

Helen Budrock – I think there is an issue with the dumpster, I travel this road and the garbage truck blocks 2 lanes emptying the dumpster. Joel Kohn - I will relay the request to the colony and see if they can relocate it.

Chairman Sush- how is the parking? That has been addressed previously and there is plenty of space.

FAMILY FUN PARK

65 Friedman Road, Monticello

Oster

Oster – I am looking to put sheds for animals and storage space. The animals are having babies and we need more space. Paula Kay – are the animals there year-round? Oster – yes, they are. Sush – I thought there was a contract with Rubin to keep them during the winter.

Kathleen Lara – are there any violations? Jim Carnell – yes it has been brought to the attention of the building department that land had been cleared and there was a slide put on the hill side.

Mr. Oster – explained what he had done at the property. Jim Carnell – the slide is on the property line. Discussion took place regarding the property line on the survey.

Michael Hoyt – was there a permit for the clearing? Jim Carnell – no there was no permit issued.

Paula Kay – stated that when the project was originally approved there was a specific number of animals to be allowed on the property. Mr. Oster – I have a license from the Department of Agricultural and that I don't require any further inspections from them. Mr. Oster – I want to plant craps and be able to board a horse. Paula Kay – there are two different uses on the property. There have been substantial changes to your site plan, and this board needs to revisit it.

Mr. Oster took the time to show on the survey what was cleared and where the slide is.

Helen Budrock – it sounds like the go kart track wasn't built in the spot that is on the site plan. Chairman Sush – anything that was built or cleared needs to be addressed on the site plan.

Mr. Oster – showed the material used for the slide.

Paula Kay – this board needs an accurate site plan with everything that is currently there and proposed on it. Chairman Sush – you need to be contacting the building department when things aren't matching the site plan.

Helen Budrock – maybe you can create an animal table, what was approved and what you have. Mr. Oster – I try to sell the babies that they have but I do have more than what was approved. Paula Kay – we need to come up with a number of animals that you can have onsite. The board agreed that there was a limited number of animals.

Mr. Oster – I will do the updated site plan, but I am asking for right now is approvals for buildings to keep the existing animals comfortable.

Mr. Oster – can I plant wheat? Michael Hoyt – how much land are you clearing for it? Mr. Oster – no land to be cleared, it is already cleared. Michael Croissant – we still need to figure out what we are going to do about the land that has already been cleared.

Jim Carnell – what is the capacity of sewer and water? Mr. Oster – the Department of Labor is currently involved. Some rides don't need inspections, but I ask that they inspect it only. Kathleen Lara – please do some type of table for the rides also.

Helen Budrock – What should be done with the septic? Have an engineer look at it? Jim Carnell – I am just saying that the site has more animals, more people and I think the capacity should be addressed. Paula Kay – please submit those letters to the board. Helen Budrock – along with your site plan, just submit all other approvals that you have along with a business plan.

Mr. Oster – so can I plant the wheat? Kathleen Lara – it's like grass, we don't regulate grass. The board isn't going to tell you if you can plant it or not.

LITTLE COMPASS

81 Pleasant Street, Monticello
Dave Toder, Project Architect

Mr. Toder - there are existing apartments on the property and apparently the building department wasn't aware of it. The owner went in for a renovation permit and this is how it came to light.

There is a large old house and a cottage. The house has 4 apartments in it, the cottage is a single unit. We will add parking. The apartments don't meet the required sq ft for the code. The apartments were dated. We have an application in for Zoning Board.

Paula Kay – how was the town notified of this issue? Mr. Toder – the owner went in for a permit. Logan Morey – this was a single-family dwelling and was done without permits. The prior owner had rented it to ARC and there was only one kitchen so it was considered a single family still.

Jim Carnell – on the site plan, I didn't see a well or septic. Mr. Toder – it was snowy when I went there so I didn't see it. I believe it is municipal water. Kathleen Lara – we will need to verify the services.

Matt Sickler – please indicate with detail what the parking will be. Mr. Toder – the cottage has paved parking already. Helen Budrock – is this an easement or right of way? You can't have parking in the middle of that. Mr. Toder – I don't have complete information regarding that. Chairman Sush – I think it has access from Pleasant Street Extension.

Helen Budrock – it is a special use and it needs to go to the ZBA. Logan Morey – I asked for an updated site plan with setbacks. It needs a change in use.

