres to 13 acres of impervious surface. There will be a number of buildings that will have flat roofs. Those flat roofs would have vegetative roofs. That would reduce the stormwater. It would also reduce the heat. This large building and the residents building would have the vegetative roofs. In addition, there would be a barrier that would be restored around the lake and around the ACOE wetland. In order to handle the stormwater, rather than using the standard approach that they used the last 20 years with just having a detention basin, the water would be slowed down and filtered into the ground through a series of stormwater planters, bio-retention basins, and underground chambers. Those are just some of the things that we would be doing to improve the drainage. The main approach to the building and over to the truck dock would be regular paving. But, then the extensions that are primarily for residential traffic or foot traffic would be of permeable paving. That would also reduce the runoff. There would be quite an improvement on getting the water back into the ground. Regarding the landscaping, this will not be a golf course style landscaping setup. This would be developed in the wooded atmosphere. To the extent possible, the existing trees would remain. Where the trees could be restored, they would be restored along the front. There won't be any large lawn area. The landscaping would be all using native plants. We are going to reuse many of the boulders that are existing around the site. Where there are retaining walls they

would be made out of the rocks that are on the site. We have one large retaining wall over where the tennis court is located. That retaining wall would be a vegetative wall. You won't see a concrete retaining wall. The landscaping and the lighting is very sensitive to where this is in a park like setting. The lighting would be a low level lighting with full cutoff lighting. You would not see a glow from the development. Since it is in the park area, the people in Sterling Forest Park asked about how it would look from off site. We had done an extensive viewshed analysis that has been incorporated into the DEIS. All of the trails between the facility, Greenwood Lake, and Sterling Lake were examined to see if they would be viewing the facility from those trails. It turned out that there is none. There are a number of offsite views from the hills beyond some of the trails. You would have to do quite a bit of bush whacking in order to get up to those points. There is a view spot along Long Meadow Road near the entrance. In the wintertime, there will be partial views of some of the buildings. The one public place that the development would be visible is from the NYS boat launch that is across the lake. As part of the DEIS, we had done a viewshed analysis of what the existing buildings look like. These buildings are a light yellow. Because of the reflection around it, it really appears gray. We have responded to the Planning Board's and ARB's concerns about the color. Again, since it is on the north facing side, the colors will reflect some of the colors around them. That would occur both in the winter time and summer time. Looking at the rendering, here is a view from the land that is across the way. To make it that you could see the buildings, we zoomed in where you could see the existing buildings somewhat and see the tops of them. This is a winter time shot. There are little glimpses over a wider period. But, in no way does it seem to spoil the effect.

Mr. McConnell: In the top photograph, I am seeing some light colors. Is that dirt?

Bob Pollock: This is that large area of grass.

Mr. McConnell: Ok. That is a grassy area. That is not the buildings. The buildings are beyond that.

Bob Pollock: These are the buildings that are beyond that.

Mr. McConnell: Ok.

Bob Pollock: Because there is this large open area of grass, what we tried to do and we had shared it with the Board at the site visit, we had taken the 2 main residences and separated them so that the views from the lake don't look right at the buildings. It is looking at an area that is between the buildings. We think we have done all that we could to try to improve and maintain minimum impact from this public space. That ends my presentation. I will now turn it over to Enrque Ford the Architect. He will give a presentation on the architectural aspects of it.

Enrque Ford: At a starting point, it is worth noting a few key design elements and thoughts that went into the actual design solution on this particular facility. The first, we felt it was important to respond to the context of the community. The scale, texture, the design elements that are commonly seen so that this complex doesn't become a pre-designed element that is just planted with no regard to this context. Secondly, on a much more intimate scale, this is rather a unique site. It has some very special natural features that we feel are worth acknowledging and responding to. On top of that, there are certain values that Watchtower as an organization brings to the site that we feel enhances some of the advantages that are already there. The primary one that you would see manifest throughout the design is

