### TOWN OF WARWICK PLANNING BOARD

PLANNING BOARD DISCUSSION AND PUBLIC HEARING

Parcel S 83 B I L 2 and L 5.1;

Old Forge Road, LLC,

Property Location: 57-61 Old Forge Road, Town of

Warwick, County of Orange, State of New York

Warwick Town Hall 132 Kings Highway Warwick, New York

April 16, 2025 7:00 p.m.

PLANNING BOARD DISCUSSION AND PUBLIC HEARING

#### APPEARANCES:

CUDDY & FEDER, LLP Attorneys for Applicant 445 Hamilton Avenue, 14th floor White Plains, New York 10601 BY: NEIL ALEXANDER, ESQ.

RECEIVED

APR 3 0 2025

TOWN OF WARWICK PLANNING/ZBA

CYNTHIA WHITE, R.P.R., Official Court Reporter

# BOARD APPEARANCES:

BEN ASTORINO, Chairman

ROGER SHOWALTER, Vice Chairman

BO KENNEDY, Board Member

RICHARD PURCELL, Board Member

DENNIS MCCONNELL, Board Member

VIKKI GARBY, Board Member

CONNIE SARDO, Planning Board Secretary

ALSO PRESENT FOR THE PLANNING BOARD:

ROBERT KRAHULIK, ESQ., Planning Board Attorney
LAURA A. BARCA, P.E., Town Engineer

DANIELLE DREYER, Planning Board Analyst

MICHAEL MUSSO, HDR ENGINEERING

# PRESENT FOR THE APPLICANT:

KEITH WOODRUFF, CFM, CPESC, Engineering & Surveying Properties

THE CHAIRMAN: Old Forge Road, LLC.

Application for Site Plan Approval and Special Use
Permit for the use and interior renovations of the
existing 87,000 plus or minus square foot buildings
for an Institution of Higher Learning, a/k/a Beth
Medrash Meor Yitzchok (BMMY) with 200 students, 12 to
18 professors/administrators with overnight
accommodations, Use Group 84, and parking area
improvements situated on tax parcels Section 83,
taxable lot three, and of Sterling Pines Road, 57
through 61 Old Forge Road in the LC zone of the Town
of Warwick, County of Orange, State of New York.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Excuse me. It's really hard for us to hear back here. Are you able to get closer to the mic or maybe even turn it up a little.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And just slow down a little bit.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure. Absolutely.

All right. So representing the Applicant.

MR. WOODRUFF: Keith Woodruff from

# Engineering --

1.5

THE CHAIRMAN: Keith, if you want to come here. I'd love to get it on the record. We have the mic here also.

MR. WOODRUFF: Keith Woodruff from

Engineering and Surveying Properties, as well as Neil

Alexander from Cuddy & Feder.

1.7

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can't hear you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Try that again.

MR. WOODRUFF: Keith Woodruff from Engineering and Surveying Properties, and Neil Alexander from Cuddy & Feder.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

So we are going to comments. We're going to just change this up, because our board members -- our professionals -- okay, so we're going to do Applicant to discuss project.

MR. WOODRUFF: The property is located at 57-61 Old Forge Road. It's a 7.01-acre piece of property of two tax parcels, 83-1-2 and 83-1-5.1.

The properties are shown on the plans in the red line.

The property in question was purchased from NYU in 2021, for which NYU put it up on sale around 2018. Since 2018 until the property changed hands in 2021 it sat dormant with no use or occupancy.

The Applicant prepared an application to the Board in December of 2023 for the occupancy of the existing 87,000 square-foot building, for which it's a

mix of a two-and-three-story type of construction, brick and mortar.

The front building being the original construction in the 1920s, the second phase of the building construction was done in the 1960s, and the subsequent three-story portion of the rear was constructed in the 1970s.

NYU operated the facility as the Nelson Institute of Environmental Medicine.

The property in question is in the LC zone.

It's also within the Ridgeline Overlay District and the Biodiversity Conservation District.

The re-occupancy of the property is an approved use within the Town zoning code as use number 84 as an Institution of Higher Learning.

As proposed, we are going to utilize the existing parking facility, which is currently split between the existing building and the lower parking lot which NYU had constructed over the years of their operation.

There currently is the existing three curb cuts, two in the upper portion and one in the lower portion for the lower parking lot.

As calculated on the plans, we had anticipated a required 63 parking spaces to support

2.3

the 23 teachers, 12 administrative staff, eight support staff, and 20 possible visitors for which we are providing 78 parking spaces, inclusive of four ADA or handicapped accessible parking spaces split up in two different locations.

The proposed improvements. There is five areas of impervious expansion as shown on the plans in pink, for which there is a 2.56 acres of existing impervious on the 7.01-acre property. Those five acres of impervious expansion will add approximately 2,055 square feet of impervious surfaces.

To offset that additional impervious, we will be removing one area for which the lower part of the parking lot was previously gravel of approximately 11,396 square feet or 0.26 acres, which is shown in blue on those plans as well.

The total area of disturbance for the development of the property will be 0.37 acres for which it's under the one-acre threshold which would require stormwater mitigation, treatment and design in accordance with the New York State DEC.

And we've submitted subsequent environmental studies for which the Board has reviewed, as well as the Part 1 -- and the Part I, Part 2 Draft and a Part 3 Draft for which the Board has also reviewed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Absolutely. Thank you, Keith.