Chairman Sush – would your client be willing to lose an apartment and make the others larger to meet the zoning code? Mr. Toder – I don't believe they are. Paula Kay – the ZBA doesn't look to kindly on work that has already been done without permits.

HAMASPIK RESORTS

283 Rock Hill Drive, Rock Hill

Steve Barshov, Project Attorney

Joel Kohn, Project Representative

Ken Ellsworth, Project Engineer

Joel Kohn – I believe we are back in front of you with updated site plans. Ken Ellsworth – since last time this was presented, we have added more sheets to the site plan. We are continuing to advance to plans. The SWPP is 90% complete. There will be profiles for the water and sewer. Briefly if we can go over the new stuff, we reached out the county for water supply. The county is working on a new agreement for this and review adding on to it to add a sprinkler line for the building. The other water for domestic use is from the well in front of the building. I believe it is a 50 gallon per minute. Another storage tank will be added to the site. Sanitary lines come out of the pool building down to the main. We considered tying into the existing line, but there was a lot in the way. Sidewalks will be added to the site plan.

Matt Sickler – please give us a narrative regarding the water demands.

Logan Morey – the laundry building onsite is no longer on the site plan that I can see, is there a new facility being added? Joel Kohn – no that one is remaining.

Logan Morey – the lane for the building seems pretty tight, the height of the pool area and the height of the new building. Joel Kohn – the height of the new building is 20'. Logan Morey - Is there a marked fire lane in front of the building and where is the compactor? Paula Kay – it is two distinctive uses on the property, maybe just make sure that it is picked up more often maybe. Michael Croissant – the drive between Bernie's and the building are tight. The Rock Hill Fire Department needs to review this project before returning to the board. Ken Ellsworth – we have the program for the turning radius, we will make sure it is on the plan.

Matt Sickler – we will need a subdivision plan also, and there are easements on the property and it isn't clear if they are staying. Please clarify that. Joel Kohn – the utility easement will stay and the conservation easement isn't needed. We are working with attorneys to see how that can be removed. Steve Barshov- it may already be gone as a matter of law.

Michael Hoyt – can they keep the building in theme with the area, more natural colors, stone. Unless the colors chosen need to be for some reason. Joel Kohn – we will make that adjustment.

Helen Budrock – the parking that has been adopted a few years ago, the code isn't as strict. Basically, parking lots should have some planting and greenery in them. More blending into the natural area.

Chairman Sush – is any work that is being done there currently spilling over to the neighboring property. Joel Kohn -no, it's not from this site.

Paula Kay – I had asked for another location to be found within the state that is similar to this project, and it can't be found. Steve Barshov – this project is a little less intense that the two uses won't be used at the same time. Paula Kay – the building department should have something in writing when the uses change as well as the Fire Department to keep all safe.

Michael Hoyt – what building permits do you have currently? Joel Kohn – we received a permit for the Mikva in the basement. Logan Morey – no everything is in order.

Helen Budrock – what is the time frame for operation? Are you planning on opening this summer? Yes, it will be open for the summer.

Steve Barshov – I submitted the criteria for the special use. The nature of the use most services were existing. The change in use, won't make much of an impact. The summer camp will not have much traffic congestion, the camp won't have negative effect on the neighborhood. The camp is what supports the economy, and will comply with the Department of Health.

Helen Budrock – what is the next step? Paula Kay – I think it is up to the board. Kathleen Lara – My concern is that there is a day camp in downtown Rock Hill. Michael Hoyt – they state they will keep up high standards, comparing themselves to Iroquois Springs. I think the traffic study was off, information was used from 2018-19. Joel Kohn – the traffic study states that there is no more traffic produced by the day camp. Michael Hoyt – I am still concerned about the parking.

Paula Kay – I think that the applicant is looking to be put on as an action item, however I feel that the board needs a little more information and time to discuss the information. Michael Croissant – I want to see the fire departments response.

Steve Barshov – this is a sleep away camp, not a day camp and the traffic for the sleep camp will not generate traffic like a day camp or hotel. Paula Kay – we may want our traffic consultant take a look at it to ease any concerns.

Chairman Sush – is there a height issue on anything? Logan Morey – the pool fence is.

Michael Hoyt – I am not for/against anything, I am just pointing things out.

Steve Barshov – are our applications complete to date? I just don't want something missing so moving forward we have everything in order. Joel Kohn – everything is in order.

Kristin Boyd – how many employees are staying onsite? Joel Kohn – it is all in the business plan, the staff will stay onsite, some directors will be off site.