Watchtower's belief for responsible stewardship. That is driven primarily by the fact that unlikely a typical developer, we are going to design it, build it, maintain it, and we are going to live in it. We have more so than your average developer inherent interest for responsible stewardship when it comes to our property. The site plan that was developed demonstrates those core values as Mr. Pollock mentioned by the area that is developed with the buildings. We started off with the redevelopment of the existing developed space. We begin with the entry onto the site which reuses the existing entry quite concurrently. The site of the new buildings relative to the entry creates an esthetic buffer so that from the road you would see none of the proposed development. You start off with acknowledging the environment and you preserve that sense of open space that you currently have on this unique site. As you curve up the entry road, you approach the first of 4 zones that are organized onto this site so that it meets the pragmatic needs in a way that it acknowledges the scale that is in this particular area. The first of these zones is what we would call the public zone. Looking at the rendering that is illustrated here in the entry, as you drive around the entry and you make a turn into the courtyard, what your attention would be focused towards is a main lobby which is providing a sense of arrival and a sense of space. It has an emblematic Watchtower on the right where our office is. On the left where our support service is, it is designed around a courtyard theme. If you notice the scale of the buildings, they are designed to reflect that lower scale that is emblematic of the development here in this particular community. As to anchor the buildings to this site to reflect some of the core features that Mr. Pollock mentioned with the natural rocky site, you will notice that the rock base makes the buildings reflect more of an organic architectural theme. We also chose in response to comments from the Planning Board and the ARB earth tones that mute the buildings to help them blend into the natural landscape. Another aspect of this initial zone with this entry courtyard is the visitor's parking lot. This particular visitor's parking lot reflects our efforts to very responsibly address the needs with the least impact to the site. It is a multi-level 4 level parking structure. For the majority of the use of this facility, based on our current number of visitors to the site, we would only be using the top level of this parking structure. On the days that we would have more guests, instead of increasing the amount of impervious surface, we take advantage of a natural inclination of the site. We have several levels going down the low grade that you would then circulate down and fill up the parking structure as needed. That would create a level surface. This particular building that is on the site plan seems rather large, but you will notice that a great deal of effort has been put into the design to articulate the different elements and the facades. Looking at the rendering, it is broken up as you can see. It is broken to the scale that a person walking along really is not overwhelmed at all by the size of this building. These buildings will also be screened by a buffer of trees. That is also noted in the DEIS. That was the first zone in this design concept. The 2<sup>nd</sup> zone is really an all utilitarian one that is created by the overlap of this multi-purpose maintenance building, which would serve as the mechanical heart of the site. That is where you would have the boiler plant and a generator plant. Also with this building, we take advantage of in this building as it backs up against the hill to provide some enclosed residents parking. There are some indoor recreation. It also ties in with a service plaza that serves as a dock for this service building. As you progress into the various zones, you also progress through a series of privacy zones leading to the most private zone, which is the residential zone at the western portion of the site. The residential zone responds very nicely to some of those core themes that we had mentioned. First of all, breaking up the residential block into a series of smaller scale buildings. The residential buildings use the same earth tone theme. They assemble the pallet of materials that reflect the site in a rather interesting manor.

Mr. Ford goes on discussing the various renderings of the layout of all the buildings and how they would be situated, the fenestration and how they blend in with the natural environment. He goes on discussing the 4<sup>th</sup> zone which would be a very private recreational area and discusses the visual impacts of it. All of the zones are also connected by a consistent sustainable design approach that starts from the design of all the buildings, through material choice, mechanical systems, and through the components that are used in the buildings. A stated goal that Watchtower has established for this project is that they would like to achieve at least 3 globes out of the possible of 4 globes by using the green globe sustainable design rating system. He goes on discussing that the green globe system is like a lead system. The design team would be the only one that would be responsible to tell the owner whether or not they make that goal with the green globe system. The Watchtower's Walkkill facility has used the green globe system. It worked out very well with that project. They believe with this proposed Watchtower facility, it would be even more successful than the Walkkill project. That is the project that we are presenting.