So what's going to happen now, I'm going to let our professionals with the Town of Warwick go through. We'll start with Danielle and Max and Nelson Pope Voorhis. They are our planners, as I mentioned earlier, to discuss the SEQR process to this project.

Max.

2.

MR. STACH: Okay. So this application started -- this version of this application started in January of 2024, when the Board adopted a resolution determining that this was a Type I action.

The Applicant had been suggesting that this is actually a Type II action. Type II actions are not subject to SEQR at all.

The Applicant had suggested that there were six Type II actions that would apply to this. The Board, upon further consideration, felt that this was actually a Type I action and we proceeded under that assumption.

So after declaring it a Type I action, the Applicant went out and prepared the Part 1 Environmental Assessment Form. This is the form that is available on line. And it provides the project's sponsor's answers to a predetermined number of

questions that all projects in New York State must address.

1.0

2.4

That document was reviewed by this Board.

And after receipt of that, the Board distributed that document to all involved agencies.

At the time it had identified the Zoning
Board, the New York State Department of Environmental
Conservation and the Orange County Department of
Health as other agencies that have permitting
authority over this action. Since then, the Zoning
Board has been eliminated as an agency that is
involved. It was originally thought that there might
need to be an interpretation made as to whether this
qualified as an institution of higher learning or as a
private school. That question had been resolved.

On September 18th of 2024, they distributed that document to all those involved agencies. At the request of the Applicant, that mailing was also distributed to several interested agencies and parties.

We had received comment from a number of local organizations and so we have copied them on the SEQR. It's an extra step.

So that included the Town of Tuxedo Planning Board, the PIPC, the New York State Office of Parks,

1.2

Recreation and Historic Preservation, the Warwick Town
Board, the Orange County Department of Planning,
Orange County Department of Public Works, the New York
State Education Department, the Town of Warwick
Police, the Tuxedo Union Free School District, the
Tuxedo Fire District, the Greenwood Lake EMS District,
the Sterling Forest Partnership, the New York-New
Jersey Trail Conference and the Open Space Institute.

After 30 days had run on this notice, we had received no objections to this Board assuming lead agency status.

Under SEQR, a State Environmental Quality
Review, this Board is responsible for reviewing the
potential environmental impacts of this project and
determining whether or not an EIS will be required for
preparation or for consideration of this project.

On November 20th of last year, 2024, the Planning Board adopted an EAF Part 2. That is the next step in SEQR. That explains what potential moderate to large impacts could occur and should be explored further by the Board. They identified impacts to land, groundwater, plants and animals, esthetic resources, historic and archaeological resources, open space and recreation, transportation, traffic, energy, noise, odor and light, impact on

1

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

human health and consistency with community character.

After that the Applicant -- or the Board asked the Applicant to prepare a Draft Part 3 document.

The Part 3 is necessary to look at all of these potential moderate and large impacts and describe the magnitude, which includes factors such as severity, size and extent of the impact; importance in terms of geographic scope; duration, probability of occurrence; number of people affected; and any other additional environmental consequences. It also talks about any design elements that have been incorporated into the project to address these. And, lastly, a reasoning as to why or why not a significant adverse environmental impact may result.

The threshold in New York State for requiring an EIS understand SEQR is that you have identified at least one significant adverse environmental impact that is likely to occur as a result of the project.

So that is the course and the process that the Planning Board has been conducting since last summer essentially, summer of 2024.

The Applicant had provided a Part 3 Draft. The Board had reviewed that, had discussed it at some

workshops. I'm sure some of you out there have been at our workshops where these have been discussed.

2.3

The Board asked for more information, particularly with regard to threatened and endangered species; potential significant natural communities or habitats near to the site; the history of site remediation and environmental site assessments; and information on potential fiscal impacts to community services.

So that supplemental information was provided in March, just last month of this year. And based on that information we revised our Draft Part 3. So the Applicant provided the first draft. We then went in, modified it to reflect our discussions and understandings of the application and the discussions held by the Planning Board.

Additionally, SEQR requires that if there are significant project changes that you give those involved agencies an additional shot to comment on those changes. While this project didn't undergo any significant changes, we still felt it was important to circulate that.

What had changed over that course was the proposed site lighting. In response to concerns by the Planning Board, the Applicant has subdued their

lighting and are proposing a warmer color temperature which is more friendly to wildlife, 2700K color temperatures.

They have made numerous changes to their environmental notes throughout the plan sets. They've incorporated park benches as requested by Orange County Planning. And they removed a parking space to retain a significant white pine tree that was identified as important on the site.

So based on those project changes, the Board then recirculated this project to all the involved agencies. No agency responded with any additional concerns in response to that.

Many of you out there have written us.

Every single E-mail that has come to this Board has been reviewed and compiled and looked at for potential additional environmental concerns that may not have been covered by the Board originally. We got some today. So we are still going through those as we are proceeding with this process.

If the Board finds that there is something that they hadn't considered, SEQR requires them to consider those, those issues, and include them in their determination of whether or not this project is going to require an EIS.

1.5

So some of the overall considerations that probably aren't clear to sort of the quick glance at the project that I think are important to consider here are that the Applicant is actually only going to disturb .37 acres of the site on a temporary basis to construct additional — not even construct additional parking, but to realign the parking to make it more circulation friendly and safe for vehicles.