ACTION ITEMS

KHIAM ROZHIK

349 Cold Spring Road, Monticello
Tim Gottlieb, Project Engineer

Tim Gottlieb – we had the public hearing and there were no comments from the public or board. Mr. Rozhik has been cleaning up the site.

A motion for site plan approval was made by Arthur Knapp and seconded by Kathleen Lara
5 in favor; 0 opposed

GOURMET GLATT

4685 Route 42, Monticello
Joel Kohn

Joel Kohn – all comments have been addressed. The board wanted some questions answered, I sent that in.

Kathleen Lara – is he opening this year? Joel Kohn – no, too much work.

A motion for a NEGDEC was made by Kathleen Lara and seconded by Michael Hoyt and seconded by Arthur Knapp.
5 in favor; 0 opposed

A motion for conditional site plan approval pending engineering comments was made by Michael Croissant and seconded by Kathleen Lara.
5 in favor; 0 opposed

BBIS AUTO AUCTION

State Route 17B, Monticello

A motion to take the agenda out of order was made by Kathleen Lara and seconded by Michael Croissant.
5 in favor; 0 opposed

No one appeared for this project.

AVON PARK

Rock Hill Drive, Rock Hill
George Duke, Project Representative
Steve Vegliante, Project Attorney
Carlito Holt, Traffic Consultant

Greg Liberman, Project Representative
Paula Kay and Jim Carnell are recused from this project.

George Duke – comments for outstanding traffic issues have been addressed including the State DOT. The board has received all the information that we had.

George Duke – We are here to respond mainly to any questions that you may have with respect to the submittals. April 4,5, 12, and earlier comments have been addressed.

Helen Budrock – I think one of the earlier comments was the emergency access. George Duke – I think Matt can speak to that, we brought updated plans which had been circulated to the board. It was originally slotted to go on the Glenn Wild Road towards Rock Hill Drive. Discussion took place regarding the emergency access road. Greg Liberman – this will be a general permit under the army corps of engineers. We will have to file a preconstruction notification. Maintenance will be done to the road.

Chairman Sush – has the Fire Department been notified? George Duke – Glenn Smith is unavailable tonight, but I know we have sent it out to all agencies around.

Helen Budrock –so I think the board is at the point where they had requested that we move the SEQRA process along. We will go through category by category to see if any further information is required. If more information is needed, please inform the applicant of what you are looking for. Then, tonight if there is a consensus, one way or the other you will basically be directing special counsel to prepare the documentation in support of your decision which goes into Part III.

Larry Wolinsky – Part III will be used if you identified any potentially large to moderate impacts on the Part II and the purpose of Part III is to take you through an analytical process of determining the significance of the impact. You do that by focusing on the magnitude and importance of the impact and its somewhat of a subjective analysis on the part of the board and the regulations recognize it to be that way and you'll go through that and you will set forth you're reasoning for the determination as part of that document and resolution that will accompany that document.

Helen Budrock – there is a draft Part II on the google drive if we can all follow along. The applicant fills out Part I and the Planning Board fills out Part II & III. We are going to go through Part II and just do an evaluation of the magnitude of the potential impacts, based on the information received to date.

- (1) Impact on land: Proposed action may involve construction on, or physical alteration of the land surface of the proposed site - We checked yes – moderate to large impact may occur - (f) the proposed action may result in increased erosion whether from physical disturbance or vegetation removal (including from treatment by herbicides). Kathleen Lara – I have no questions; I feel that the applicant adequately informed the board.
- (2) Impact of Geological: The proposed action may result in the modification or destruction of or inhibit access to any unique or unusual land forms on the site - We checked No. There were no further questions or comments by the board.