Bob Pollock: I would like to mention that the property has been taxed exempt for the last 20-years through the Kings College, Touro College, and now with Watchtower. It will remain taxed exempt. The complex that has been proposed is a live and work in environment. Many services are being provided on site because of the attention that is being given to detail and our continued communication with the Fire Services, Police Services, and some of the others in the community. This should have very minimal effect on the community services. In addition, as Mr. Ford had mentioned about the 4-level parking garage that would be primarily for visitors. This is because it is a World Headquarters, it would be open to the public or tourists. It is going to have a very nice museum in the Visitors Center. As it has been realized in some of our other complexes, it will be a tourist center, as it is highlighted in the DEIS. We expect that the direct expenditures of the tourist would be an addition to the actual construction cost and the operational cost of the facility. The direct expenditures used by tourists in the area would be about 7-1/2 Million Dollars. There would be a definite financial benefit to the project eventhough the property itself is taxed exempt.

Mr. Astorino: Do any Board members or Professionals have any comments? Do you have the renderings of the buildings and the maintenance facility?

Bob Pollock: No. We didn't bring those tonight.

Mr. Astorino: Ok. That is fine.

Mr. McConnell: I am impressed.

Mr. Astorino: Yes. I would like to say that every aspect we brought up at the site visit from this Board, the Conservation Board, and the ARB was fully intertwined. I appreciate that. That was very nice. Is there anyone in the audience wishing to address the DEIS, Preliminary Site Plan Approval, and Preliminary Special Use Permit on the Watchtower Facility? Let the record show no public comment. John, could we close the public hearing on the DEIS?

Mr. Bollenbach: Yes.

**Mr. McConnell makes a motion to close the Public Hearing on the DEIS.**

Seconded by Mr. Kennedy. Motion carried; 4-Ayes.

**Mr. Kowal makes a motion to adjourn the Preliminary Site Plan Approval & Special Use Permit Public Hearing without date.**

Seconded by Mr. Kennedy. Motion carried; 4-Ayes.

Mr. Astorino: There will be a written comment period for the DEIS until August 3, 2011. If anyone has any written comments on the DEIS, please get those comments in by August 3, 2011. Thank you.

Bob Pollock: Thank you.

**Other Considerations:**

1. Planning Board to discuss cancelling the 7/25/11 Work Session & 8/3/11 Planning Board Meeting due to no submittals.

Mr. McConnell makes a motion to cancel the 7/25/11 Work Session and the 8/3/11 Planning Board Meeting.

Seconded by Mr. Kowal. Motion carried; 4-Ayes.

2. **United Methodist Church / McFarland Lot Line Change** – Letter from Bob Krahulik, Esq., dated 6/21/11 addressed to the Planning Board in regards to the United Methodist Church/McFarland Lot Line Change – requesting a 6-Month Extension on Conditional Final Approval of a proposed Lot Line Change, situated on tax parcels SBL #54-1-2 & SBL #54-1-25.1; parcels located on the northern side of Forester Ave., 200 feet north of State Highway 17A & Campsite Way, in the SL zone. Conditional Final Approval was granted on, 12/1/10. *The applicant has stated that the extension is requested because they need time to finalize conditions associated with the approval for the purpose of completing the subdivision map and attending to other technical revisions involving the application.* The 6-Month Extension becomes effective on, 6/1/11.

Mr. McConnell makes a motion on the United Methodist Church/McFarland Lot Line Change application, granting a 6-Month Extension on Conditional Final Approval of a proposed Lot Line Change. SBL # 54-1-2 & 54-1-25.1. Conditional Final Approval was granted on, 12/1/10. The 6 Month Extension becomes effective on, 6/1/11.

Seconded by Mr. Kennedy. Motion carried; 4-Ayes.

