

## Town of New Paltz Planning Board

Monday, August 10, 2020

### Final Meeting Minutes

This meeting was held via ZOOM Videoconferencing and Teleconferencing with Live Stream to YouTube.

Free Conceptual meeting held with Michael Stepanovich with the PB members. Mr. Stepanovich was advised to apply for a lot line revision with the PB then will be referred to the ZBA for a variance when he applies for an accessory apartment.

Call to order by Deputy Chair Lyle Nolan at 7:09pm

Board Member Attendees: Stana Weisburd, Lyle Nolan, Amanda Gotto, Amy Cohen, Jane Schanberg, Matt DiDonna

Board Member Absent: Adele Ruger

Also Attending: PB Attorney Richard Golden, PB Engineer Ryan Cornelison, PB Telecommunications Engineer Michael Musso, PB Attorney John Ahearn, PB Engineer Andy Willingham

### **Meeting Minutes**

Deputy Chair Nolan asked for a motion to approve the meeting minutes for July 13, 2020. Member Amy Cohen commented she was quoted on some of the things she said about second floor use at Trans-Hudson, and the minutes said she didn't want to see families there and she just wanted to include that the reason she didn't want to see families over there is because there are major health issues that face people that live on interstates and she has send over 50 articles to our Boards about the detrimental health effects that these busy roads have on individuals, and she's been very, very clear throughout this process that she does not support residential at this site. Attorney Golden commented "that's all good, and they can be included in tonight's minutes because they were said tonight as a clarification as to what occurred and what you said at the last meeting, but you don't change the last meeting", which Amy stated that she understands but the way she is quoted in the minutes "it sounds like I'm anti-family which I am not and I'd like to make that clear in the minutes because I will not be on record as being anti-family". Pat agreed to update

the minutes, and Deputy Chair Nolan asked to hold the minutes until next time.

### **Public Comments**

Amy Cohen mentioned that there was a public comment from a neighbor sent to the PB with some photos of the balloons at this project, and didn't know if there's a way that we can include that in the minutes but that is definitely a public comment that was given to us for tonight and she would like to have it included in the minutes as she thinks it very, very important that we have those photos that were taken by our residents of the balloons. Deputy Chair Nolan commented to add them as public comments for this meeting, which Pat will add as an attachment at the end of these minutes.

### **Application Review**

#### **PB 20-193 Alfandre Simplified Site Plan – 231 Main Street**

Attorney Golden responded that the Board did not have to declare themselves as lead agency for this application there is no need to on this particular one but it is a Type II action but it should be noted for the record that this is a Type II when asked by Deputy Chair Nolan.

**Deputy Chair Nolan motioned to classify this application as a Type II Action.**

**Motion 2 by Stana Weisburd. All present in favor. Motion carried.**

Deputy Chair Nolan asked Andy Willingham to comment on his review. Andy stated that it is located at 231 Main Street where they are combining two office spaces where right now there are two suites on the bottom floor they are combining them, and they are knocking down a couple of walls and that's why they are here. Andy noted if you go through the checklist it meets the criteria, the first is any provision of the exterior of the building, there's no site work or any revisions to the exterior of the building, no change in traffic because the same amount of office space, no change in stormwater, sewer and water, adding it is a Type II action which we talked about and it does not have any effect on the neighboring properties so we are recommending that it meets all the requirements.

Deputy Chair Nolan asked for a motion to waive site plan review.

**Motion 1 by Jane Schanberg to waive site plan review.**

**Motion 2 by Amy Cohen. All present in favor. Motion carried.**

**PB 20-08 Homeland Towers Site Plan – 60 Jansen Road**

Deputy Chair Nolan noted that the Homeland Towers Site Plan, SEQRA Part 2 was next on the agenda. Amanda Gotto commented that their Engineer had noted a few discrepancies or issues with the Part One and she actually found a few also, so she asked if they needed to address those; are they germane to what we're trying to decide here. Ryan Cornelison noted that the ones he found were minor enough to proceed, and noted at some point in the future, we will get an updated Part One for the record. Amanda asked if she should send her notes to the ones she found as well for those that seem to be incomplete or not consistent between part, noting for instance, operation 24:7, 365 is that passively or is that when the active operation when the trucks or maintenance people could be coming on site, how often, what time of day, noting things like that, as they didn't put any details.

