

The minutes of the Village of Haverstraw Planning Board Meeting held on Monday, June 11, 2018, beginning at 7:00 PM.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL	Joseph Natale-Chairman	-Present
	Gil Carlevaro	- Present
	Diogenes Dominguez	-Present
	Edwin Molina	-Present
	Danny Scaffidi	-Present
	Ruben Berrios, Bldg. Inspector	-Present
	Eve Mancuso, Village Engineer	-Present
	Dennis Michaels-Attorney	-Present
	Michelle Ventura	-Present

Joseph Natale opened up the meeting by introducing the first item on the agenda, PAG Investments, 217 Route 9W, Haverstraw, NY 10927. **27.45-2-49**

Amy Mele, Attorney, 4 Laurel Road: Good evening. I am a council to Ira Emanuel on this application. With me tonight are our Engineer that works at StoneField Engineering Daniel and our Architect. If you recall last time we were here we wanted to go informally before the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) and the Architectural Review Board (ARB) to get their thoughts on our application before we went much further. Our original application was for a 5 story building. We went to the ZBA and presented that plan and it did not go very well. They felt the 4 story building would be much more appropriate in that corner. So we re-design the building to a 4 story building and we brought it down to as much as I think we possibly could. We also went to the ARB, although I wasn't present our Architects were. They presented the plans that night that we have here this evening. We did receive Mr. Stach's and Mrs. Mancuso's memorandum. We're happy to respond to all of those comments. We are scheduled for the ZBA Thursday night for variances so we were hoping that perhaps the board would consider a negative declaration tonight but that of course is up to you. We're here to answer any questions you have.

Joseph Natale: Mr. Natale asked the Mr. Michaels if he wanted to discuss the comments from the Rockland County Department of Planning GML response letter.

Dennis Michaels: Procedurally you can make suggestions but you can't do anything until there's a Negative Declaration under SEQRA. I wouldn't suggest diving into the County's GML letter sent on May 14, 2018 until or anything else really until you get passed SEQRA. Some of the issues you're concerned about like visual impacts effect the SEQRA review. I read it and we all have it. We also referred to Max Stach's memorandums.

Amy Mele: I also liked to mention a balloon test was requested which is still there now. I hope everyone had time to stop by and take a look or a chance to drive by.

Dennis Michaels: Max Stach, our Village Planner from Nelson, Pope & Voorhies, LLC submitted a memorandum to the Planning Board dated June 7, 2018. The applicant also has a copy. This memorandum is 5 pages long with a narrative. Attached is a part 2 with a full environmental assessment form that was submitted and prepared by Mr. Stach. Could you please briefly summarize for the board and the applicant.

Max Stach, Village Planner: Mr. Chairman as you know, the applicant has declared a part 1. We had a few technical questions on the part 1. We believe it was adequate for us to prepare a part 2. That part 2 identifies areas that we believe the applicant is required to provide more information before this board to conclude that there's no impact. This has to do with how they will deal with slopes over 15 %, how they will control erosion and surface water runoff. There was a note that might be some sensitive habitat. I believe that it is an error or it is a reference to something in area and either case the applicant has to provide that information for you to conclude that is the case. I believe the one issue that is very relevant here is the impact on aesthetics, the visual resource. This is at a gateway to the Village; we know it's not necessarily in character with the surrounding area due to the height. So I believe this board needs to determine what it needs in order to conclude that there won't be any visual or character impacts. As you know today, the Village flew some balloons in order to assess the height impacts. The applicant's engineers provided us with the heights and we put up the balloons. It was very difficult because the trees were in the way and the wind was blowing but you did get an idea of where the structure would sit. Tonight the applicant has some renderings that they are proposing. This board needs to give us some feedback on whether you think these elements are sufficient or whether you'd like to see something additional in order to determine that there's no impact. Everything else is more or less performance and can be dealt with in a certain manner. So that's where we are with the SEQRA. If you agree you can adopt the part 2 tonight which is the list of impacts that must be explored in their part 3. They submitted the part 3 this morning, but I haven't had an opportunity to completely go through it but it didn't include any additional visual impact materials.

Dennis Michaels: I would agree with Max, you can adopt the part 2 tonight with the understanding that the applicant will respond or intends to respond to all those items that have been indicated as a moderate to large potential adverse to environmental impact. That's why the applicant wants to return to address those potential moderate to large adverse environmental impacts.

Joseph Natale: This is why I was hoping the entire board would be able to get to see the balloon test and two couldn't make it but we'll have to deal with that.

Max Stach: Mr. Chairman, I am the one who will be taking the balloons down. I could leave them up until tomorrow morning if you'd like and I could do that or remove the balloons an hour after the meeting ends.

Diogenes Dominguez: We agreed that we would stop by after the meeting to take a look so that's still ok with me.

Amy Mele: I'd like to thank your planner. We did look around for somebody to do the balloon test and he came in at the end of the day and helped us out so it's actually your consultant that did the balloon test at our cost of course, but thank you.

Edwin Molina: The balloon test is currently up, comparing it to the structure we see here, where does it level off of? Is it off the tower or the site building? I saw the two locations where the balloons were set up, one was on 9W and one off Gurnee Avenue.

Eve Mancuso: That was my question too.

Bob Zumesky: It would've been the height of the parapet wall I would assume.

Gil Carlevaro: It is.

Eve Mancuso: But at what point of the building was it placed? On the corner?

Max Stach: It wasn't at the corner exactly but as close as we could get with the trees.

Eve Mancuso: To the west corner?

Max Stach: We put 3. The double was the one right at the corner, there's a triple right in the parking lot for the current law firm, and then another behind the first house going up Gurnee Avenue. So those are the 3 corners.

Joseph Natale: There was one where there was only a flag where the building makes the "L" on the 45 degree angle.

Max Stach: Oh right here, yes.

Joseph Natale: You couldn't really put balloons because the topography was so bad.

Max Stach: In terms to where the balloons are actually at, so if this is where the property corner of the flag is, we probably flew the balloon about here, which was right in the driveway. So we flew it back in here, and this was right up against the house so we flew it closer to 202.

Joseph Natale: You did a good job.

Dennis Michaels: I would recommend procedurally, what other submissions do you anticipate submitting if any that needs to be drafted that haven't already been drafted this morning or yesterday?

Amy Mele: Other than if additional renderings are needed, we think that we basically have submitted everything. There is a little point I wanted to address, with Eve and I think I can do that offline. It has to do with parking because that's not included in our variance right now. We can turn this around very quick unless you need additional studies or things that we'll have to send out to other experts or professionals.

Dennis Michaels: Max had suggested in his memo's visual renderings. Is this what you were referring to or is there more you're recommending to the board? Ultimately, it's the board that needs to decide what you want to see. What were you recommending Max?

Max Stach: Yes so this is close to what I'm suggesting. Sometimes the balloon test is very powerful because you can go out and actually see it and picture it. If you have this in your hand it's easier to relate the mass of this when you have the balloons.

Bob Zumesky: At the Architectural Review Board (ARB) that was the preliminary motique. They asked us to add this mansard wrapping around to kind of bring down the scale of the building. Instead of it looking like a 4 story building, now it looks like a 3 story building. So that's the new scheme and that's what the ARB wanted to see done. This is the rendering in the street but I don't want to show you this because it's really way off scale and it's difficult to picture. In order to get a program to do that, that's something I'd have to form out and it's additional money for my client. The ARB was very positive with it. They loved the idea. They liked what we had but wanted us to modify it with the mansard to visually bring the scale down a little bit. Since the last time we met we broke up the foot print of the building so we have these little ins and outs. That helps to bring down the overall scale. We still are trying to keep the brick motique like some of the buildings in your town along with the feature since it is the focal point is the tower.

Joseph Natale: Eve, do you want to weigh in on the things that you wanted that are still outstanding?

Eve Mancuso: Yes thank you Mr. Chairman. I did have the opportunity to have a detailed discussion with the engineer and in terms of SEQRA my primary concern is always drainage. They did verify that soil testing was performed and they modified their drainage system to accommodate the onsite conditions. So in my view they were able to mitigate the drainage concerns with the presentation that was discussed on the plan. As Max noted, the second one was the visual which I believe they really made great efforts to address but that's up to the board to consider. The third item that we had previously discussed was traffic. As you know the access is going to be controlled by the Department Of Transportation (DOT). But in terms of placement of the access, it's at the very best place that it could be based on the property configuration. Secondly,

parking was an issue and I think that's what Amy was referring to that the board had suggested the applicant notify them of other sites that are similar in scale and in parking. I was wondering if they had the opportunity to find any such sites that we could go visit to see if the parking has in fact worked with that scale of building.

Zachary Chaplin, Stonefield Engineering: Our office has prepared traffic studies for other self storage facilities specifically more in Long Island and North Jersey. In those cases we studied, three sites in Long Island and the site in Northern NJ similar scale, 100,000 square foot gross floor area approximately. At no point in time were there more than 9 vehicles ever on site or parked on those sites. We also took a look at nearby self storage facilities in Rockland County. We didn't perform a study but we did note the size and the parking provided. Areas like Suffern, Monsey and Spring Valley's parking generally ranges from 3 to 17 spaces so we fall right in the middle with 10 parking spots plus the 4 loading births. So this is more than sufficient for this type of use.

Joseph Natale: Could we get a copy of that?

Zachary Chaplin: Sure, we could submit this report of course.

Eve Mancuso: Where was that northern Jersey site located?

Zachary Chaplin: Rochelle Park, NJ.

Eve Mancuso: Ok thank you. That's close enough to go visit, it should be about 40 minutes.

Danny Scaffidi: Will you be able to fit a tractor trailer in there?

Zachary Chaplin: Self storage facilities like this generally will usually use box trucks. That's what they're typically designed for. So we did prepare an exhibit that I can put up. This is an SU 40 which we believe would be the largest type vehicle that would enter the site. It does have enough space to get into the loading area and safely egress the site over here.

Danny Scaffidi: What is the length of the truck?

Zachary Chaplin: The length is 40 feet. We did also meet with Patrick McNamee, the Fire Inspector a couple of months ago. We showed him the plans and he said, based on the fact that the site has 2 frontages, the frontage on Gurnee Avenue and the frontage on 9W that the larger ladder trucks wouldn't actually enter the site. The pumper trucks which are smaller about 30 feet long, those would be the ones that would access it. Unfortunately he didn't have a template but this is a much larger vehicle and we feel comfortable that it can safely maneuver the site.