There is the possibility that they may need to temporarily disturb some of the natural areas of the site to repair or replace or supplement their wastewater sewer connection.

That would be approximately 5,000 square feet of disturbance but that would be a temporary disturbance once it was installed. That area would be naturalized over time.

Additionally, the Applicant is proposing the removal of 11,000 square feet of parking area. It is likely that more natural meadow, lawn, vegetated area will exist after the project is completed than was there before the project was completed.

So the project sponsor has clarified that all students — the Applicant is proposing up to 200 students, and has consented to all of these operational limitations being imposed as conditions of

approval; map notes to be enforceable by the Town.

They're proposing no more than 200 adult male students that will arrive on the site approximately once per month and leave once per month.

They will only have daily arrivals by the staff, the faculty, and they're estimating approximately 20 visitors.

These are numbers that are informed. They do have an existing facility in the Town of Ramapo that have informed how these operations will occur.

No families will reside on the site. So there will not be people coming to and from the site. You will only have the adult students living there.

With regard to specific environmental impacts that I identified previously, I think Mike Musso, who's from HDR, will address some contamination concerns. Laura is going to talk about some parking concerns.

In terms of other impacts, it's noted that the disturbance of land is actually fairly limited and should be controllable through best management practices.

The Town Engineer will be reviewing a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan to ensure that erosion and sedimentation doesn't occur.

With regard to water supply, the Applicant will be in fact, as many of you noted, doubling the usage of water in this district.

They will be going currently from a 13,863 gallon per day usage to they'll be adding an 18,000 gallon per day use to that. However, this water system is estimated by DEC or Sterling Lake is estimated by DEC to have a safe withdrawal of a half a million gallons per day. So they're permitted in that water district to take half a million gallons out of Sterling Lake. Even after this project they will be at six percent of that.

With regard to the aquifer, the Applicant is proposing the removal of underground storage tanks.

Again, Mike Musso will touch upon that.

Those underground storage tanks, before they are removed and remediated, have the potential to impact the aquifer.

With regard to impacts on plants and animals, the Planning Board through the DEC mapper or EAF mapper had identified several species: The Northern Long-eared Bat, Timber Rattlesnake, Eastern Small-foot Myotis; as well as two habitat types, the Hemlock-Northern hardwood forest and Appalachian Oak-Hickory forest.

2.

б

They asked the Applicant to retain a ecological specialist to review that. They did provide a report. That was reviewed -- peer reviewed by HDR, the Town's engineering firm.

Additionally, we have received comments from some of you, as well as from PIPC, Sterling Forest Partnership, indicating additional species that should be investigated.

We asked the Applicant to invest those species, including the peregrine falcon, bald eagle, short-eared owl, pied-billed -- pied-billed grebe, least bittern, golden winged warbler, whippoorwill and common nighthawk.

Those have been supplemented and have been addressed in the EAF Part 3 that is available on the website.

Additionally, the Applicant is proposing certain conditions to help eliminate impacts to the species and habitat in the area.

First, all tree clearing of trees greater than five inches of caliper will occur between November 1st and March 31st. But the Applicant has actually looked at the areas of disturbance and doesn't believe that there are actually trees over five inches in those areas. But if they are, they

will come down in the DEC permitted period.

The Applicant will be installing snake fence, a Timber Rattlesnake fence, around the entire site, and will be hiring and employing a Timber Rattlesnake monitor, who will be on site when the fence is installed during all construction, and at the end when the fence is removed.

Additionally, as we described previously, the lighting in the project had been reduced and made dark-sky friendly and more animal friendly by reducing the color temperature.

The habitat sites that were mentioned do not exist on site. However, they do exist in the park and not far from the site. And the Applicant has amended their landscape plan to only add species of the type that are appropriate for those habitats. So they have matched up that.

With regard to esthetics and community character, the Applicant is not proposing any architectural changes to the facades of those buildings. The facades of those buildings, the Applicant is proposing to replace in kind.

Again, with the native landscaping, the Applicant has provided documentation from the State Historic Preservation Office that there will be no

impact to archaeological resources or historic resources as a result of this project.

Additionally, with regard to impact on transportation, we mentioned previously the Applicant will be required to bring students to and from the site by bus, and they have offered that. So that will be a condition of the plan.

And, Laura, you'll go over the traffic.

Miles -- sorry, Mike Musso will go over the

contamination potential.

The Applicant was asked to look at impacts to emergency services. They looked at their existing facility. Their existing facility — I'm sorry, the existing facility, when it was in operation, so we're talking not about their facility, we're talking about this facility when it was still in operation, resulted in 17 calls for service from 2010 through 2018; while their Monsey school facility, between 2020 and '25 resulted in 25 calls for emergency services.

Additionally, the Applicant has said that they are going to hire an employee, professionals on the site during daytime hours that are trained in health care, fire safety and security.

With that, I think I probably have talked enough and I will cede over to Laura to go over other

1 issues.

1.4

2.2

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Laura, do you want to or do you want Mike to take -- Mike, why don't you take your section of it and then Laura will take hers.

MR. MUSSO: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the board, members of the public. Thank you for having me here tonight.

My name is Mike Musso. I'm a senior technical adviser with HDR. I work with Laura Barca.

Laura brought me into this project and the group I work with to look specifically at environmental conditions.