- (3) Impact on surface water: The proposed action may affect one or more wetlands or other surface water bodies – we checked yes – moderate to large impact may occur – (h) the proposed action may cause soil erosion or otherwise create a source of stormwater discharge that may lead to siltation or other degradation of receiving water bodies. The board had no further questions or comments.
- (4) Impact on ground water: The proposed action may result in new or additional use of ground water or may have the potential to introduce contaminants to ground water or an aquifer – we checked no but it should be yes – no or small impact may occur. The board had no further questions or comments. The project relies on ground water as their source.
- (5) Impact on flooding: The proposed action may result in development on lands subject to flooding – we checked no. The board had no further questions or comments,
- (6) Impact on Air: The proposed action may include a state regulated air emission source – we checked no. The board had no further questions or comments.
- (7) Impact of Plants and Animals: The proposed action may result in a loss of flora or fauna – we checked yes – moderate to large impact may occur (b) the proposed action may result in a reduction or degradation of any habitat used by any rare, threatened or endangered species as listed by New York State or federal government. (h) the proposed action requires the conversion of more than 10 acres of forest, grassland or any other regionally or locally important habitat. That is because of the long-eared bat. The board had no further questions or comments.
- (8) Impact on Agricultural Resources: The proposed action may impact agricultural resources – we checked no. The board had no further questions or comments.
- (9) Impact on Aesthetic Resources: the land use of the proposed action is obviously different from or are in sharp contrast to current land use patters between the proposed project and a scenic or aesthetic resource – we checked no. The board had no further questions or comments.
- (10) Impact on Historic & Archeological Resources: the proposed action may occur in or adjacent to a historic or archaeological resource – we voted no. The board had no further questions or comments.
- (11) Impact on Open Space and Recreation: the proposed action may result in a loss of recreational opportunities or a reduction of an open space resource as designated in any adopted municipal open space plan – we voted no. The board had no further questions or comments.
- (12) Impact on Critical Environmental Areas: the proposed action may be located within or adjacent to a critical environmental area – we voted no. The board had no further questions or comments.

(13) Impact on Transportation: the proposed action may result in a change to existing transportation systems – we voted yes – moderate to large impact may occur (a) Projected traffic increase may exceed capacity of existing road network (b) the proposed action may result in the construction of paved parking area for 500 or more vehicles. Larry Wolinsky – I think it is a good idea to really drill down deep into this category to know exactly where we stand with this traffic issue. What is answered, what is not. We will see where how the board feels about where the traffic issue presently stands and if more information is required or whether you are ready to make a determination. With regards to the traffic, we have had all the traffic studies but also a letter dated March 15, 2022 from the Highway Superintendent. A large chunk of that letter was about the emergency access. The other part of the letter however was kind of a general statement saying that the impact of the project would certainly affect Rock Hill area.

Helen Budrock – the highway superintendent stated at the end of his letter that it would be his recommendation to take no action until final written comments are received for the NYSDOT and the counties DPW and review and accepted by our town & traffic engineers. At this time, I believe we have not heard back from the county DPW because of the change in the emergency access. The counties involvement is a little less at this point, but they still had questions or concerns about the ownership and maintenance of the traffic signal. Chairman Sush – that was a little confusing, there is a proposal for 2 traffic lights but it seemed like somebody wouldn't operate more than one. If one isn't operating, what is the purpose? So, can you clarify? Will there be 2 lights and who would operate them. Greg Liberman – there are 2 lights proposed and I think the final determination of who owns and operates them would be part of the final design discussion between the town, county and state. We are unable to answer that at this point, but I would assume that it would be the same entity. Larry Wolinsky – I think it will be an intermunicipal agreement.

George Duke – with respect to the DOT comments, I think it's important to note we didn't go through them item by item but maybe we can highlight some of the points and certainly some of the conclusions. These items need to be resolved as part of the site plan but not necessarily determination whether there's significance. Larry Wolinsky – everything in that application that's before the board must demonstrate factually and pretty conclusively that there will not be a significant adverse effect on the environment.

Larry Wolinsky – there is one part of the DOT letter that should be pointed out and that is, they won't allow Rock Hill Drive to be modified without the modifications meeting our design standards for intersecting with a freeway ramp within our jurisdiction, shoulder width for pedestrian accommodations do not look like they were considered in the traffic impact study. Greg Liberman's response was that it would be addressed appropriately during a form of design phase for the recommended improvement. We need to check with our traffic consultant to see if that will work and we will need to rely on the promise of that being completed during that design phase. We agree with the counties comment. The applicant's response is that they are amendable. Final design details for this improvement would be prepared during the formal off-site highway design phase.

Kathleen Lara – one thing that keeps coming up is the curbage, and the memo from Carlito on April 12, 2022 specifically says that no curbing is being proposed along Dutchess. So where did this come from?