Eve Mancuso: So you don't anticipate large moving vans like furniture moving vans needing access to the storage areas?

Bob Zumesky: The self storage facilities are very rarely used by large moving companies that are bringing in the big semi's. The average size of these units just aren't conducive or cost effective for that kind of usage so you would never see a semi anywhere on site except during construction. But really even a box size truck like that would be very rare. That has been our experience all over the country.

Danny Scaffidi: Did you consider going down one story or no?

Amy Mele: We looked at the ability to build down and we just can't.

Zachary Chaplin: It's a really tough site in terms of the constraints and topography. If you're not aware, there's about a 20 foot high mound in the center of the site.

Bob Zumesky: Part of the building is going to be cut into the slope.

Zachary Chaplin: So the access here, will be on the second story as compared to access here which is on the first level. We are trying to utilize the grade change when we designed this site in terms of the cut fill. But it is a very difficult site. Rather than do anything else we feel this is the maximum output and best design approach that we came up with. We did take a number of conceptual designs that we looked and a number of different plans.

Bob Zumesky: Realistically, on Route 9W it's a 4 story building. As you go up Gurnee Avenue, it actually turns into a 3 story building just because of the natural slope.

Joseph Natale: Eve, do you want a copy of the report for the truck?

Eve Mancuso: Of the wheel turning radius? Sure, is that part of your plan too?

Zachary Chaplin: Yes we could submit that.

Amy Mele: I'd also like to point out, at the original Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), the parking issue was discussed. While we're certainly happy to get you any information that you want on the parking, I think what was determined was that we're going with the parking requirements for wholesale and warehousing and distribution businesses. Which are 2 employees for which the building is designed for 300 square feet floor area whichever is less. I know Eve that you pointed out in your memo that doing that requirement with the 300 square foot, which would yield 336 parking spaces. So in our ZBA application, were not asking for a variance for parking because we think we meet it but we certainly understand your concern from a planning stand point.

Dennis Michaels: For the record, I'd like to ask Amy return for a special meeting and pick a date for the applicant to come back subject to your consent. We will get to the dates next. Our next meeting is July 9, 2018. We had moved the July 2nd meeting at my request. The fireworks are July 2nd here in the Village anyways so the meeting has been moved to July 9th. We have the Rockland County Department of Planning GML; General Municipal Law Section 239 report of May 14, 2018. We aren't going to go through it now but please bring to the next meeting. I'd ask all the board members to review it before the next meeting. We also have a correspondence from the Rockland County Health Department dated May 18, 2018 and that's signed by Elizabeth Melo, Senior Public Health Engineer so we just have to comply with the Rockland County Mosquito code. Incidentally the County GML letter report is 4 pages signed by Douglas J. Schuetz, Acting Commissioner of Planning and by Arlene Miller Deputy Commissioner of Planning. It recommends 23 modifications. For the County Health Department we have Eve Mancuso, our Village Engineers report of May 14, 2018 its two pages and we also reference Max Stach, the Village Planner's memo of June 7, 2018 and a proposed Part 2. Max suggests that you adopt his suggested Part 2 that he has prepared for your consideration.

Max Stach: I have two suggestions Mr. Chairman. One is that the applicant needs to clarify the glass on the facade which is always great in self storage, but clarify what that glass actually is. Whether it's mirror, tint, if it's actually used into the self storage facility, or if it's into a foe roll up door pipe diorama type thing. The other thing is, I see that there's a landscaped plan on that side that doesn't necessarily agree with the Landscape on the visual rendering. When I was going around the Village today and looking at the building, it seemed to me like the best thing they could do is have a really robust beautiful landscape plan in front of this building. If they could show that on the 3D rendering what they're proposing over there, that might be better for board to determine what it's really going to look like.

Dennis Michaels: So the applicant doesn't have to come yet again. It is potentially possible that you could render a Environmental determination of the Negative Declaration which would be again no potential significant adverse environmental setbacks and the next special meeting. Immediately following that you could actually render approval decision if you find it appropriate, with appropriate conditions as recommended by the Village Planner and Village Engineer. With that said, the applicant would love to hear in addition to this 3D rendering, do you want to see maybe something from the other side? The street scape that you saw but wasn't to scale? Let the applicant know so when they come here at the next meeting they will have that for you.

Joseph Natale: Well they're shooting blank because they didn't have time to see the balloon test.

Gil Carlevaro: I was there when they were setting it up.

Dennis Michaels: Could you show us again the street scape that you said was not to scale?

Eve Mancuso: Maybe a photographic rendering so you can see it in relation to the buildings next to it?

Dennis Michaels: Do you want to see this reflect to what they're proposing, because this doesn't accurately show that?

Gil Carlevaro: It's probably twice as high as what that looks like. Look at the size of the car, that building is almost twice as high as the car.

Dennis Michaels: Correct as the Architect mentioned so would you like to see this done more accurately?

All members agreed.

Max Stach: It also might help the applicant to take some pictures right now while the balloons are up and use those as approximate reference points.

Dennis Michaels: What about elevations rendering from the opposite sides of this?

Joseph Natale: I say anything they can give us to help they should do.

Dennis Michaels: So is there anything else you'd like to see from the applicant?

Joseph Natale: Well there's already of ton of things.

Dennis Michaels: So can we pick a date? I have 3 dates I'll recommend only because I'm available.

Amy Mele: While I'm thinking of it, Ms. Ventura will be adjourning the ZBA meeting for Thursday because obviously we won't be able to get anything done this Thursday.

Dennis Michaels: We will state something on the record at the ZBA meeting so we don't have to repost and republish and re-mail. Just put it on the agenda, to be continued-held open so it'll remind us to make that announcement. Amy I have available June 19, 20, 21 but let's start with the board. Are all of you available on those dates?

Bob Zumesky: In order to get the type of renderings that they want we'd need more time.

Dennis Michaels: That was my next question.

Gil Carlevaro: The following week is Monday the 25 through Friday the 29th.

Dennis Michaels: Monday June 25th would work. Could you have your renderings by that date?

Bob Zumesky: We will shoot for that.

Dennis Michaels: Are you all available for June 25, 2018?

All board members agreed they could make the meeting.

Dennis Michaels: Could we make the meeting for 8:00 pm instead? If you could send your renderings digitally to Max, that would be great.

Amy Mele: If it looks like we're having a problem meeting that date we will let you know in advance so that everybody doesn't have to show up if there's no reason to.

Dennis Michaels: The application of PAG Investments, LLC Route 9W in Gurnee Avenue, for self storage facility will be held open and be continued to a special meeting of the Planning Board will be Monday June 25, 2018 at 8:00 PM here in this meeting room. Thank you.

Amy Mele: Thank you all.

Gil Carlevaro made a motion to postpone this meeting until June 25, 2018 at 8:00 pm as sighted by council.

Seconded by: Diogenes Dominguez

Carried by: All

Dennis Michaels: You can now make a motion to adopt Part 2 of the SEQRA.

Dennis Michaels: Suggested to make a motion to Declare the Planning Board as Lead Agency under the SEQRA for 217 Rte 9W, Storage Facility.

RESOLUTION 19-2018

Motion by: Gil Carlevaro

Seconded by: Danny Scaffidi

ROLL CALL

Joseph Natale: Yes

Gil Carlevaro: Yes

Diogenes Dominguez: Yes

Danny Scaffidi: Yes

Edwin Molina: Yes

Motion: Passed

Dennis Michales entertained a motion to adopt the Part 2 of the long environmental assessment form under the SEQRA as prepared by the Village Planner Max Stach

dated June 11, 2018 for PAG Investments, Self Storage Facility, 217 Rte 9W, Haverstraw, NY 10927.

RESOLUTION 20-2018

Motion by: Gil Carlevaro
Seconded by: Edwin Molina

ROLL CALL

Joseph Natale: Yes
Gil Carlevaro: Yes
Diogenes Dominguez: Yes
Danny Scaffidi: Yes
Edwin Molina: Yes

Motion: Passed

Joseph Natale introduced the next item on the agenda, Public Hearing for Metro-PCS, 21 Broadway, Haverstraw, NY 10927. **27.45-2-49**

Gil Carlevaro made a motion to open up the Public Hearing for 21 Broadway.

RESOLUTION 21-2018

Seconded by: Diogenes Dominguez
Carried by: All

Chairman Natale asked the Clerk to the Board, Michelle Ventura to read the Public Hearing Notice sent out to surrounding properties.

Michelle Ventura, Clerk to Board: The Public Hearing reads,

“ PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that a Public Hearing will be heard by the PLANNING BOARD OF THE VILLAGE OF HAVERSTRAW, in the Village Hall of the Village of Haverstraw, located at 40 New Main Street, 2nd Floor, Haverstraw, New York 10927, on **June 11, 2018, at 7:00 PM**, to consider the following application:

The applicant, MetroPCS New York, LLC (“MetroPCS”), the contract lessee of a portion of the property located at 21 Broadway, Village of Haverstraw, NY, issued Tax Map Designation 27.45-2-49 (“Property”), has made application to the Planning Board of the Village of Haverstraw, pursuant to Chapter 221 of the Code of the Village of Haverstraw, for a Special Use Permit and amended Site Plan approval to upgrade its existing rooftop Wireless Telecommunications Facility on the Property, which is located in the Central Business District (CBD). Currently, MetroPCS has three panel antennas affixed to the existing apartment building bulkhead on the Property at a height of 56’ 8” inches, and

equipment cabinets in the building's basement. MetroPCS's application requests approvals to upgrade the existing Wireless Telecommunications Facility by replacing the three existing antennas with nine new panel antennas, and remote radio heads, to be installed on the main building rooftop at a height of 48.5'. The antennas will be installed behind a new 42" tall screen wall, which will run the entire length of the south and west sides of the building rooftop. The screen will also continue for a short distance on the east side of the building. The existing equipment cabinets in the building basement will also be updated. MetroPCS also requests any additional approvals, variances, waivers, exceptions, or any other relief, which may be deemed necessary upon review of the application by the Planning Board."