You've heard a few of those from Max as pertaining to SEQR; threatened and endangered species; impacts on the aquifer, et cetera.

What I'm looking at on this site, first got involved in 2023, is looking at recognizing environmental conditions that might exist at the site based on historic use. The site has been active for some time.

Before I get into my summary, just to give you a little bit of a background, myself and the group I work with, we've done numerous types of property assessments.

1.8

You are going to hear some acronyms from me tonight maybe and I apologize for that. But a Phase I or Phase II ESA, Environmental Assessment, is something that's paramount to a property transfer process. We've done a lot of those and in this case we reviewed the work that was done by others over time.

Our group does a lot of investigation. We go out boots on the ground. We collect soil or air or water samples as need be. We look at exposures to human health in the environment. We manage and interpret data, compare it to appropriate standards and levels and criteria.

And we also do a lot of remediation or clean-up when it comes to it, and also managing sites over the long term.

Most of our work I want to note at HDR in our group is not for private developers. Most of our work that we do is for governmental entities. Might be in the Brownfields Program of repurposing sites for EPA or the New York State DEC. Could be working for a county.

I worked not only in Warwick but for a number of New York State municipalities on similar types of issues.

Like I said, I got involved at the site and started looking at documentation from 2023. I personally have been to the site a couple of times with the Planning Board members for site walks. I have interfaced with the Applicant representatives, requesting information, reviewing it, and summarizing and digesting it for the Board.

So a couple of the key things we looked at at the time of the property transfer from New York University, there was a robust document put together called a Phase I ESA.

So this is something that's not just thrown together. It's done by a process that could stand up to scrutiny by lending institutions, by financial and also by prospective purchasers of the property. It's meant to be transparent. It's meant to disclose environmental conditions that exist. It's done by environmental professionals.

In this case, NYU hired a company called TRC, a national company that I'm familiar with. They not only do site visits and inspections as part of that report, there's also an independent environmental database.

And if you really want to fall asleep at night, you look through one of these reports, because

it's about a thousand pages of output that will look not only at the subject property but one, three and five-mile radius of anything that might be happening.

1.4

And it flags anything that might light up on the state's DEC database or the U.S. EPA's database.

All that was included. There was also historic maps and aerial photos that were looked at.

HDR looked at all of this independently when it came in. Do want to indicate, though, this is based on the process that's established. So we're used to looking at those types of reports. We're used to digesting what's found.

The key things from that report that I took away is that there were no identified recognized environmental conditions, RECs.

There were historic recognized environmental conditions in the form of petroleum bulk storage, building materials that exist in an old building like this. You are going to have things like lead-based paint. You are going to have asbestos that needs to be fully remediated. Again, that's all inside the building.

The underground and above-ground storage tanks is something we inquired about. Those of course are outside the buildings. We did look and follow up

independently with the New York State DEC on that.

1.8

2.0

So a record that was identified, there were rather large -- as you might suspect -- heating oil tanks, fuel tanks. Much bigger than the ones we have at home, certainly, that could be five-hundred gallons or less. These were 20,000 and 10,000 gallon sizes.

Five underground storage tanks at the time of the property transfer were identified. Three had already been closed or removed. There were three above-ground storage tanks. So if you drive by the site you might see them. However, two have been closed and removed.

We wanted to look back a little bit more at this. We looked through what's called a petroleum bulk storage registry that the UST has. And one thing that struck me is that all the documentation really easily checked out. That's not always the case when we get involved in these sites.

And I think it's important just to note, you know, working for institutions like we do, school districts or universities, New York University is extremely risk-adverse. They're very sensitive.

If they're divesting a property, especially with some of the past uses, they want to be very diligent on what they leave behind and what they don't

leave behind.

So they've actually removed those tanks.

The spill numbers were closed out with the DEC. We confirmed that independently.

I also note that they did some abatement on their own; not uncommon during a property transaction, but they hired reputable asbestos, lead and mold firms to come in and at least do pretty clean sweep of the building. They got rid of their storage of chemicals, things that would run the boilers, some of the chemical uses that they've had at the site, et cetera.

And then the Applicant kind of got involved of course as the site was sitting vacant and the property transaction was happening.

There were a couple of tanks that weren't closed out in that 2017 report. However, the Applicant submitted a UST closure report. Everything checks out on our books with those petroleum storage tanks above ground and underground.

We've also looked at the closure report. It included soil and groundwater testing, so nothing lit up in our mind as far as current use or future potential use of the site in terms of any detectable levels that we found.

So going here I was also brought in or going

on from this point I was also brought in to look at the site plan. We made suggestions for notes that have to run on the site plan environmental notes.

1.0

about with SEQR with rattlesnake monitoring, et cetera, tree protection. But we added a series of ten to 15 notes that very much prescribe the applicable rules and regulations; the agencies like the DEC, like the Department of Labor that manages and administers asbestos abatement for anything in the future that needs to be done.

We reference building materials that might remain, whether they're waste chemicals or old mercury switches in electrical equipment or fuse boxes. This is typical of an old building.

Importantly, in speaking with the Planning Board, there is a protocol in place for any environmental work regarding notifications to the agency, but as importantly, scheduling with the building department here. Those notes are now on the site plan and need to run with that.

There will be submittals. For example, after any additional asbestos abatement is taken care of, that report has to be submitted within a time frame to the Town of Warwick for review.