Greg Liberman– Carlito put it to bed that it is stripping, no curbing. Helen Budrock – maybe Jay can clarify that. The applicant is proposing stripping, but that won't stop people from coming in and out. Matt Sickler – the plan that was just submitted suggests channelization. George Duke – maybe Jay is aware of what that is. Jay Patel – on the highway sometimes at some places they put markers that about 3 inches in diameter and 4 feet high, they are made of plastic, like jersey barriers made of plastic. It is not continuous. This is not ideal for this project. The ideal improvement for the Dutchess frontage is similar to Pizza the Rock, curbing. Helen Budrock – it is just another open-ended questions that is still not 100% resolved. Chairman Sush- that would go along the aesthetics of developing Rock Hill into. Larry Wolinsky – is Jay saying that striping is ineffective and the actual curbing is necessary to have the channelization work properly? Jay Patel – Yes

Jay Patel – whether all the improvements will be a significant impact. I am saying with all the improvements being proposed that there would be no significant impact, but the items still need to be resolved.

*The first one is the right of way. I know that the traffic letter from DTS is saying all the design will be explored during the later stage. However, there are still some items that need to be clarified before we get into approving the improvements.

*The second one is the left and out of the Citgo gas station on Rock Hill Drive. One of the improvements or mitigation is saying to ban the left turn out of the gas station and then the response received is saying the applicant will talk to the gas station owner and will ban the left turn, but doing that will have the traffic come out onto Glen Wild Road. I am not sure that there is enough room for the trucks to come out on to Glen Wild Road.

*The third one is the Dutchess frontage because what is proposed we are not sure that can be done within the right of way. Meaning we are not sure that the curbing can happen in the right of way.

Larry Wolinsky – this has been an ongoing issue whether the improvements will fit within the right of way and there has been reluctance to do any surveying. Everyone is needing some information that can give a level of certainty that these can be installed in the right of way without taking private property.

Greg Liberman – the information that was provided with the traffic impact study based upon the reduced footprint we provided a far more granular level of detail. Looking at the public data we anticipate that we will have enough space. Larry Wolinsky – what data was looked at and relied on that allows you to conclude that these all fit within the public right of way.

Greg Liberman - on the latest conceptual mitigation plan shows the stripping in front Dutchess. Greg Liberman – so the right of way data is from the county GIS mapping and you know that's not 100% accurate but typically gives a good sense of what the right of way availability is. There is a standard right of way width typically along each roadway. We found that the proposed modifications for what we are primarily what we are talking about is the left turn lane on Glen Wild Road approaching from Rock Hill Drive and the left-hand lane on Rock Hill Drive approaching Glen Wild Road could be accommodated within the right of way and the proposed stripping that is proposed along the Dutchess frontage, also within the public right of way based upon the GIS mapping. That is assuming all lanes would be 12-foot lanes, there is a potential to narrow them down. I am coming in late and I am not sure that it was discussed that these turn lanes that are being proposed are actually above and beyond the mitigation

necessary to offset any incremental impact. The traffic signals alone would also offset the impact. We saw a public benefit to have the turn lanes.

Michael Hoyt – the where are the poles for the street lights? In front of the Citgo there is a left turn lane, how is the traffic going to get into the gas station? The tractor trailer that is queued up to get into the Citgo because the 3 trailers from Glen Wild are waiting to turn, now we are all backed up. Carlito Holt – the movement from Glen Wild Road would be more efficient with the traffic signal. There would be a gap in traffic created by the traffic signal. Michael Hoyt – I am talking about the trucks trying to make a left-hand turn and the ones turning into the Citgo. Michael Hoyt – described his concern more in depth. Carlito Holt – the traffic signal serves as a meter. Arthur Knapp – we need to make a decision on this and we need to know how this is going to work. Kathleen Lara – we need more information; we don't have to make a decision tonight. George Duke – we need to make sure we understand what you are saying. Helen Budrock – explained the concern Michael Hoyt has.

Chairman Sush – when we add the left turning land on Rock Hill Drive that we turn on to Glen Wild Road the note is saying “may required minor grading and guide rail relocation to be determined.” Knowing the project, we worked on with the Citgo, that retaining wall was an issue, and I believe it right up on the right of way, so I think more information, knowing how much space is needed and the structural integrity of that wall would help. The retaining wall made the entrance tight.

Michael Hoyt – the other thing that I want to add is the ariel map being showed isn't current.

Helen Budrock – is there any reason at this stage, you couldn't do a more detailed design analysis because I think we have reached and impasse. Carlito Holt – the important thing is that there are right of ways on both sides, and we were looking into widening one side, but, if need be, we could widen on the other side and still be in the public area. We widened all to the Citgo side, but the Dutchess side can be widened slightly.