Frank Ferraro, Attorney: Hello everyone. I'm the attorney representing the applicant for Metro PCS, LLC. We're back before the board seeking the Special Permit and Amended Site Plan Approval in order to upgrade the existing wireless facility on the roof. As Ms. Ventura just explained, previously we informed the board and in the packet, this facility has been on the board for some time. The Village Board approved the Special Permit Use for up to 6 antennas on the stairway bulk head of that building back in November 15, 2010. At the time the antennas were approved at a height of 56 feet 8 inches. What we're looking to do is upgrade the site and redesign it. We will be taking the antennas down. There are currently 3 up there though 6 were previously approved. All that structural steel up there will come off and come down and be replaced with 9 new antennas. So three antennas per sector on a proposed screen wall. We do have four witnesses for you tonight to review the need for the facility. We have our Radio Frequency Engineer who will go over the capacity issues that Metro's having in this area. We also have our Radio Frequency Admissions Consultant. He'll go over how this facility will comply with all FCC admissions standards. Once it's updated we have our Professional Engineer to review the site plan. We also have our Planning Consultant just to review the photo simulations since he's the one who actually did put those together for the board. That's an overview of where we hope to go. Mr. Chairman, if there are any initial questions or perhaps comments from you or the board members to our professionals, please feel free to jump right in.

Dennis Michaels entertained a motion to declare the Planning Board to be Lead Agency under the State Environmental Quarter Review Act.

RESOLUTION 22-2018

Motion by: Gil Carlevaro
Seconded by: Diogenes Dominguez
Carried by: All

Frank Ferraro: Was it agreed that this is a Type II action?

Dennis Michaels: I think we decided to treat it as unlisted.

Frank Ferraro: Our first witness is Ms. Francis Busholty who is our Radio Frequency Engineer. Ms. Busholty could you please review your background, qualifications for the board.

Frances Boschulte: Yes, I have a Bachelors in Electrical Engineering from the City College of NY. I've been employed as a Radio Frequency Engineer for over 10 years. I've designed self sites, wireless facilities throughout the State of NJ and NY. I've testified for multiple boards within the State of NY and NJ.

Frank Ferraro: Ms Frances Boschulte., your firm prepared the radio frequency comprehension plan report dated April 24, 2018 and a copy of this report was submitted to the board in its packet. The exhibits she is about to go over are from this particular report.

Frances Boschulte: The first exhibit is a detailed site map that was submitted in the first report but also included in the April 24, 2018 report.

Frank Ferraro: I will mark this report as A1. Could you please start with explaining what's on it, in the report it's known as Exhibit A.

Frances Boschulte: At the bottom you'll see the legend titled "Detailed Site Map" with the address of the facility known as RK06126A at 21 Broadway, Village of Haverstraw NJ. It should say Haverstraw NY so that will have to be corrected. As you can see on this map north being at the top straight up, there are dots. The pink dots is the existing Metro PCS facility. The purple dots are the existing T-Mobile wireless facilities. The road in green indicates the US Highway 9W going from West to East. As you can see, this existing facility provides coverage to most of the Village of Haverstraw.

Frank Ferraro: You can also demonstrate the capacity issues that Metro PCS has experienced in this area.

Frances Boschulte: The primary objective is to upgrade the existing facility. Right now Metro PCS currently has LTE 2100 megahertz in the existing facility. Metro PCS is licensed in 3 frequency vans, the 2100, 700 and the 1900. The 2100 megahertz is their largest channel that has 20 megahertz band with. This particular channel is already approaching 100% utilization. When a facility passes the 70% utilization, the Metro PCS customer will experience difficulty accessing the network and a significant decrease in data speeds. As you know, even voice today is being processed as data in addition to all the applications that are out that are utilized for our smart devices today. So when the utilization starts to cross the red line which indicates the 70% capacity threshold, Metro PCS looks at ways to increase their capacity. That is what's being proposed tonight. The additional antennas will include the LTE technology for the 1900 as well as

the 700 megahertz, which will overall enhance not just the capacity but coverage as well. It will keep up with the greater service and enhancement for the Metro PCS customers.

Frank Ferraro: Is this graph based upon imperial data from the Metro PCS/T-Mobile network?

Frances Boschulte: This data is from the busy hour of the day. Along the bottom are the horizontal access that you have from January 2018 all the way to April 18, 2018 with the time stamped of the busy hour indicating the amount of data that's being utilized in that time.

Frank Ferraro: Mr. Chairman and board members, if you remember from our last meeting, we gave an explanation of the relationship between Metro PCS and T-Mobile. T-Mobile has essentially acquired Metro PCS however the Metro PCS service is still out there and being utilized by T-Mobile in this area and other areas in this Country. What we're trying to do is upgrade this particular site but this is in fact owned by T-Mobile. With respect to this graph, this relates to one of the existing sites shown on the site map previously correct?

Frances Boschulte: Yes correct. These capacity charts are of the existing Metro PCS at the proposed site. There's a chart here each sector. Currently there are 3 sectors. Each sector has a particular azimuth to cover 360 degrees around the site within the village. This is the alpha sector, and on the next capacity chart this is the beta sector. This one is pretty much consistently over 90% utilization. The third exhibit is the gamma sector. As you can see it was at 70% and now it's increasing.

Gil Carelvaro: I don't fully understand what you mean by alpha, beta and gamma sectors.

Frances Boschulte: As I mentioned before, panel antennas are directional, it's not an omni. So each panel will see a piece of the 365 degrees, typically each panel will have a 65% beam width. So let's say its 3 slices of a pie. The alpha is typically the one that points closest to the north, the beta is more southeast and the gamma is more toward the west.

Gil Carlevaro: What's the significance of that and these charts?

Frances Boschulte: These charts correlate back to that particular antenna pointing in that particular azimuth, the area of customers that they're covering. This is the data utilization for that particular sector.

Frank Ferraro: If I could just refer to the plan that the board has in their packets. The plans show the existing Metro PCS facility on the stairwell bulk head. You'll see 3 antennas in different directions. You'll also see arrows pointing such as beta, alpha

pointing towards Broadway and then gamma pointing back. So these charts relate to those particular antennas and what's going on at those particular locations. So Ms. Boschulte, this is different than a coverage gap correct?

Frances Boschulte: Yes.

Frank Ferraro: So Metro PCS has coverage in this area correct?

Frances Boschulte: Yes.

Frank Ferraro: Am I saying it correctly in that the antennas themselves just don't have the capacity to deal with the demand of all the phones that are being used in this area?

Frances Boschulte: Yes that is correct. As I mentioned before MetroPCS which was taken by T-Mobile is licensed in 3 frequency bands, 700, 1900 and 2100 megahertz. The 700 propagates further meaning that it covers much larger area because the lower the frequency the more coverage radius. The higher the frequency, the more susceptible it is to foliage and building structures; it weakens the signal. With this proposed facility the 2100 megahertz based on the coverage footprint, it reaching its maximum amount of customers that it can serve in that particular geographic area.

Frank Ferraro: Has the service become unreliable once you've reached exhaustion or a capacity deficiency in this area?

Frances Boschulte: As it begins to approach the 90% the data speeds start to slow down tremendously. What happens is with your phone, when you try to access the network, the applications time out or you'll see the circle basically in a queue and the longer you're in that queue the less likely you're to get that information.

Frank Ferraro: In your opinion will these new antennas at these new locations on the roof top be remedied that of capacity deficiency?

Frances Boschulte: Yes, adding the additional LTE channels; the additional frequencies as I mentioned, you're adding the additional capacity and additional bandwidth.

Frank Ferraro: The antennas that are being proposed, are they at the minimum height necessary in your opinion to address this area of efficient coverage?

Frances Boschulte: Yes they are.

Frank Ferraro: If this facility were approved, would it cause any interference with any existing communication equipment or electronic equipment in the area?

Frances Boschulte: No. MetroPCS as well as T-Mobile wireless is licensed to operate in their own FCC license frequency band, and if any issues were to occur they would more than willingly work with any public entity then if they need to.

Frank Ferraro: Mr. Chairman, do you or any of the board members have any questions? Or perhaps Mr. Musso has any questions?

Mike Musso, Village Telecommunications Consultant: I wanted to ask, this site will work with both T-Mobile subscribers and MetroPCS subscribers?

Frances Boschulte: Yes that is correct.

Mike Musso: At the first Planning Board meeting, i know it was discussed I think you answered the questions well. There's 3 antennas bunched together on top of the penthouse right now. Metro PCS in 2010 was aiming for 6 antennas. Over time the 3 antennas remain now. The idea is to remedy this capacity plots. As a telecommunications consultant working for many municipalities, especially in downtown type of areas, this is where it's at. There are cell sites going back to the late 1990's early 2000's and now it's about capacity. Not only phone calls but data needs and downloads and things like that. So we did review these capacity charts. We are in agreement with those and we can talk more about the proposed layout as we get into that. One other question though related to the RF Engineer, there's a new frequency that's licensed for T-Mobile in this case 600 megahertz.

Frances Boschulte: That is correct.

Mike Musso: This site will activate that frequency which is FCC licensed. We are starting to see that in other municipalities too at existing T-Mobile or MetroPCS cell sites, there is a new frequency that they're licensed to use. So aside from updating the existing frequencies, there is another benefit if you will. This site will really continue to service the entire downtown area. I do want to note also because it is related to RF, there's really nothing more on the radar screen for Metro or T-Mobile to cover the downtown area so this is kind of a one and done as far as we could see right now. I think that's important for you to consider.

Frank Ferraro: Mr. Chairman that brings us to our next witness, Wayne Neil who is our radio frequency emissions compliance expert.

Wayne Neil, Electrical Engineer: I'm Wayne Neil. I have a Bachelors in Electrical Engineering from Clemson University. I've been working as an RF Engineer since 2001. I've worked for all major carriers as well as designing federal communication systems for different federal agencies.

Frank Ferraro: Mr. Neil, your firm prepared the original report by Centerline Solutions entitled RF Safety and NY Analysis Report dated February 18, 2016 is that correct?

Wayne Neil: That is correct.

Frank Ferraro: There was an updated report as of today. We did supply it in electronic format to Mr. Musso and I'm not sure if you've had the opportunity to review the entire thing but the purpose of the supplemental report was to address the comments in Mr. Musso's technical memo. We will ask Mr. Neil to testify as to the updated report and how it differs from the original report. May 25, 2018 was the report that was submitted to the board. The supplemental report from 6/8/2018 which is a newer report the board doesn't have. Mr. Neil could you please just describe the analysis and conclusions contained in this report.