Attorney Gaudioso, who represents Homeland Towers and Verizon, noted that they had received the August 5<sup>th</sup> comments from the Town Engineer, and this evening, they did supply the revised EAF to those comments, and added, as far as all of the operations and the details to that we did previously submit, he thought, on July 15<sup>th</sup>, a full memorandum detailing all of the criteria of the special permit, which includes some of those operational details but added if there are any other questions or comments, he would be happy to address those. Amanda Gotto noted that they did not get the revised one. Attorney Gaudioso stated that they had actually submitted a number of revised documents since they last met (with the PB) back in February, adding he thought they submitted the revised EAF a number of times including the response this evening to the Town Engineer's comments, which was basically two business days in the past. Amanda Gotto noted that whatever that had been submitted this evening by them we (the Board) did not have it. Attorney Gaudioso noted he understood, noting that those comments as were mentioned are fairly minor and would be happy to discuss what those were. Amanda Gotto noted a discrepancy in the acreage, noting they had described the acreage. Attorney Gaudioso noted the acreage of the property is 44.7 acres, but they are using much less than that, noting that the total area of disturbances is about 28,314 square feet, and they've proposed two different access drives as part of the application package, having shown the disturbance associated with those two different options, the disturbance within the

buffer and the disturbance without the buffer, noting they have them detailed throughout the documents, so with any specific questions, he was happy to try and address those.

Amanda Gotto noted she would just love to be able to use Part 1 to do Part 2, adding but that's where the things are not quite matching up.

Attorney Golden noted he thought what be helpful is that everybody take a look at the revised one that he hasn't seen either, but the revised one submitted today that when it gets circulated and if there are still items in Part 1 to advise Pat, and Pat can circulate that among all of the Board members, applicants and consultants, and then if it's needed to go ahead and address with a future revised Part 1 then it will be done. He also added that most of the time the types of modifications that are needed don't really affect the significant decision making that the Board will have to do through Part 2 but added sometimes they do but the only way to know that is if you identify them and then the applicant will respond and then they'll submit, if necessary, a revised Part 1 but it doesn't really require the stopping of the process right now. Pat noted that she did receive the update after hours today and it was not sent out in time for the meeting tonight.

PB consultant Mike Musso commented that he was last before the Board in late February in person, and he had a couple of things he's submitted, one was a completeness memo in late May, that he thought this Board had seen that, and the ZBA has seen that. Mike noted that within that memo there are 20 odd items that he had asked for; three, four or five of those pertain to the Part 1 that was filed initially and noted that tonight the applicant's rep noted that in July they had provided a response to what was in regard to the clarification of a generator, which is no longer proposed at the site, the depth of groundwater for instance, and notes towards construction, and a couple things related to the land use and water table, soils and water table. Mike noted those were addressed and also stated he knows Ryan had some more comments from last week, and like everyone else, he hasn't had a chance to really did into any detail of what was received tonight and agrees with Rick that is to be the latest and greatest in was in the package tonight that came in and that would be the Part 1 with all the comments addressed so far.

Amanda Gotto noted then that the generator is off, which Mike confirmed was correct, and then she asked if the pad is 65 x 65 feet or is it 100 square feet. Attorney Gaudioso noted that there is no pad, and the

equipment compound which is a gravel surface is 65 x 65 and the leased area is 100 x 100. Mike Musso asked Attorney Gaudioso to confirm that the leased area goes outside the fencing, which Attorney Gaudioso confirmed was correct. Amanda Gotto commented that there is nothing outside the fence. Attorney Gaudioso noted he could go through the site plan to show the details of the utility connections that are outside the fence because the utility company requires access to the utility connections as well as the parking and turnaround area outside the fence and show those details if that would be helpful. Amanda Gotto noted that she just wants to get straight the parts that are the disturbance and what is in the buffer and what is not.

Steve Matthews, with Tectonic engineering, a professional engineer, went through the maps on pages A-1, AD-1, SB-1, C-1A, C-1B, and C-1C. Vince Xavier, regional manager for Homeland Towers noted that the green dotted line on map C-1C is the extent of the wetland buffer and not the wetlands themselves, noting that this is the extent of the 100 foot wetland buffer line, and the encroachment is not into the wetlands, it is just into the wetland buffer, adding that it would save a significant number trees vs. going in the buffer and staying wholly outside of it would result in more tree removal, but added regardless there is a portion of the compound that will be inside the buffer

Jane Schanberg questioned the number of trees total that are planned to be removed, is it 53 and 6 so 59 trees? Attorney Gaudioso noted there are actually 63 trees; 6 in the compound, and 4 up by the road, then 53 if they stay out of the buffer with the access drive for a total of 63, but added that in comparison with their alternative it is a total of 16 so it would again be the 6 in the compound, 4 up near Jansen Road, and then an additional 6 in the buffer area so it is a significant difference between 63 outside of the buffer and 16 within the buffer with respect to the access drive. Jane then verified on the map C-1C that the dotted green line was the buffer area. Robert Gaudioso commented that the dark area is the amount of the buffer disturbance would be 5357 square feet and if they were to go with the alternative access drive the amount of additional buffer disturbance would be 8843 square feet. Vince Xavier also noted that the light gray area in option 1 is an existing trailway that is already in use that they would continue to use.