3. **Lands of Kirk Rother** – Letter from Kirk Rother, dated 7/6/11 addressed to the Planning Board in regards to the Lands of Kirk Rother Subdivision – requesting **3<sup>rd</sup> Re-Approval** of Final Approval of a proposed 2-Lot cluster subdivision, situated on tax parcel SBL # 42-1-110.4; parcel located on the western side of C.R. 1, 1885 feet north of Waterbury Road, in the RU zone. Conditional Final Approval was granted on, 7/16/08. The 2<sup>nd</sup> Re-Approval of Final Approval was granted on 7/22/10 became effective on 7/16/10. *The applicant has stated that given the current economic climate the significant effect it has had on their income, they are unable to afford the monies necessary to satisfy the conditions of final approval at this time. This includes payment of parkland fees, other fees and legal services for preparation of the necessary legal documents.* The 3<sup>rd</sup> Re-Approval of Final Approval becomes effective on, 7/16/11 subject to the conditions of final approval granted on, 7/16/08.

Mr. McConnell makes a motion on the Lands of Kirk Rother application, granting **3<sup>rd</sup> Re-Approval** of Final Approval for a proposed 2-Lot cluster subdivision, situated on tax parcel SBL # 42-1-110.4; parcel located on the western side of C.R. 1, 1885 feet north of Waterbury Road, in the RU zone, of the Town of Warwick, County of Orange, State of New York, subject to the conditions of Final Approval granted on, 7/16/08. (See attached). The 3<sup>rd</sup> Re-Approval of Final Approval becomes effective on, 7/16/11.

Seconded by Mr. Kennedy. Motion carried; 4-Ayes.

4. **Planning Board Minutes of 6/15/11** – Planning Board to Approve the 6/15/11 Planning Board Minutes.

Mr. McConnell makes a motion to Approve the Planning Board Minutes of 6/15/11.

Seconded by Mr. Kowal. Motion carried; 4-Ayes.

### **Correspondences:**

1. Letter to the Planning Board from the Town Board regarding Re-Zoning of the Mid-Orange property to the OI zone.

Mr. Astorino: That correspondence is in our packets. I believe it is a wise move by the Town Board.

Mr. Bollenbach: There is a request for input from the Planning Board to get their response if they have a favorable recommendation. This is for the Mid-Orange Correctional Facility located on State School Road. It is currently zoned RU. The Town Board is planning on holding a public hearing on this proposed change to OI (Office/Industrial) zone.

Mr. Astorino: I think that is a good idea.

Mr. McConnell: How much of that parcel fronts Kings Highway?

Mr. Bollenbach: I don't believe any of it does.

Mr. McConnell: If that were rezoned for OI, there would have to be some improvement to access in there.

Mr. Bollenbach: No. It would still be State School Road which really bisects the property. Material Processing/Sapanaro is located on the left hand side and Mid-State Lumber, is located on the right hand side entering from Kings Highway. These other properties are already in the OI zone.

Mr. McConnell: Out of 1,000 acres, do we know how much of that would be developable? Mr. Sweeton, do you know?

Supervisor Sweeton: There are estimates of less than 100 acres.

Mr. McConnell: Ok.

Mr. Bollenbach: That is pretty much where the complex is right now. It would be isolated with wetlands from adjoining areas. I think it would be very well suited. Is the Board in favor of giving a favorable recommendation?

Mr. McConnell: Yes.

Mr. McConnell makes a motion to give a Favorable Recommendation to the Town Board from the Planning Board on the Re-Zoning of the Mid-Orange property to the OI zone and authorize the Chairman to forward a formal recommendation.

Seconded by Mr. Kowal. Motion carried; 4-Ayes.

### **Privilege Of The Floor For Agenda Items!!**

Mr. Astorino: If there is anyone in the audience wishing to address any of the agenda items, please rise and state your name for the record. Let the record show no public comment.

**Mr. Kowal makes a motion to Adjourn the July 20, 2011 Planning Board meeting.**

Seconded by Mr. Kennedy. Motion carried; 4-Ayes.