Wayne Neil: The FCC sets forth certain guidelines they consider to be safe or unsafe for professionals in the industry that have controlled access to the equipment or the general population. Obviously the general population isn't aware when they're being hit with the radiation from the antennas so their threshold is much lower for safety. What we do is take all the information provided to us by T-Mobile, Verizon or MetroPCS, whoever needs the analysis done. That includes their frequency, their specifications on the antennas, flactal cables so we understand how much loss is coming through, the radio so we know how much power their outputting. Finally the orientation of these antennas, so we understand how they're interacting with each other and create certain hot spots of energy in the given location. We take all of that and we determine what the environment is whether it's occupational in a controlled access or general population. We then run it through our tool that tells us whether or not it meets the FCC criteria. If it is above the FCC threshold, it tells us what kind of signage is required and in what location in order to meet the FCC threshold for compliance safety.

Frank Ferraro: With respect to the general limits and not necessarily the occupational limits, did you find that the site will operate within FCC allowable limits?

Wayne Neil: We did. If anyone has the copy of the report, you can see on page 12 that on exhibits 3.2 - 3.4 all three of these are general population locations and all 3 show below general population thresholds.

Frank Ferraro: This report takes in to account all the antennas correct?

Wayne Neil: All the antennas yes. You can actually see in the hotspots 9 small red spots. Each one of those is the actual location of the antennas where the energy is strongest directly in front of the antenna.

Frank Ferraro: Those locations in front of the antenna, does your firm recommend signage in order to follow the FCC requirements and will there be caution or warning signage put on the door access to the roof?

Wayne Neil: We do. On exhibit 3.5, we provide an analysis showing where and what kind of signage is required at each location in order to be compliant with FCC signage. Yes there will be signage on the door as well.

Frank Ferraro: Also contact information with respect to how to get in contact with Metro PCS as well?

Wayne Neil: That is correct that is also required. i

Frank Ferraro: So based on your review and your running of the FCC model, is it your opinion that this facility will meet all FCC emissions requirements?

Wayne Neil: It is.

Gil Carlevaro: Will these signage's be bilingual?

Frank Ferraro: They can be.

Gil Carlevaro: I think they should be.

Frank Ferraro: I think that was a recommendation already so yes no problem.

Danny Scaffidi: Will the frequency interfere with any emergency signals?

Wayne Neil: No it will not. In my RF opinion, having done specific interference analysis for government systems that could potentially interfere with public safety and also doing that for commercial wireless systems, we almost never see interference between commercial wireless systems and public safety unless, they're within extreme close proximity.

Danny Scaffidi: In case there's an emergency and everyone is using the cell phone at once, will that interfere with any emergency signals?

Wayne Neil: No, they're using completely separate frequencies. There's no interference just because of extra network traffic.

Joseph Natale: Frank this question is for you. On page 14, the conclusions and recommendations, do you have any problems with their must do lists?

Frank Ferraro: It needs to be done with accordance to the FCC guidelines and then we will do it.

Mike Musso: I have a couple of comments. Number 1, the question on interference is a good one. I think that relates to the rf commissions persons and also the first person we

heard in radio frequency. Interference is one of the things like safety that's largely exempted from municipal review if they're in compliance. We always ask for information and calculations. We did have some comments on this that you may have seen in my tech memo. I wanted to learn more about street level. I think they did a very good job covering the rooftop. A lot of it is green which means it's ok for anyone's exposure 24/7. Right in front of the three antenna arrays, they're above the general public. That's where the signage comes in and bilingual signage is very important at all of the site. At each of the three arrays and on the access way to the roof, they will be in compliance with what's called an FCC controlled exposure environment. I think the interference issue, I've heard this in the past from Mayor Kohut and others regarding the antennas on the Central Presbyterian Church. That's something I think in the resolution they would have to remedy. If there is reported interference they're obliged to look into it. In my experience, it hasn't been a large probability because of the lights frequency bands. I think that's something the applicant would have no problem complying with and perhaps that's something we could add to resolution when ready. I did have a chance to look to the reissued report that I received this afternoon. There is a statement in there about street level. There's also some clarifications regarding the front of these antennas, what height and how far away do you have to be to be in compliance with the general public. The most conservative, the most protective maximum permissible exposure limit. The idea is that the people aren't going to be hovering in front of these antennas and air but we do have buildings around. I spent a lot of time today looking at street view images on google.

Danny Scaffidi: The roof top will be open correct?

Mike Musso: The rooftop will be a controlled access with signage. That's what the FCC requires. That's something we could talk about at the time of the resolution. There will be bilingual signage. Maybe there's another type of controlled access. But technically that's not required for these types of sites.

Danny Scaffidi: I'm just thinking if there's a kid up there playing around, if it's safe enough.

Mike Musso: Whether they should be up there is another issue but I think you bring up a point that that's maybe the reality. There's also the northern roof which is about at the same level. Now the antennas aren't directed towards the roof. They looked at a lower roof to the north that drops down two stories and the west behind the building on W Broadway drops down one story. Those are compliant right now. I would like a couple clarifications and I think even after the meeting tonight perhaps Wayne could take a look. I think some of the assumptions in the report are based on things like desk top mapping and I think perhaps you'll get a better idea of those drop down in heights to the neighboring roofs. It's really the one issue that I have and I think the recommendations that I have in here are typical about rooftop access. We could perhaps revisit those. But the site will be compliant in terms of the signage rooftop access and the levels. Again these aren't directed into neighboring windows. There's space, about a 30 foot arch in

front of the antenna arrays. At that antenna height we will be at compliance but really no one is residing there. For a 3 story building this isn't a typical. A lot of cell sites are built on top of 3 story buildings. My recommendation is there could be a little more supplement submitted. I was very happy to see the report that was submitted earlier today. As you can see in my tech memo generally it is in compliance but perhaps we could right in something as a condition just for the files. Because this is an upgrade technically and not a new cell site due to existing since 2010, and the idea that radio frequency admissions on this type of structure, 3 stories above ground level, some of this will be exempted from municipal review. But they've cooperated at this point so far and I think we could write something very solid into the resolution about being protective.

Dennis Michaels: In that regard, is there something new that you're suggesting could be made conditions of the approval or are they reflective on pages 12-14 of your tech memo dated June 8, 2018.

Mike Musso: Pages 12-14 note that we have requested additional information that we just received today. The recommendations in our tech memo, those could be perhaps copied into a resolution in the future.

Dennis Michaels: That's what I would recommend as well but you mentioned a couple things in the past few minutes that these are conditions this board may wish to add to the resolution of approval. My question to you is are those already reflected in your tech memo of June 8 or are these something we need to make note of now. If this board were in a position to approve this tonight; I believe our Village Planner unless he's changing his mind is recommending or suggesting to this board that a Negative Declaration under SEQRA would be appropriate. That means the application is deemed complete and this board is in a legal position to be able to approve this tonight with conditions. So I'm looking at your Tech Memo dated June 8, 2018 pages 12-14 and mentioned in your cover email you'd suggest these be made conditions of any approvals. So are there any more conditions standing here today in addition to those that appear on those pages in your memo?

Mike Musso: I would say after reading the report I just received this afternoon which is the supplement radio frequency emissions report, I relayed tonight about confirming the heights and the drop downs from the antennas to the back roof and the two roofs to the north. If those heights are confirmed, I think we're ready for a condition on the radio frequency emissions. Is there a draft resolution?

Dennis Michaels: No there isn't.

Mike Musso: So that is something we could work on and the Planning Board members could talk about.

Dennis Michaels: We could approach it one of two ways. We have Michelle who takes detailed minutes. As an attorney for the Land Use Board the most important thing to me is that the minutes reflect what you're approving as you reference the documentation and the dates of the plans with the most recent revision dates. Critically important are to specifically state the conditions of your approval so that's why I'm asking these questions. Pages 12-14 of the June 18, 2018 tech memo from Mike Musso, those we'll make conditions of the approval and Michelle copies and pastes them into the minutes. Max Stach has any conditions in the memo the same thing will happen. As long as we recite them clearly and they're understandable and everyone accepts them we recite them into the record, the minutes get typed up and they come back to the board for review and that could be your resolution. It's been my legal opinion that there's no requirement you have a document called Capital R Resolution, Capital R Decision or Capital R Minutes. What the law requires is a written document that accurately reflects the decision of the Land Use Board and has all the elements in there that reflect what they're reviewing and what they're approving and what the conditions of the approval are. The fancy resolutions in my legal opinion are unnecessary if you have minutes that are drafted well and Michelle is very good and we get the conditions to accurately reflect it in the minute, that is all you need. If you'd like to draft one for this board and for me to tweak we did that for the last tower application.

Mike Musso: Yes I'm just being consistent from what we've done in the past.

Dennis Michaels: It's up to this board I think the minutes are adequate.

Joseph Natale: Mike I would say if you can have that ready by our next meeting and if everyone is in agreement, by the June meeting we can make it the first thing on the agenda.

Dennis Michaels: Is this board comfortable enough to approve this today?

Joseph Natale: I want Mike to draw up the resolution because he just said he would do it. I'd rather have the resolution I don't know about everyone else.

Dennis Michaels: How about this. You know how you approve the minutes you're doing tonight for the May meeting, you can take action on this tonight I think. We have a Negative Declaration potentially. If you have all the information you need and you're comfortable with the expert's testimony and the documentation submitted, I asked Mike if there are any conditions in addition to his tech memo and he did recite one. What I'm trying to say is legally and procedurally you're cable of approving this tonight. You don't have to have the document in front of you.

Gil Carlevaro: The only problem is that we have a report dated May 25, 2018 an you guys have a report dated June 8, 2018. We haven't had access to the document and would like to see it before any decision is made.

Dennis Michaels: Fair enough.

Frank Ferraro: We will also provide any additional information that we need.

Dennis Michaels: Would you like to add them to the special meeting?

Joseph Natale: If Mike is comfortable and can have the resolution ready then sure.

Dennis Michaels: So you can send me a draft with the resolution.

Mike Musso: Yes I will send over a draft. I'll send over a resolution that incorporates what I need to say. Did you have any questions about confirming the heights and the drop downs to the neighboring roofs?

Wayne Neil: We can talk definitely add to that.