1.1

2.1

In speaking to the Planning Board Chair, HDR is available of course to review all this, but as importantly will be available also to have real boots on the ground, to do our own documentation on behalf of the Board.

So that's kind of an overview of the topics that we're looking at.

I think the takeaways are that the registration historically of tanks and practices that need to be registered with the state agencies were done.

There's been a large amount of abatement, tank removal, soil sampling and point sampling testing done by NYU before divesting the site, but also by the Applicant representatives here. And everything appears to cross-check on our end, at least as this information goes.

And then moving forward, we feel that the notes that have been added to the site plan are robust. We feel they make sense. And we feel that they're diligent in terms of any kind of reporting of conditions or just reporting when stages work are completed as the Applicant would move on should this application be approved.

So that's all I have.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mike.

1.2

MS. BARCA: Good evening. My name is Laura Barca. I represent HDR Engineering for the Planning Board with the Town of Warwick.

Relating to stormwater, Max touched upon it.

There are five different locations of five minor disturbances. The total sum of those disturbances will be 0.37 acres. That is all that is proposed to be disturbed.

And, again, the reason for that is to kind of square off the parking lot areas and to make them -- to make them safer to provide better circulation throughout the area. The SWPPP is --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Please put on your mic.

MS. BARCA: Sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Much better.

MS. BARCA: Okay. Sorry about that.

So there's five different areas in the —that will be disturbed. They're all related to parking area disturbances. The total area of those disturbances will be 0.37 acres.

And the reason for those disturbances is to square off the corners where the ground, you know, where the vegetation has come into those areas and to

make those areas safer for circulation of the traffic.

The stormwater itself, because the total area of disturbance is 0.37 acres, the SWPPP itself is limited to erosion and sediment control. And HDR is reviewing that on the site plans as well.

And, again, as Max stated earlier, that the change in impervious surfaces is actually a net decrease of 0.21 acres for the sole reason of a -- one of the lower parking areas is being removed and allowed to return to nature, to its natural condition.

The water and the sewer. The water and sewer demand is on an average daily basis of approximately 18,000 gallons per day.

The Town -- the Applicant received and submitted to the Town what they call water -- a water willness to serve letter and a sewer willness to serve letter, and from the entity that operates these facilities.

And what that means is -- it doesn't -- it's not a carte blanche, you can, you know, turn on the faucets and starts tomorrow. It still requires Orange County Health Department review and approval for any improvements that are in there.

And in both of these cases the operator of the two facilities is requiring the Applicant to

assist with upgrades to those facilities that the Town is -- will be monitoring.

Again, all that will be done under the review and approval of Orange County Health

Department, DEC, if it's applicable. But the Town will be involved in knowing what's going on all the time in that situation.

As far as the traffic, we, the Planning
Board requested that a complete traffic report be
conducted. Creighton Manning Engineering prepared a
traffic report and a trip-generation assessment report
that was received by the Planning Board and reviewed
specifically by traffic engineers with my company.

The average combined vehicles per day on that road currently is 172 vehicles per day. It's anticipated that the two -- it's -- well, it's anticipated that the 200 proposed students will be shuttled to the site, but that's actually -- they'll be a note on the plan that the students when they come once a month, they will be bused there.

Any of the teachers, the administrative staff, the support staff, they — in the traffic study — they will be coming on, you know, a day-to-day basis. But the students themselves will be — and it's estimated that there will be four

50-passenger buses.

So part of what my company has done in our overall site plan review is looking at -- is making sure that these buses can, you know, arrive on site safely, that they have the turning radius to get in, to get out of the parking areas to be able to deliver the students safely. All right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Laura. Thank you, Mike.

Mr. Krahulik is our attorney. He will speak to the legal issues.

MR. KRAHULIK: All right. I guess it's my job to explain whether or not this use is permitted in this zoning district and why. I'll try not to get too technical.

The property is located in the LC zoning district. LC stands for land conservation.

Under Use Group 84 in the Town code

Institutions of Higher Learning are permitted in the

LC District.

Prior examples of similar applications can be examined. There was an application by Kings

College to build a college campus on the former

International Nickel property. Touro University also proposed a college campus on that same site.

Ultimately, it was developed by what we now know as the Watchtower Organization. All three of those applications contemplated some form of residential housing as a part of the institution of higher learning.

There are some limitations, however. The code requires a minimum of five acres of land in order to get approval for an institution of higher learning. Plus, one additional acre for each 100 students.

The Applicant has just over seven acres.

Using the formula, the maximum number of students is

200. There's been some concern about future growth

and expansion of this use. Based on this formula, 200

would be the maximum in perpetuity.

People have also asked about the opportunity to buy more land and expand elsewhere. The parcel is completely surrounded by Sterling Forest parkland. There are no land acquisition opportunities that would allow them to grow and increase the number of students on this particular campus.

No variances are required by the Applicant in order to obtain approval.

The Applicant did seek a variance to increase the amount of impervious space to improve parking and traffic circulation. That variance

application was denied. But that's not necessary for the Applicant to obtain approval.

There will be no children residing on the property. There will be no impact on the Tuxedo School District.

Emergency services will be provided by the Greenwood Lake Fire Department and by the Tuxedo Fire Department pursuant to an interagency agreement between those two organizations.

There's been concern about the number of -
THE CHAIRMAN: Excuse me. Excuse me. Let
him finish.