Amanda Gotto asked when during construction, what outside of the area shown on C-1C will be involved. Robert Gaudioso explained the grading

plan (map C-2) which included a proposed silt fence area shown as the dotted lines, proposing a 30 x 180 foot wetland, no mow zone that will have a cumulative area of disturbance almost of 5357 square feet. Jane Schanberg asked clearance between this and the nearest residence which was stated by him was according to code, but wanted to understand this location is not seeking a variance to put it in this location since they've said it is up to code, asking them if they're using code applied as if it were in a location that was already approved for a cell tower, or are they transferring that concept or where is that concept is coming from as they are seeking a variance to put it in this location. Attorney Gaudio explained that in August the Building Inspector had issued a determination that the facility requires a use variance for location out of the wireless facility overlay zone, noting that the overlay zone is essentially one half mile centered on I-87 not including an area up by 299. He noted they are not in that overlay zone and because they are not in that overlay zone they require a use variance according to the Building Inspector from the Zoning Board of Appeals and the Building Inspector has also determined that the special permit criteria for the special permit required from the PB is applicable with respect to that criteria, they have certain setbacks to meet, one of the required setbacks is related to the height of the tower and they have actually met that setback with over 300 feet to the closest property line for the 150 foot tower, adding there is also a special setback of 500 feet for the closest school, day care center, camp, playground and public park. He added they have also met that setback, adding that they far exceed with respect to all of the bulk requirements under the code and they've met those requirements for the special permit but they do need a use variance for being outside the overlay zone. He also noted that they meet the height requirement as well which is 150 feet which is a height limitation, with maximum height of 150 feet that they meet. Attorney Golden noted that is a bulk requirement.

Amy Cohen asked Attorney Golden what he meant when he says, "bulk requirement". Attorney Golden commented that not only with respect to cell towers but with respect to almost all of the types of improvements that you look at, whether they be residential or commercial they have certain requirements that are generically called bulk requirements although not all of them deal with bulk but they are called bulk requirements, noting that's when you have to have so many feet from a side setback yard or front setback yard or the height of a structure, adding that all of those types of requirements and limitations are generally referred to as bulk requirements and most of them are in the bulk table but some of them are set forth

elsewhere, adding that for the particular with respect to the cell tower, there are regulations that say cell tower requirements are as follows and then they give all of these, and are not limited only to the zone that cell towers are permissible. He added the building inspector has said that the general requirement in the code dealing with cell towers including the 150 foot height which is much higher than a residential zone, but as to cell towers that is the one that controls and that was a determination by Stacy and that's what controls this application.

Attorney Gaudioso continued to discuss the SB-1 map of everything inside the fence compound, the 65 x 65 gravel compound, noting utilities are on the ground, and they go to a utility backboard, a fiber vault, a transformer, and we have those protected by bollards, adding they have a gate, opening to allow access into the compound, noting the bottom corner of SB-1 map the proposed Verizon wireless equipment, as well as noting they've shown the center of the compound, the proposed tower footprint, and three future co-location spaces to show that both the towers built to support co-location and avoid the proliferation of towers, and also have shown that there's ground space available, noting that they had submitted both on July 15<sup>th</sup> and again tonight, is they would reserve additional space within the compound of approximately 100 square feet in case the Town's emergency services needed equipment in the future, adding that all the equipment, all of the cable, the monopole itself whether it is a tree pole or monopole would all be within the compound, and the only thing outside the compound are the small utility connections, referring to the top left corner of C-3 map, and added, the access drive and the utilities going out to Jansen Road. Amanda Gotto noted they would not be putting in another monopole in, just the wireless pad, which Attorney Gaudioso noted would be approximately 200 square feet which is more than enough for future carriers. Continuing onto the C-4 Elevation Map, Attorney Gaudioso noted that these are different elevations, either monopole on the left or as a tree pole on the right, and noted on the top of the Verizon Wireless antennas, they went back to Verizon Wireless and they reduced the number of antennas and they also reduced the spacing of the antennas so that they were able to make the top of the tower somewhat more slender, whether it is a tree pole or a monopole but in either case they'll build the tower to be able to support the future co-location of the other carriers for that exact reason so there would not be multiple towers in this location.

Amanda Gotto asked how wide the pole would be since it got slender. Attorney Gaudioso stated that the monopole itself is a few feet in diameter

from the top down to the bottom, it extends at the bottom a little bit more in diameter but they've shown which he felt is more important is if the Town were to select the monopine, the tree pole, what they've shown is at the top of the tower the branches would be much closer together, a total of 23 feet, with branches that would get longer towards the bottom, variable so it would not look like an ice cream cone, but a natural look with the widest branches at the bottom, 31 feet in diameter and more natural appearance.