Frank Ferraro: Thank you. So that brings us to our next witness, Peter Tardy a professional Engineer here to briefly review his educational background and qualifications along with the amended site plan.

Peter Tardy, Engineer: Hello my name is Peter Tardy, I have a Bachelors of Science from Rutgers University and a Masters of Science from Rutgers University and have been a professional Engineer in New Jersey and New York for over 10 years. I've appeared before numerous boards as much as over 100.

Frank Ferraro: Mr. Tardy, you prepared the plans last revised on 4/26/18 is that correct and could you review the existing conditions of the site as well as the proposed wireless facility upgrade.

Peter Tardy: I did prepare the plans that are correct. I'd like to refer you to sheet SP2 which is titled Roof Plan and Elevation.

Joseph Natale: Do we have those Michelle?

Dennis Michaels: Yes you have them I have one here. It's in your material.

Peter Tardy: So in sheet SP2 entitled Roof Plan and Elevation, the rooftop structure is approximately 42 feet above grade. T-Mobile has existing equipment located in the basement of the building and routes their antenna cables up the exterior of the building to the roof which then routes to the existing stairway pent house structure. This currently supports a total of 3 antennas as it was mentioned previously. We proposed to remove that steel structure that supports the 3 antennas and then install the total of 3 sectors worth of antennas; 3 antennas per sector for a total of 9 antennas. You'll see in the roof plan, at the North West corner of the building will have the gamma sector. Again there will be 3 antennas at that location. To the southwest corner of the building along west

Broadway, there will be a total of 3 antennas proposed. The south east corner of the building will be the alpha sector. We're currently also proposing a 42 inch high screen wall which will route the full length of W Broadway and the western end the building to help screen the proposed antennas.

Frank Ferraro: The size of these antennas has been reduced from the initial submission to 6.3 feet, is this correct?

Peter Tardy: Yes it has been.

Frank Ferraro: Originally we proposed 8 feet tall antennas correct?

Peter Tardy: That is correct.

Frank Ferraro: The equipment cabinets will remain in the building basement is that right?

Peter Tardy: All the cabinets will remain in the basement although one of the cabinets will be switched out for a newer version.

Frank Ferraro: The new antennas and screening will be approximately 8.5 feet above the roof?

Peter Tardy: Well the screening itself will be about 42 inches. The top of the antennas will approximately be 8.5 feet.

Frank Ferraro: Your firm prepared a structural certification letter dated May 23, 2018 indicating the building can structurally support the additional antennas and screening is this correct?

Peter Tardy: Yes that is correct. The proposed steel support as well as the existing building can actually support the post configuration.

Frank Ferraro: If the board were to approve this design do you agree to submit a full structural report for review by the board's professional's condition of approval?

Peter Tardy: That is not a problem.

Frank Ferraro: With respect to the installation will the facility conform to all applicable building codes? Is there any need for an extension of utilities of the upgrade?

Peter Tardy: Yes it will conform to building codes and there's no extension of utilities. The only thing that would be modified is the cable routing up on top of the roof to ensure that cables get from the equipment to each of the 3 proposed antenna sectors.

Frank Ferraro: Would the upgrade impact any parking on the site or the site area?

Peter Tardy: Not at all. There will be no change from a visit requirement. Again every 4-6 weeks a technician will come on site to do routine maintenance.

Frank Ferraro: They arrive in a typical SUV vehicle?

Peter Tardy: Yes.

Frank Ferraro: Any ground disturbance of any kind proposed in this facility?

Peter Tardy: No ground disturbances proposed.

Frank Ferraro: Any new lighting proposed? Any new commercial or advertising signage?

Peter Tardy: There is no new lighting proposed. The only signage that is being proposed is what's been previously described from the radio frequency expert.

Frank Ferraro: Are these sites monitored at a 24/7 basis?

Peter Tardy: They are monitored and they do have switch stations in case there's a problem. The technician will be alerted and will visit the site.

Frank Ferraro: Will this facility upgrade propose any hazards to the general public from an engineering standpoint?

Peter Tardy: No it will not.

Frank Ferraro: Do you feel that this building can accommodate the additional antennas and screening?

Peter Tardy: Absolutely.

Frank Ferraro: Are there any variances associated with this application?

Peter Tardy: There are not.

Frank Ferraro: Mr. Chairman is there any questions for Mr. Tardy with respect to the plan or design?

Gil Carlevaro: I have one question. You mentioned monthly maintenance. Will there be any significant noise impact when you do the monthly maintenance?

Peter Tardy: Not at all. A technician comes on site and brings a laptop and does diagnostic testing to ensure the equipment is operating properly.

Joseph Natale: I have a question for you. I have a letter about the existing roof framing needing to be reinforced? You are going to have to comply with that because it says it must be done?

Frank Ferraro: Yes of course. Mr. Chairman is referring to your May 23, 2018 letter in the middle of the paragraph.

Peter Tardy: At the antenna locations there will be sistering existing roof framing to ensure that it can properly support it, just as well as when we post back from the screening back onto the roof top. We will make sure there's adequate support to make that installation.

Joseph Natale: I believe it mentioned lateral support?

Peter Tardy: Well within the roof framing itself, we will be providing additional members and some blocking between the existing members as well.

Frank Ferraro: That will be contained in a full structural report that will go to the building department sign and sealed by our NY licensed Engineer.

Joseph Natale: Are you conformable with that Ruben?

Ruben Berrios: Yes.

Eve Mancuso: Mr. Chairman I just have one question. In terms of the structural framing to support the antennas, would that all be below the 42 inch screen height?

Peter Tardy: Absolutely.

Mike Musso: Just some notes I'd like to mention. Some of this is going to lead into I think the last presenter. The big things are the visuals. The full structural analysis is a condition we work with. If you think of new towers, whether it's going to be a flag pole or a stealth tree, that's not this case at all. The Planning Board needs to approve the design and that's part of what's going to be in front of you tonight. We will go through the different visual options we've worked with. Essentially they're going to be losing about 8.5 feet from antenna tops with the new antenna tops. I know this gets a little into the visual assessment. All the cross members that would connect to each of the 3 antennas for each sector will be behind this 42 inch wall. All this will be taken down from the top of the pent house. You could probably see that in some of the simulations. The monthly maintenance is very typical. In fact a lot of that may be in the basement in the equipment cabinets which is kind of the guts to the system. Some roof top sites everything is on the roof, the antennas and the equipment cabinets but in this case it will remain in the basement where it is now. Normally that's a very low impact on the site.

Danny Scaffidi: The wiring for the antennas run down the center of the rooftop or the side of it?

Peter Tardy: Right now we show it more towards the center of the rooftop. There will be a small cable tray of approximately 12 inches wide. If it's the boards desire we can route it closer on the edge of the roof.

Danny Scaffidi: I would prefer that to avoid tripping hazards or paint it in some type of color.

Mike Musso: This is flush mounted onto the roofs surface.

Danny Scaffidi: Could this be tucked away towards the wall for hazardous purposes?

Peter Tardy: If its desirable by the board we certainly can re-route it and put it within 5 feet of the edge of the wall. Part of what we proposed is based on what is existing and minimizing the re-use.

Joseph Natale: I'm thinking maybe further in incase of a problem getting on the roof for the fire department operation.

Michael Kohut, Village of Haverstraw Mayor: Further in makes more sense.

Mike Musso: The cables will run down the back end into the building. They will all be grouped together. So they will join from the array here, the array here and the array out front and run down the side of the back of the building like they do now. There's actually a cable tray on the outside of the building that enters into the basement. One of the things that I didn't mention what I believe the capacity issues they're having now, is actually due to the shadowing of the antennas on top of the pent house. The idea is trying to get down to users mainly at the ground surface or in vehicles you can see in this long cross section of the roof there's probably some shadowing that goes on. Wetland about that a little bit at the first meeting. The idea that you just can't bring the antennas down and slide them in to the middle, there has to be some kind of line of site. This rf screen wall is actually rf transparent which is nice.

Joseph Natale: I was speaking in regards to the table trays. If you have to go up the aerial ladder and climb on the roof, say to ventilate because you have a fir in one of the apartments God forbid, but I think further back so when you go up the parapet or jump over the 42 inch screen you don't want to be jumping on that cable tray. You want to have room so that can be further in as far as I'm concerned.

Mike Musso: So you have this that runs down almost the mid spine of the building. I can make a note for the resolution to make it visible.

Frank Ferraro: It's something that can be considered.

Eve Mancuso: Is there any other equipment on the roof that needs to be serviced such as air conditioner units or any other equipment do you know of?

Peter Tardy: No there isn't.

Frank Ferraro: Metro PCS has an existing condenser unit on the roof but it's their own equipment.

Eve Mancuso: Ok so just your equipment and no other HVAC equipment or anything like that needs to be serviced regularly.

Frank Ferraro: This brings us to our last witness, David Karlebach who's our planning consultant. Please review your background and qualifications for the board.

David Karlebach, Planning Consultant: Yes, I have a Masters Degree in City Regional Planning in Rutgers University. I earned my AICP Certification in 1994, I've testified on a nightly basis as a Land Use Expert for Planning Boards and Boards of Appeals.

Frank Ferraro: You prepared the photo simulation report that was submitted to the board as well as the previous photo simulations of all the different designs we've gone through is that correct?

David Karlebach: Yes that is correct.

The board now in its packet has the latest iteration which tries to show where we started and where we got to which is basically Mr. Tardys design. Mr. Karlebach, maybe you could go through the iterations of the photo simulations in the packet.

Dennis Michaels: He doesn't have his title stamp on his photo so if he could hand in his card more importantly for Michelle.

David Karlebach: This shows various design alternatives. The one that was universally accepted by the TAC and the Planning Board was "alternative e" which consists of the 42 inch high screen wall that's on 2 sides of the building and for a short portion along the third side of the building. The screen wall is going to be treated to match the color of the trim of the building which is a warm gray color. The antennas themselves come out of the factory off white and those antennas will be treated with a cool gray color to best match the sky backdrop. The other important feature of this design is it's most noticeable on photographs 2 and 4 where the antennas support structure and the antennas are going to be removed from the top of the bulk pad. There also appears to be a hand railing or some sort of railing on the roofs edge which will also be removed.

Frank Ferraro: Did you have the opportunity to drive through this particular area of the Village?