MR. KRAHULIK: -- about the number of residents residing on the property. Again, they will be all adults. There will be no children. There will be no impact on the school district.

Other examples of this can be seen at Watchtower, where again there are adult residential facilities, no impact on the school district. As well as the Town of Tuxedo approved residential housing in the form of International Paper Facility, again no impact on the school district.

We have received further comment over the last few days. I want to assure everybody that they will all be reviewed, they will all be addressed.

Some of the comments received, they are just factually incorrect. For example, we received an important letter from the Palisades Interstate Park Commission. The letter suggests that the property is located in the Sterling Forest Bird Conservation area. That's not true. It's not located in that conservation area.

So we will do our best to examine all the issues raised. We will review all the issues to see whether or not they are credible and important, and before the Board votes everything will be considered.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Bob.

At this time we're going to open it up to the public. We do have a sign-up sheet, which I have here.

I would just, please, you've been a great group this evening. I know this was long but I think it was very important to explain everything from our professionals on this end.

So please, if I call your name, please come up.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Your mic.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. I'm usually loud enough that everybody can hear me. Just ask Connie.

I'm sorry about.

1	What I'm saying is I'll start with the list.
2	Come up here, you'll have three minutes. Connie will
3	time it. And if it runs over, please bear with us
4	because there's a lot of people here. Everybody
5	deserves a chance to speak. So that's why we're going
6	to do that.
7	I'll swing the mic towards you. Address the
8	Board.
9	If you agree with somebody, that's great.
1.0	Keep it to yourself. Again, I want to reiterate, we
11	want to get everything on the record. That's what you
12	are here for.
13	So with that being said, so Meryl Levy,
14	number one.
15	Going to keep this mic right out here for
16	you.
17	Thank you. Just state your name.
18	MS. MERYL LEVY: Meryl Levy.
19	My house is the second house across the
20	street from the school.
21	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you turn the mic
22	on?
23	THE CHAIRMAN: I think you're good. I
24	really do.

MS. MERYL LEVY: My house is the second

25

house across the street from the school. We bought for peace and tranquility. I opened my own law practice and work out of my home.

1.0

1.8

The construction will disturb my ability to work in my home and our peace. The construction will cause dangerous particulates to be released into the air from that which we know to be there: Asbestos, black mold and lead paint.

Who is responsible for the oversight of the construction? We are an area with very few resources. What will be the days and hours of construction?

The construction is forcing me to list my dream home in a bad market. Is there planning for the construction? What is the plan? Where are the dumpsters during and after construction and after they move in?

We saw a bear go late at night from our development across Old Forge and into that property just the other week.

How many animals will be attracted to the smells of the kitchen and the refuse? What does that do to us in terms of the animals?

What is the plan for pickup and drop-off days? How does that affect us on buses, cars, taxis and the narrow width of Old Forge Road? I will feel

unsafe driving it with buses.

Will there be police enforcement of traffic, construction and other laws?

Based upon the record before you, the information made available to you, and the assessment you have already made in Part 2 of the EAF, this Board must either issue a positive declaration of significance and require a full EIS or deny the proposal.

To do otherwise would be arbitrary and capricious, putting this Board at risk of an Article 78 claim.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Excuse me. Excuse me. is just what I didn't want to happen because it screws with the minutes. If you want everybody's -- what they say on record, please don't do that. what we're here for. That is what all you waited for, to speak.

So I can't stress it enough. We want to get everybody's word, last word on the minutes. Doing that does not work.

Thank you.

Mr. Howard.

MR. GEOFFREY HOWARD: Hi. My name is Geoff

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

Howard.

1.5

2.4

THE CHAIRMAN: Address the board, Geoff.

MR. GEOFFREY HOWARD: Sorry.

THE CHAIRMAN: We're the ones that need to hear from the public. Not out there.

MR. GEOFFREY HOWARD: My name is Geoff Howard and I've lived in Warwick a long time.

And one of the things that's clear to me is that Warwick has managed to develop and at the same time to retain its rural character and its special qualities that make Warwick Warwick.

And you all, and your predecessors, had a strong role in making that happen so thank you.

In 2011 the correctional facility closed.

Big question of what would happen. It worked out very well. As I think everyone knows, Warwick Woodlands; recreation, beauty, jobs and taxes.

Kutz Camp closed several years ago. Another major change. Another very positive outcome. Again,
I assume you all had some role in that.

Now the NYU Research Lab has changed and there's another possibility, a major change being proposed of a 200-residential school, plus faculty, that will, as I say, produce major changes.

You have done a good job of identifying that

by classifying it as a Type 1, and by identifying in your EAF Part 2 21 moderate to large impacts. So, again, I think that's great.

The question right now is what happens with a SEQR review? And my firm request or my firm hope is that you will follow what you did with the Type 1, follow what you did with the EAF Part 2 and request a SEQR review of this entire process.

It is a major change. It is in a state park and there will be impacts.

There will be a lot of questions and you want the answers to those, we want the answers to those, and I think that's what SEQR will do.

So thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Rebecca Quackenbush.

MS. REBECCA QUACKENBUSH: I have some goodies for you. I want to share. Here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS. REBECCA QUACKENBUSH: Tell me when to start.

THE CHAIRMAN: Right now.