Larry Wolinsky – the conversation that is going on right now – is this need, is that not needed; we still need definitive answers before we can make a final determination. You need to put the right of way lines on the map. Kathleen Lara – speak to Jennifer Stone at the County, she is the GIS coordinator and she could give you a more definitive answer of what percentage of accuracy that map is.

Helen Budrock – I think the other thing to consider is the pedestrian accommodations need to be clarified based on the DOT comments. The sidewalks, or shoulders need to be shown.

Kristin Boyd – has the Citgo owner responded yet regarding the turn lane?

Logan Morey – there is a sidewalk in front of Pizza the Rock, are you removing that, it shows to be in the lane. Carlito Holt – any sidewalks that are that, will be maintained or replaced.

Carlito Holt – my one overall question is that if it can't be done in the right of way and we eliminate the turn lane on Glen Wild and Rock Hill Drive and demonstrate with additional analysis that it's not needed to offset the incremental impact is that sufficient? Larry Wolinsky – you proposed the improvements as

a benefit, why would the board want to remove them. You have given a level of certainty that it will work. Address it to the board and see what happens.

Steve Vegliante – I think it is just a question of presenting 2 plans one showing without the turn lanes, clearly within the right of way we give you the data that the impact is not there, we would prefer the turn lanes. Obviously, it won't be finalized without a final survey. I think we could provide the alternate. Greg Liberman – the preferred is to have a proposal whatever it is. If it can be documented that it fits, documented that we avoid the retaining wall, documented that we maintain a level of service and improve the conditions out there and if we wanted to have something else, we could do that. We would show the board exactly what we can do. Larry Wolinsky – the board wants a definite proposal.

George Duke – Does Jay have any further questions? Jay Patel – just for reference the removal of the left turn definitely I discussed that once before, but so if we will have all the improvements within the right of way and do not have a significant impact that would be great. We still need to have a concrete solution for the Dutchess frontage. Carlito Holt –for the backup issue we would offer a que analysis for the condition without the project at Glen Wild, and then with the light.

Logan Morey – so coming out of Glen Wild Road if a tractor trailer wanted to turn right, can they make that turn without going into that left turn lane? Carlito Holt – I think that is one of the comments that the DOT had and that is something we need to design accordingly. We need to take a close look at that when we do our design.

(14) Impact on Energy: the proposed action may cause an increase in the use of any form of energy – we voted yes – none of the impacts reach moderate to large impact. The board had no further questions or comments.

(15) Impact of Noise, Odor and Light: the proposed action may result in an increase in noise, odors or outdoor lighting – we voted yes – none of the impacts reach moderate to large impact. Helen Budrock - I want to make sure that the board is comfortable with the conclusions of the noise analysis, because there are some residences and some sensitive noise receptors that it was determined that any noise impacts are not beyond the acceptable threshold that has been established and if that tree buffer were to be retained then there would be no significant impact of noise on the adjoining properties. Larry Wolinsky – this is an important issue where the language in there about the possibility of an encroachment into that buffer area and in the event additional analysis being done to see whether the encroachment was significant and provisions of additional mitigation. The board had no further questions or comments.

(16) Impact on Human Health: the proposed action may have an impact on human health for exposure to new or existing sources of contaminants – we voted no. The board had no further questions or comments.

(17) Consistency with Community Plans: the proposed action is not consistent with adopted land use plans – we voted yes – moderate to large impact may occur (c) the proposed action is

inconsistent with local land use plans or zoning regulations. That is because of the proposed height of the building. The board had no further questions or comments.

(18) Consistency with Community Character: the proposed project is inconsistent with the existing community character- we voted yes – none of the impacts reach moderate to large impact. The board had no further questions or comments.

Helen Budrock – time check I think it is about 10:00 and we have kind of exhausted the issues to make it official, does the board want to make a motion of determination of significance or do you feel like it puts it back on the applicant for the additional information requested. George Duke – I defer to Jay and Carlito because I want to make sure that we have enough window to have our answers. Helen Budrock – you would have to turn it around by next Wednesday. If you can meet the deadline, you will be on the agenda if not you will be on the agenda for May.

Helen Budrock – I was informed by the DOT that there was a request by a local citizens group to have a conference call with them about the traffic impact study. I believe that was scheduled for next Thursday.

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Michael Hoyt and seconded by Michael Croissant.
5 in favor; 0 opposed

Respectfully submitted,

Heather Zangla
Secretary
Town of Thompson Planning Board