David Karlebach: I did.

Frank Ferraro: Did you have a chance to look through the submissions by the Planning Board?

David Karlebach: Yes.

Frank Ferraro: In your opinion, does this 42 inch screen wall option represent the best aesthetic option for the upgrade of this facility?

David Karlebach: I think it does. It's a superior alternative to the 8 foot high screen wall because that essentially adds another story to the building. So really it's adding a great deal of mass to a building that's only 3 stories tall effectively making it a 4 story building. I think this is the preferred design alternative. The antennas extend above the height of the roof and the most important feature is that the antenna support system; the carbonic, the brackets, the conduits and the cables would all be hidden from public view. Essentially you're going to see just a portion of the antenna emerge above the top of the screen wall.

Frank Ferraro: The antennas and the screen wall could be any color correct?

David Karlebach: They could be any color, absolutely.

Frank Ferraro: What we tried to do here was treat the screen wall to match the existing coping of the building is that correct?

David Karlebach: Right, you can see there's some trim around the building and along the face of the building that's a warm gray color and we're going to treat it to match that warm gray color.

Frank Ferraro: The antennas as you indicate would be a lighter gray to blend in to the sky if you will?

David Karlebach: We find that to be the most effective camouflage after doing hundreds if not thousands of installations is to get them to match the sky. That's the only back drop for the antennas. Had they have been fixed to a portion of the building of course they would be painted to match the building. Here, the light gray color seems to be most effective.

Joseph Natale: Do you have the sample? You said you would bring over something to look at.

Frank Ferraro: I have a sample here. It's not going to be very useful. I brought this so you can feel the material of what the stealth wall will be. I didn't have anything that would

closely match what we're proposing here. We could provide that to Mr. Stach under the conditions of approval before it gets installed that we have the manufactured actually get us the color that's shown in the photo simulation. They don't like doing it unless they come out to the site. They actually go to the site and make sure that the color they pick matches it extremely closely and then they can create a sample and send it to us. In fact we prefer to do that because we want to make sure that you're happy with it before we install this all away around the building. Mr. Chairman nothing further from Mr. Karlebach unless there's questions regarding the photo simulations.

Dennis Michaels: Just for purposes of our resolution, I'd like to list all their drawings that are being approved. Mr. Karlebach, I believe 4e is where this board agreed on.

Joseph Natale: It was all the "e" options.

Dennis Michaels: So it was the same proposal correct?

David Karlebach: Correct.

Mike Musso: So in my tech memo, I included these "e" options. I gave you 4 views I also sent an appendix if you're interested going through the evolution of everything. I just want to remind the board here we've really been at this since 2016. This is before Mr. Ferraro began working on this application. There was informal meetings at TAC. The options that we ended up with most recently Eve, Max Ruben and myself were looking at and giving feedback were no screening wall and the 8 foot screening wall 42 inch screening wall with the special color matching. We ask looked at canister and antenna covers. We didn't feel that was the best option. We feel option "e" has had a lot of work going into that. But of course comments that you have aesthetically or questions could be addressed as well. Color matching is a good idea. I think this sample is not unwasted because there's a little wrap around on the northern wall on the back side but with a different color if you're looking from that angle, more of a brick type of color. But point taken I think this is stealth concealment solutions very possibly?

Frank Ferraro: Possibly.

Mike Musso: A vendor that deals with these stealth walls they want to get it right. Max I believe you had some comments also in your memo?

Max Stach: As Mike said we've spent quite a lot of time talking to the applicant about what solutions work best on this site. We believe option "e" is the best option. In addition to presenting what we believe is not an error out of character design, the 8 foot wall certainly seemed out of character and so did the canisters. This solution of the 42 inch screen wall seems to be in character. It almost looks like an architectural element that the corneous on the front of the building wraps around to the back of the building. We thought it was effective and we're also very happy that they're painting the stair tower which currently i believe is a black color. They will paint it to match the gray facade of

the building. Additionally there is a chimney on the south eastside of the building that currently will be painted to match the corneous gray color. The railing that's there will be behind the screen wall. The satellite dish, chimney and all the other clutter that's up there now will be cleaned up by that 42 inch wall. We think it will be a very mark improvement. I did have a couple comments with regard to the relationship between the visuals and the actual engineering plans. There was a note on the chimney painted to match the façade but it should match the corneous. Additionally I think you just want to make sure the antennas are marked the specific gray chosen for those antennas. The screen wall makes it clear on the engineer plans that it's going to be the corpus gray. So that's really the only issue that we had. The application as Mike said, we don't see any remaining environmental impacts associated with this project. As Mike goes over frequently, the issues with regards to RF frequency exposure are precluded from review as long as they're in compliance with FCC regulations. So as long as you're satisfied with the visual impacts with the project that they've mitigated, we did provide a part 2 and a negative declaration for you tonight.

Joseph Natale: Do you want to weigh in now on yours?

Eve Mancuso: I don't have any further comments. I think everyone went into a lot of detail and I think the renderings provided really are helpful to the board and making a decision so I appreciate all the work that went into the renderings. I have nothing further to add thank you.

Joseph Natale: You agree with the structural capacity and structural support correction?

Eve Mancuso: The structural support will be below that 42 inch wall and the reinforcement of the roof structure will be approved by the building department.

Joseph Natale: So it's all up to you Mike if you want to add anything your report.

Mike Musso: No, a list of findings which I think were covered with the presenters tonight. The application has been comprehensive we feel it's been bedded by your experts and by the building inspector. Number of recommendations that we included are typical, you've seen them before for other roof top sites. I think there's some specific feedback that I recorded tonight on things like cable trays, neighboring roofs and things like that.

Danny Scaffidi: The 42 inch wall, how does that get attached to the building?

Ruben Berrios: They have to submit plans and we would take it from there.

Eve Mancuso: Yes but they did show the angle that will be posted down into the wind load. Then they will reinforce the roof structure to make that attachment.

Mike Musso: There will be a pretty beefy structural analysis for this. One thing that we asked and confirmed before the applicant came in front of the Planning Board was that these different options indeed can work. It's a lot of wind load on the south side. But,

they've done a lot of this before. I don't think I have to go over all the recommendations but if directed I could draft a resolution.

Chairman Natale invited the public to come forward with any questions or concerns regarding the proposed project for 21 Broadway.

Mike Kohut, 34 Rela Avenue: One question and one comment. In reference to the gentlemen with the RF frequency and interference with the emergency services, there's no interference with the basic radio but I can tell you I operate the ariel and the front and the back speak to each other through a wireless headset. The Presbyterian Church building anywhere in the vicinity we lose reception and the radios cut out. I don't know that I've experienced this down in this building am I'm not looking to interfere with this approval but just so you know there are interferences with wireless headsets from other antennas.

Peter Tardy: Depending on the frequency band that's not unexpected.

Mike Kohut: Just a question on the parapet wall, is that worthy building owner to sometime change the color of the building, is that a paintable surface?

Frank Ferraro: Generally it is a paintable surface. The issue I'm thinking is these materials come finished and they have a warranty. So once you paint that it might do something to the warranty of the product but typically this is paintable.

Emily Dominguez, 6 Broadway: Will Sprint and T-Mobile merger have any effect on Metro-PCS?

Frank Ferraro: We don't know at this point. We don't know of any Sprint sites in this immediate location.

Mike Kohut: The church actually.

Frank Ferraro: Yes the church would be the closest so even if they were to merge, we did look into that, there's just not anything close enough in this particular downtown area that would replace this site. So we still feel this site would be needed if ever the merger were to move forward. Typically if that were ever to move forward, they would do an analysis of what sites are duplicative and make decisions as to whether they would need all of them or not.

Dennis Michaels: I have a suggested procedural step you could take tonight. You cannot close the public hearing until the Negative Declaration is adopted. We could make a motion and adopt it. Max do you feel compelled to draft a formal Negative Declaration Resolution or just accept your part 2 and part 3?

Max Stach: I always defer to the Planning Board's attorney.

Dennis Michaels: Based upon the memo from our Village Planner Max Stach dated June 7, 2018 from Nelson Pope and Buerus in which he in a 2 page memo and attached to that a full environmental assessment form under SEQRA, the Part 2, identification of potential project impacts 1-10, also a proposed Negative Declaration prepared by our Village Planner Mr. Stach that is your document recommended by our Village Planner Stach so it will need to be signed by the Planning Board Chairman on the very last page of the document. This is the Negative Declaration based upon that correspondence from our Village Planner Stach. Also June 18 2018 report, Village Planning Boards Wireless Telecommunications Consultant Mike Musso from HDR, I feel this would be appropriate for this board and I find it would be defensible legally challenged if you issued what is known as a Neg Declaration. This means under SEQRA, you find that there will be potential significant adverse environmental impacts as a result of this project after it's completed and in operation. Also in that motion, acknowledge that you find it to be a unlisted action under SEQRA. That's my suggested motion. I'm comfortable with you adopting it as cited by council.

RESOLUTION XX-2018 Motion by: Edwin Molina
Seconded by: Gil Carlevaro
Carried by: All

Dennis Michaels: Now the application is deemed complete under SEQRA you are in a position to approve the application if you were so inclined but I understand you would like a draft resolution in front of you which is fine. I think your going to submit a revised Centerline of May 25, 2018 to June 8, 2018.

Frank Ferraro: Yes June 8, 2018.

Dennis Michaels: So you will send that electronically to Michelle and she will circulate that to the rest of the board. It's being reviewed by the board for this boards consideration and potential approval are a set of drawings by French and Parellos is the firm, Peter J Tardy NYS Licensed Engineer and the page numerated is C-01SP-1, SP-2, SP-3 and they're all most recently revised on April 26, 2018 is that correct Mr. Tardy?

Peter Tardy: Yes that is correct.

Dennis Michael: Correspondence from Village Engineer Eve Mancuso, Brookers Engineering dated May 14, 2018, there's also submissions from Ferraro and Stamos letter dated May 31 2018 signed by Frank Ferraro, correspondence from French and Perelo dated May, 23, 2018 also signed by the licensed professional Engineer Mr. Tardy, correspondence from Piercons Solutions dated April 24 2018 it's 3 pages long signed by Adam Fehan, RF Engineer of Piercons Solution LLC and there's several page correspondence to that attachment. Another correspondence from Ferraro and Stamos, 2 pages dated May 2, 2018 in the Centralized Solution RF Safety analysis report dated May 25, 2018, I understand there is a June 8, 2018 version which will be submitted for

distribution to the board and our consultants. The photographs by Mr. Karlebach. There was a part 1 of the full EAF that the applicant submitted several weeks ago but that's part of the original application submissions.