 $\label{eq:ms.REBECCA QUACKENBUSH: Can you all hear} \\ \text{me at the back? Okay.}$ 

I'm here today to respectfully urge this

board to issue --

1.4

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Who are you?

MS. REBECCA QUACKENBUSH: -- a

positive declaration.

Rebecca Quackenbush.

To issue a positive declaration under SEQR for the proposed project that presents a moderate to large impact on the ecological integrity of Sterling Forest, particularly on its federally and state-listed sensitive species of which you have noted here tonight.

These are not fringe organisms. These are keystone indicators of a healthy, functioning ecosystem. And all three are known to inhabit or depend on habitats directly adjacent to and potentially within the project site.

The Northern Long-eared bat is currently listed as endangered under the Federal Endangered Species Act due to white-nose syndrome.

And Sterling Forest is a known roosting and foraging habitat. This species is extraordinarily sensitive to forest fragmentation and human disturbance, exactly what this project entails through site clearing, lighting and noise.

The Eastern Small-footed Myotis, one of New

York's rarest bats requires rocky outcrops and forest edges for summer roosting, habitats that would be irreparably disturbed by construction and increased human activity.

Я

2.4

And let us not forget the Timber

Rattlesnake, a threatened species in New York, which
depends on undisturbed forest corridors for denning
and migration.

Development along Iron Forge Road, a known corridor, would fragment this critical habitat and elevate risk of mortality from increased traffic and human contact.

Notably, the Applicant has pointed to the threatened and endangered species investigation by ERS Consultants dated June 26, 2023, as evidence that there's no cause for concern.

That report submitted as Exhibit L, stated that none of the threatened or endangered species were found on site at the time of their visit. But let's be clear, the absence of evidence is not evidence of absence, especially when even the report itself acknowledges that the site contains conducive habitat for these species.

It is simply flawed logic and poor science to suggest that a species failure to appear on one

particular day for one particular consultant means that they don't inhabit or traverse that area.

1.3

2.4

The Applicant also complains that a positive declaration and thus a full EIS is unnecessary. But that assertion is inconsistent with SEQR regulations.

According to the SEQR Full Environmental Assessment Form, Part 2, any project that may result in the reduction or degradation of habitat for listed species constitutes a moderate to large impact. That threshold has been met and exceeded in this case.

To waive a full Environmental Impact

Statement here would be an error with lasting

ecological consequences and a potential violation of

SEQR's intent.

I urge the Board to take the cautious, responsible route. Deny the application or issue a positive declaration. Require a full EIS and give these species and the public the thorough environmental review this region deserves.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Again, again, I don't know how many times I have to say it, we want to get it on the record. You fold your arms. If we don't get it on the record, it doesn't count. We want it on the record. That's what

you are here for; correct? I said it four times.

Please. Respect everybody that's here.

Roger Friedman.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Quiet, please.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. ROGER FRIEDMAN: My name is Roger Friedman and I live in the Town of Warwick.

And I'll be referencing Section 17 of the Full EAF Part 2, or Part 3.

Sometimes people ask me where I live.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Lean into the mic.

MR. ROGER FRIEDMAN: Sometimes people ask me where I live. And after 30 years, I actually don't know what to tell them because I live in Warwick but my mailing address is Tuxedo. I vote in Greenwood Lake but my library is seven miles in the other direction. I pay Tuxedo school taxes and Warwick property taxes.

So where do I live? Well, the reality is that I live in Sterling Forest. There's a total of about 30 occupied residences around the southern shore of Sterling Lake. They form a distinct and integral settlement. And I estimate the total population of all these homes at about 45.

The nearest inhabited buildings beyond are

2.4

more than three miles away in any direction through dense forest. In fact, our settlement once had a name. It was called Lakeville until about 1920 or something. And on MapQuest it still says Lakeville if you look it up.

So the Full EAF Part 2, Section 17, paragraph B, prepared by Nelson Pope Voorhis asserts that the proposed action will not increase the population of any town or city by more than five percent.

Now, this statement can only be accepted if the Board ignores the real facts of the locality, Lakeville, Sterling Forest, and signs on to a technicality that the population of the Town of Warwick will be largely unchanged.

Sterling Forest, as a community of homes, is a real place, whether or not it's a separate political entity.

The proposed action for this dormitory for 200 men will increase the population of the community of Sterling Forest by a lot more than five percent. Count all the residents in all the homes around the southern shore, the addition of 200 men will increase the population by more than 400 percent.

Consider merely the 23 residences uphill of

the Lautenberg Visitor Center and that percentage nearly doubles.

So I reject as a cynical technicality that no impact on EAF Part 2, section 17, paragraph B.

Any reasonable person would recognize that the measure of a city or town does not apply to this locality, and that the entire Town of Warwick -- am I at 30 seconds? The entire Town of Warwick is a poor criterion for measuring the population of our community against, and it is against the intent of SEQR.

So these sorts of inconsistencies would be teased out in a full EIS enacted through a positive declaration.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

MR. ROGER FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: John Gebhards. John Gebhards.

MR. JOHN GEBHARDS: Honorable Chair and Board members, my name is John Gebhards. I've been a resident of Orange County for some 43 years.

And in late 1900 -- 1990s, I was hired by a consortium from the Nature Conservancy, Open Space Institute and Scenic Hudson to be the Executive Director of Sterling Forest Resources which became

Sterling Forest Partnership.