Mike Musso: So what I heard tonight, there are some tweaks to the drawings. We talked about the cable tray possibly adding the colors. There may be a final upgrade going into approval or building permit for this. The colors that are mentioned, signage and some of the resolution recommendations would be great to put those on and add what Max had to add on the memo.

Frank Ferraro: Will there be conditions in the approval in the resolution?

Dennis Michaels: Yes. Certainly pages 12-14.

Mike Musso: But the drawings we'll tweak in the meantime.

Dennis: We will have that prior to the special meeting which we will talk about now, the revisions so they may not need to be made concessions of the approval because I'll recite the revised drawings not the record and that's what the board will be reviewing and approving. In other words, if we were going to approve it tonight then we'd have to make it a condition of the approval with specifications as to what the revisions are going to show etc. If there's nothing else we will put on the record that the Public Hearing will remain open and continue to the special meeting on June 25th at 8:00 pm and by making this announcement we're avoiding having to send out any further public notices. The application for Metro PCS at the site of 21 Broadway for the wireless telecommunications facility will remain open and continue to June 25, 2018 8:00pm here in this meeting room.

RESOLUTION 23-2018

Motion by: Gil Carlevaro
Seconded by: Danny Scaffidi
Carried by: All

Dennis Michaels: The July 9th meeting was actually July 2nd, you all got my message right?

Michelle Ventura: I never got that message.

Dennis Michaels: So now, the Planning Board's July 9th meeting has been rescheduled to June 25, 2018 at 8:00 pm.

Emily Dominguez: Michelle could announce the meeting on the website home page.

Dennis Michaels: So make sure the July meeting date shows on the Village website. Just post an announcement that the July 9th meeting has been rescheduled for June 25, 2018 at 8:00 pm.

Chairman Natale introduced the next item on the agenda, an informal by Ginsburg Development Companies, LLC (GDC) DPW Facility, 150 Broadway, Haverstraw, NY 10927. **27.05-2-1.1**

Andrew Maniglia, GDC: Good evening members of the board. I'm from Ginsburg Development. So there are 3 matters that we'd like to introduce to you informally this evening. One is a little more formal than the other two. I would like to start with the water front units. They were already adopted in March 2014. We submitted a site plan with 48 units. I'm with my engineer Mark Lukasic from Tectonic Engineering. This matter is mostly ministerial. This site plan was approved in March 2014. We originally proposed to have this site plan approved and the site plan for Riverside building which is now up and running. Its been in service since 2015. This we didn't go forward with at the time because we were trying to determine which would be the most economically feasible to construction. As you know, the other two discussions we will have will be the Admirals Cove portion which is known as site b under the original water front re-development plan that houses the ferry. We weren't quite certain at the time but now we've made the determination to go forward with the water front units first. The waterfront units were approved as condominiums in 2014. We have amended that slightly and reduced its impact from 48 units to 40 units. We've met with your Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), to discuss this reduction and under the original urban renewal plan that was adopted in 2003, any approval for site plans that come before the Planning Board, the Planning Board must then issue a referral to the Village Board of Trustees under the Urban Renewal Plan. The Village Board of Trustees is who makes the final decision on adopting the site plan and or a site plan amendment. I will ask Max Stach to review little, some of the changes he wanted after we worked with the TAC, and Mark Lukasic will tell you what we did to correspond to that and we seek this evening your referral to the Village Board of Trustees for their next meeting so they can make a final decision on the 40 water front units.

Mike Stach: I think what you're looking for is not the referral but the recommendation from this board. So as you all know, The Board of Trustees is responsible for approving site plans with regard to the water front district. This application came before us at TAC and as Mr. Maniglia noted, the buildings essentially had gotten smaller because units have been taken out. The only thing that really took our attention were details. There are certain Zoning provisions regarding the amount of building area that can be within a certain distance to the water is a setback. You're allowed to exceed their encroachment setback by 20%. That initial draft that we got had exceeded 20%. Additionally there's a requirement for separation of buildings 30 feet, some of the buildings were within 30 feet. They were detailed items that we needed to clarify or they needed to go to the Zoning Board for a variance. Essentially the way that the applicant had responded was those buildings that were within 30 feet, they connected. They connected at the garage structure which is a one story structure along the front of the building. If they were too close together they just connected the garages. Essentially the buildings are connected they don't need to be 30 feet away from each other. That was really the primary item we

dealt with at TAC. It was really about performance. As Mr. Maniglia said it's an improvement to the original plan. This plan was improved but the footprints have changed so that requires an amendment to the site plan. There's no SEQRA requirement. It was already done and the letter has already been put into file that this plan is already consistent with the original.

Danny Scaffidi: What changed?

Andrew Maniglia: We reduced the amount of units from 48 to 40.

Danny Scaffidi: What about setbacks?

Max Stach: Development coverage has gone up a little bit so I believe it's 1200 square feet more than the approved plan?

Mark Lucasic: No it's about 500 square feet additional because they put garages along the front of the building.

Danny Scaffidi: You added more or less parking?

Mark Lucasic: What is happening here if we go back and forth from 2014 to 2018 and we just work progressively from the North end of the project southward along the river. In this area in 2014 there was one building footprint. Now we're proposing 2 smaller footprints in its place. So what you see here in blue was 4 years ago and the black line is what we're proposing now. Working into the center of the site, essentially the same building slightly smaller in its structure but with little garages on the wings so it shifted slightly. We're basically saying it was one building there before roughly the same structure there now. Then furthest south of the waterfront we had 2 buildings in 2014 and now 1 large building. So to grossly simplify things here, the large building on the North in 14, and large building in the South in 18. With respect to parking we have less units, less required parking. The actual number of parking spaces that are proposed on the surface actually increased by 4 and what's proposed now at that's really by virtue of the fact that we have a certain number of garages along the frontage and each garage is going to need a place to drive and enter into that garage. Public parking designated by resolution is unchanged over many years on this project. Anything that was surface parking outside of the garages or the driveways is unchanged over the past 4 years as well. Public utilities are all in place as of 4 years ago have not changed, only the utilities services to the building are being rerun in to the required locations based on these footprints. Storm water management has been built for many years as well, that's also a change by this proposal.

Joseph Natale: So you don't go into the units through the garages right?

Mark Lucasic: I think what you're asking is if there's a central lobby serviced?

Joseph Natale: No, so I guess these are all garages now in the front?

Mark Lucasic: Yes.

Joseph Natale: So you don't go straight into the unit from the garages?

Mark Lucasic: Correct they'd have to leave the garage and go through a central lobby elevator.

Mike Stach: Just to clarify what Mr. Lucasic said about the southernmost building being one big building. In form though, I believe it's going to be 2 separate buildings that are 3 stories and then a connector that is one story between the two. So really it is 2 buildings and if you live at Riverside and you're looking out into the water, you'll still be able to see between the two buildings, but along the front the garage will go span the two buildings. That's the only place they're really connected.

Mark Lucasic: Visually less mass.

Danny Scaffidi: My only concern was the parking but if you took care of that then I don't know how much change there could've been in 4 years if you require more or less.

Andrew Maniglia: It really hasn't and since we first proposed this site plan going back to 2003, when we sought the entire site plan for "Site A" we didn't have the bridge over pass at short Clove Road but we do now. That's a constant in this and can handle the traffic.

Max Stach: I can put it this way; the applicant already has an approval to build the buildings. If they built those buildings you would have less parking per unit then you do under this plan. So with this, it has improved the parking situation.

Danny Scaffidi: How many parking spots are you required to have per unit?

Max Stach: It averages out to 1.6 spaces per unit across the entire site but it goes by the number of bedrooms.

Danny Scaffidi: Ok so all of that was taken into consideration.

Max Stach: Yes when it was originally approved. It has improved since that approval.

Andrew Maniglia: Also the bridge overpass has improved the area.

Max Stach: Well I'm not sure what the bridge overpass has to do with the amount of parking.

Andrew Maniglia: Well no but the amount of traffic emanating from this site has improved since the bridge over pass was installed.

Joseph Natale: So you are just looking for us to make a recommendation to the board on that.

Andrew Maniglia: Yes, correct.

Dennis Michaels: If you are comfortable, you can make the recommendation now.

Joseph Natale entertained a motion to make a recommendation to the Village Board of Trustees with regard to the Harbors, "Site A" Waterfront Units.

RESOLUTION 24-2018

Motion by: Edwin Molina
Seconded by: Gil Carlevaro

ROLL CALL

Joseph Natale: Yes
Gil Carlevaro: Yes
Diogenes Dominguez: Yes
Danny Scaffidi: Yes
Edwin Molina: Yes

Dennis Michaels: A suggestion to the Village, check with Jay Hood, Max may know the answer but I'm looking at the NYS General Municipal Law and this is for your benefit as well, as to whether or not this site triggers the General Municipal Law Section 239-nn etcetera. It has to be within the 500 feet boundary. Apparently the Rockland County Planning Department thinks the Hudson River is a trigger. It would only be a trigger if the shore line is a Village boundary.

Mike Stach: It isn't, the boundary is the middle of the river.

Andrew Maniglia: Because that's 16 acres. They did do this in 2014 so it will not be necessary.

Dennis Michaels: It's your call but as of lately they've been very aggressive especially with the Villages. It was just a friendly suggestion but if it's not in their jurisdiction then it's not necessary.

Andrew Maniglia: Mr. Maniglia thanked the board for the positive recommendation.

Joseph Natale now introduced Admirals Cove application.

Andrew Maniglia: Admirals Cove is known as "Site B" in the Haverstraw Waterfront Redevelopment Plan. Since 2000, it has been known as the actual ferry terminus. It currently has approximately 330 parking spaces on it now. It also encompasses other sites that you may not know for example the DPW site and also the old Ferguson Landscaping site. There was a Hogart parcel that we purchased and 2 other private parcels that boarder on West Street. We are now showing you a concept plan of that development. It is potentially 244 rental units. The original approval under the GEIS permitted 250 units there. In order to effectuate this site plan we must relocate the Village's Department of Public Works (DPW) facility, which will be the next sheet you

open up in the submitted documents. This is just concept, it's not completely engineered. I will allow Ross Winglovitz to describe it.

Ross Winglovitz, Engineering & Surveying Properties: So "Site B" for those of you who don't know is directly north of "Site A" which was the Harbors Site. The waterfront units are up here. The water fountain is here, the DPW garage is here and the DPW facility is here. What is proposed as Andrew indicated is 244 units in 4 buildings. The buildings are set perpendicular to the Hudson River. We will be reconfiguring the existing pump station, there's a sewer pump station actually on site. The idea is to actually redo that structure so that it actually fits with the architecture of the buildings. There will be a pool, bathrooms and some bbq areas. There will be provided parking based on the adopted regulations for the waterfront. There are 381 spaces on site. The remaining spaces left without a reconfigured the ferry landing that I think goes from 328 to 323. Water and sewer will be through the pump station. Water is available on Riverside Avenue and extended to the buildings.

Andrew Maniglia: This is our concept right now. Ross will have more work to do. We've shared this with the HOA at Harbors as well as everything else you've seen here and will see. I don't think we've shared the DPW yet but we have shared this plan and the Waterfront unit plans. We meet with them once month to discuss changes to their neighborhood as it affects them. So far they're much supported and we are grateful for that and in return we are very supportive of them. Are there any questions on this?

Joseph Natale: What was the number of units for this?

Andrew Maniglia: It was approved for 250 units but we are aiming for 244.

Ross Winglovitz: There will be 36 studios, 106 one bedroom, 85 2 bedroom and 17 three bedrooms.

Danny Scaffidi: Is this garage under or no?

Ross Winglovitz: There are garages on both sides of the building. Where there is no parking spaces out front are 2 car garage or 2 deep garages that are stacked. Where there is parking out front there's a single loaded garage with 1 gar deep. Out of the 380 spaces, 154 are garage spaces.

Danny Scaffidi: Have you done a traffic study on this?

Ross Winglovitz: It was done as part of the original study.

Andrew Maniglia: Also the new bridge overpass works well for that too. We will also have how many egresses?

Ross Winglovitz: The emergency connects at the Harbors "Side A" main boulevard entrance to the site and another emergency connection into the parking lot into the fairy.

So there's actually 3 connection points into the site, one primary access on Riverside Avenue.

Max Stach: Mr. Chairman if I may, I do want to remind Mr. Maniglia that while this particular site was approved for 250 units, "Site A" was originally approved for 490 units. I believe that 540 units have been approved

Andrew Maniglia: Actually it was 537.

Max Stach: So it's 537 with the waterside reduction. So when you originally approved, I believe you asked for 544. So at the time that you had 544 approved for "Site A" you also lowered "Site B" to 196. So even though it was originally approved for 250 units, you took units from "Site B" and brought them to "Site A." So now what's being asked is that additionally we want more units on "Site B" and the question is where are those coming from. They're coming from "Site C" and "Site D" right?

Andrew Maniglia: Well that's your interpretation.

Max Stach: Or if that's not the case, then we have a different SEQRA situation because we're increasing the density of the overall project. So that's just something here, while working with the Village Board, come to a conclusion on how this SEQRA is going to move forward and know what kind of environmental review will be needed. I will also say with regards to the original SEQRA, yes this was planned to be 250 units but it wasn't planned to be 250 and 330 ferry parking spaces, because the ferry was originally proposed to be moved to the foot of Main. While the over pass is a positive traffic development, I think we do have to look at the traffic flow out of "Site B". I believe "Site B" and "Site A" were full time interconnection under the original plan. This is a gated interconnection emergency access only, so there are some changes to the project that need to be vetted into the environmental review process. We need to work with the Village Board as lead agency to determine what that's going to entail, as this board only is advisory you cannot serve as lead agency. I would imagine that traffic is going to be one of those items.

Danny Scaffidi: I mean you have 250 units and you have how many parking spots?

Ross Winglovitz: 381 parking spots.

Max Stach: Including the ferry?

Ross Winglovitz: No that's just for the site itself. The ferry is another 330.

Joseph Natale: There's parking underneath each building.

Andrew Maniglia: So aren't looking for acts from this board on this matter, we just wanted to make you aware of it. So we will go to the Village Board first and see how they view it. So in order for us to facilitate this project, it is in our Land Acquisition and Disposition agreement with the Village of Haverstraw that was executed back in 2003,

that we have to relocate at our expense the DPW facility to a new location. That location is off of McKenzie Road, Bowline Point Road.

Dennis Michaels: For the record we are now reviewing the newly proposed DPW facility, 150 Broadway, Haverstraw, NY 10927. The reason I'm making that announcement is because I believe you will be the lead agency on this.

Max Stach: This is not in the waterfront district.

Andrew Maniglia: So this part would be separate and distinct from the Admirals Cove approval. If we could get this approved, we could get this moved done sooner than getting the Admirals Cove approved.

Dennis Michaels: So you're going to be Lead Agency on the newly proposed relocated DPW facility. This would need to go to the County Planning Department because its ran on the County stream and give them 30 days with an opportunity to comment under the NYS General Municipal Law Section 239-nn. So within 500 feet from a County stream is one of the thresholds. Within 500 feet of any Village or Town boundary within 500 feet of any existing County or State park, 500 feet of any existing County or State Highway expressway, roadway or highway, any stream or drainage owned by the County of which the County has established channel lines and a couple of other things.

Andrew Maniglia: So this would be the primer for the Admirals Cove. It would be the first part and separate and distinct for approval. You, the Village Planning Board would be Lead Agency under SEQRA to simply move the DPW to the new site. We could describe that new site. It is part of the old Hornicks Furniture Facility, the Curtain Factory that we purchased of about 2.5 acres back in 2004 or 2005. We held it and paid the taxes on it until this day would arrive.

Ross Winglovitz: We've met with the DPW and talked about facility planning of where to place everything. So what's proposed is about just over a 6000 square foot garage office facility to replace their existing facility. Currently at "Site B", assault storage shed that is 50 by 45 and is consistent with what they have now. The new location will have space for the fuel storage and fuel tanks and pumps. We're actually providing some coverage parking areas that doesn't exist today at the existing facility. There's storage containers and material bins. One of the difficult things is that the water and sewer will have to be provided from Broadway through an easement. That was obtained for that purpose so there will be a long run of about 708 feet to connect the sewer and water for the facility. Currently there's no water and sewer on Bowline Point Road. Again we reviewed it with the DPW and we think they were pretty happy with it. If everyone is satisfied we will add more details and design.

Andrew Maniglia: Then we could get into introducing the drawings to present to you. Will this be a full EAF?

Max Stach: Actually I would like to deliberate on it some more. Maybe reach out to you Dennis. This is really a related action to "Site B" and I'm just getting a little nervous here about segmentation. The Village Board is able to be Lead Agency on this project because they are involved as the owners of the DPW and I just want to talk it through.

Dennis Michaels: Does the Village own the land? I just want to know how we will treat this separately or as Max is thinking about suggesting, since it's part of the overall project that already went through an environmental review many years ago.

Max Stach: This is treated differently. I mean we did always contemplate moving the DPW so it would've been dealt with at least generically in the DGEIS so I want to at least think about it and I don't want to say tonight.

Gerald Gigaleski, GBD: I think it's important to note here, there's a huge lead timing element. Not only does the DPW have to be built on the other site and the operations have to move but there will also be prep work that will be going on in the Admirals Cove site for demolition, removal and soil stabilization. So just the predatory work on Admirals Cove even contemplating an approval takes about a year after the approvals. So it's a very long time. If our anticipation was to handle this DPW work maybe starting to get that site approval soon on the Hornicks parcel towards the fall of this year because it's such a long process. I don't want this wait process to extend into next year.

Max Stach: That's not the aim; I just want to make sure that we don't run a fowl.

Dennis Michaels: Well I wasn't around and the Village Board was the Lead Agency for the Waterfront Development project. So I don't know what your SEQRA review encompassed. Did it generically encompass this relocation?

Max Stach: I believe it encompassed the relocation it didn't encompass this site.

Andrew Maniglia: The site wasn't identified at that time.

Max Stach: It needs some SEQRA treatment it's just who does it and that's a question I think we can figure out very quickly.

Dennis Michaels: Well we'd be very comfortable if the Village Board were to be the Lead Agency on this as well. Maybe we should decide so we can issue a Notice of Intention to Declare Lead Agency and get the 30 day clock rolling.

Max Stach: I have no problem doing that.

Dennis Michaels: You aren't necessarily committed to be lead agency but you'll issue your Notice of Intention to get the 30 day clock started. If it turns out the best thing is for the Village Board to be Lead Agency then you'll just withdraw your Notice of Intention or they'll object and you'll consent to their objection and they'll be lead agency. So the motion is the Planning Board is going to issue its Notice of Intention to declare itself to be Lead Agency under the SEQRA and issue that Notice of Intention to all involved

agency which as of now we know is the County Department of Planning, Drainage Agency, Village Board of Trustees, Village of West Haverstraw, Rockland County Health Department, Joint Regional Sewer District.

Max Stach: Also the Waterfront Advisory Committee.

Andrew Maniglia: It's actually the Waterfront Consistency Board.

Dennis Micheals: Michelle did you get that?

Michelle Ventura: Yes the Waterfront Consistency Board.

Chairman Joseph Natale entertained the motion as recited by Council.

RESOLUTION 25-2018

Motion by: Danny Scaffidi
Seconded by: Gil Carlevaro

ROLL CALL

Joseph Natale: Yes
Gil Carlevaro: Yes
Diogenes Dominguez: Yes
Danny Scaffidi: Yes
Edwin Molina: Yes

Joseph Natale entertained a motion to approve the month of May minutes.

RESOLUTION 26-2018

Motion by: Gil Carlevaro
Seconded by: Diogenes Dominguez
Carried by: All

With no further business to be discussed by the Planning Board, Chairman Natale entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting.

RESOLUTION 27-2018

Motion by: Diogenes Dominguez
Seconded by: Danny Scaffidi
Carried by: All

The Clerk Typist to the Planning Board is hereby authorized, directed and empowered to sign these Minutes, and file a copy thereof in the office of the Village Clerk:

Michelle Ventura, Clerk Typist