2.0

My charge was to develop a grass-roots movement to foster the protection of the forested land then known as Sterling Forest, owned by Sterling Forest, LLC.

The Sterling Forest Partnership was proud to be part of the purchase of 15,000 acres which was the beginning of the Sterling Forest Park.

One of the stated reasons for creating the Sterling Forest Park was quote to protect and conserve the various unique ecosystems that exist there, end of quote.

Sterling Forest Partnership has strived to protect the environments of the park from intrusive development over the years, which include projects such as the casino, the dinosaur park, Sterling Forest and clean-up of the mulch pile.

My concern with the current proposed resident college is with the minimally defined response to its potential impact on the plants and animal life in this fragile ecosystem. That could happen if there's no Environmental Impact Statement to identify and reduce this minimum to -- impact to a minimum.

The current project proposal has failed to

inventory the spring that emerges on the property, that flows presumably into Sterling Lake, a drinking water supply.

There is also a seasonal stream that runs through the property at the southeast corner. not represented on the maps but it is clearly there in plain sight. That stream likely empties into Ringwood Creek, ultimately into New Jersey's Wanaque Reservoir, which is drinking water.

For this reason, and for other inadequacies too numerous to list, I respect that the Board issue a positive determination so that SEQR, the procedure for a full EIS with public hearing, can proceed. Either that or the project should be denied on grounds of unresolved environmental concerns.

Thank you for the opportunity. pictures of the spring and the creek that I referred And a copy of my --

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir. We can have this?

> MR. JOHN GEBHARDS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

Heather Bullard. Heather.

MS. HEATHER BULLARD: Thank you.

I am reading for -- my name is Heather

21

1

2

3

5

б

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

Bullard. I'm a resident of Sterling Lake. And I'm actually reading a letter from a neighbor who could not be here today because he had a chemo treatment.

2.5

He was -- his name is Steve Ostrega, and he was the retired Deputy Commissioner of New York City Department of Environmental Protection, and Executive Director of the New York City Water Board, and had this position for 35 years.

Steve wrote to the Planning Board and copied elected representatives in New York and New Jersey who have a responsibility to safeguard the nearly 80 million Federal New York and New Jersey investments made since 1998 to secure the 22,000 acres of land and establish the Sterling Forest State Park for the critical environment; purposes of watershed protection; protection of 27 rare and endangered wildlife specifies; and further and secure the safety of a strategically located north/south migratory route for birds.

The strategic objective of the rationale in establishing the park was and still needs to be to preserve the land in an open space in an undeveloped state, and that is what it's in and today so remains, and thereby ensure that the many streams and headwaters from this watershed that serves more than

two million New Jersey residents and tens of thousands of Orange and Rockland counties' residents remains a reliable and sustainable safe drinking water supply.

In equal importance, that the park's environs and existing low-impact community, less than 40-single-family homes and cottages, the narrow park entrance roadway not be compromised and create land and area use that would change the entire character of the park and existing community.

The proposed development of a full-time residential campus at the site of the -- sorry, at the site, um, would have typically less than 30 staff, will increase the area's full-time residents population by more than 400 percent, increase limited potable water demand by more than 60,000 gallons per day and produce wastewater and considerable solid waste that will impact the flow into streams and feed into the Ramapo River water supply system.

Further, emergency services, police and ambulance services, already distant from this community, within 45 minutes of good weather, would be further taxed and endanger the health and well-being of the existing community members.

The entire college construction development project needs to be extremely careful and be

1	critically reviewed.
2	It is absolutely critical that the New York
3	State SEQR process be followed and a full
4	Environmental Impact Review Study be performed.
5	80 million dollars of the taxpayer funds
6	expended on achieving this beautiful park exist in
7	reality, a safe land buffer zone achieving critical
8	environmental protection and stabilization of the
9	park's area.
10	BOARD MEMBER MCCONNELL: Time.
11	MS. HEATHER BULLARD: Thank you.
12	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you so much. And I
13	will open it up at the end.
14	MS. HEATHER BULLARD: I also sorry.
15	THE CHAIRMAN: If you have something to
16	submit, submit it.
17	MS. HEATHER BULLARD: I have something else
18	to submit. It's a petition by all the residents on
19	Sterling Lake who are petitioning against this.
20	THE CHAIRMAN: So this would all be in the
21	record. Thank you.
22	MS. HEATHER BULLARD: Thank you.
23	THE CHAIRMAN: Our next speaker, Kiki
24	Nelson.
25	MS. KIKI NELSON: Hello.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Hi

MS. KIKI NELSON: So I'm going to have to wing this because I actually forget the item I wrote for so long.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, speak from your heart. That's all. You're here talking to the Board.

MS. KIKI NELSON: Oh, all right. So my name is Kiki Nelson. I live in Sterling Forest. I've lived there for 30 years, which is -- predates the formation of the park.

During those 30 years, I spent 25 years commuting into New York City, where I was the director of — what's the terminology here? Director of Research Laboratory Operations for all the research labs of NYU Medical Center, including Sterling Forest. So I have a lot of firsthand knowledge about that place.

I don't know where to begin, but I'm going to try to in three minutes try to tell you that the base -- the main type of research that they did there was -- had to do with inhalation of contaminants.

They are the gold standard for the information we have following the attacks on 9-11.

And this information resonates down 25 years later to the first responders to today.