Jane Schanberg noted that they have shown the two options for the look of the monopole and the faux tree, asking if they could consider a silo configuration for this. Attorney Gaudioso stated that at 150 feet that would be a tremendous structure, at that type of height we've seen silos generally in the 80 foot maybe 100 foot range, but at 150 feet that would be an enormous structure but has never seen that at 150 feet. Jane asked what the bottom diameter was, was it the same for the faux tree and the monopole, the bottom diameter of the pole itself.

Attorney Gaudioso responded he believed it would be a few inches more in diameter at the bottom just because they would have to design the steel of the pole to be a little bit stronger to hold the wind, loading of the flow branches, but nothing that would be discernable. Mike Musso noted that the diameter would probably be close to six feet. Amanda Gotto asked if the lower branches would be about the height of the current trees that are there. Mike Musso stated yes, and Vince Xavier noted that they based the proposed modeling of an identical monopine that was currently under construction now, and for that one the base plate was 69 inches in diameter. Jane Schanberg asked how the monopine that is being designed here differ from the look of the one on the Thruway. Attorney Gaudioso noted a couple of things that the older designed trees are not very realistic looking, they use products that are much more realistic looking, meaning when you look at the actual faux branches up close they not look realistic but from a distance they're very realistic, they're resilient, very reliable in their appearance, they also paint the pole a typically thunder gray color, as trees are typically a gray tone, not brown, which matches very well to the natural environment. He added they also use a very dense tree branch configuration, adding Mike Musso had specifically asked for details on that, which he noted they did submit that, and noted they use a branch design that is not so uniform that it looks unnatural, and what they call socks on the antennas themselves, where they paint all of the attachments where the antennas are attached to that same color, and they

put a sock with actual fake needles over the antennas themselves so that way they blend in with the tree branches.

Jane Schanberg asked if they had a faux tree photo they could put up to look at. Mike Musso stated there was one from the July submittal that was a representative, and noted the cross section drawing (C-4) that is an option to be entertained by the Board, adding that the stealth tree is not always recommended by HDR for obvious reasons because there's some horrid examples in our area, noting Jane's comment on the one driving north towards Albany, on the left, guessing the height of that is taller than 150 feet, and it serves the Thruway, adding that perhaps aesthetics aren't as important as it would be here in New Paltz but some of the principles about design there would be a slightly larger diameter of the pole, as the pole itself would taper from maybe a six foot diameter at the base up to something a little bit thinner on top and noted he will certainly discuss that when we go through the photo simulations, as there were photo simulations provided for the stealth tree upon request, in July he thought. Mike added he thought an important option for this board is to look at the conventional vs. the stealth tree, and he will certainly provide the Board with some examples, adding also the concept of the silo, and knows in ag districts in Orange County, he thought there's a couple, the texture, and even in the branching in this case, they have to be radio frequency transparent, adding actually the material is a special material to allow signal to go in and out from the antennas, so a silo would be something similar, with the bulk of the silo would have to fit all the way over this cross section (C-4 map).

Jane Schanberg commented that he was talking about a silo that is approximately 23 feet in diameter then, which Mike noted yes it would be close to that, adding that HDR is still looking at the height. Mike also added that this property may have merit if we go in this direction at 60 Jansen, if it ends up in his tech memo once he has the need and the justification done for the Board, because of the existing stands of trees, and it is a rather unique property, he would submit given the acreage, that a stealth tree might make some sense here, adding there a number of deciduous trees though, this time of year is different than the leaf off season when we've asked them to do the simulations, but there are a decent number of pine in the area but nothing this tall but noted no one is claiming that this is going to blend perfectly but the option that's been provided is good. Vince Xavier referred to exhibit C of another 150 foot monopine that they had built recently in Salisbury, Connecticut, and this image was included within a response back to one of Mike's comment letters dated July 10<sup>th</sup> and is an

example of the type of structures they build, and noted at Jane Schanberg's request, he will get additional examples in subsequent submissions. Amy Cohen commented she wouldn't mind if he had an actual living example that was in the Hudson Valley that if Board members had time, and they wanted to pass by that they would be able to, as it's been very helpful for them in the past to not reinvent anything here, and they can actually see what we're talking about in real life.

Vince Xavier commented that in addition to some photos, he'll give the Board a list of some of the closest ones, there's one they just built in Phillipstown in Putnam County, but stated he'll work with his attorney to get some additional photos and addresses of some of the closest ones to come visit. Mike Musso stated he would do the same. Mike also added going back to C-3 map on the fence compound, that the tower structure itself is right in the middle and going off to the bottom right is Verizon's proposed equipment, so that is it for them at the ground, and everything else will run underground out to the meter box that's technically outside the fence compound so that's to allow access by other utility companies, with no other utility poles on the property.

Mike Musso asked if they can describe the placement of the gravel (of the 12-foot-wide gravel access drive), equipment staging or stockpiling, and dewatering during construction.

Steve Matthews reviewed the grading plan on C-2 map, -and reviewed the concrete washout area and area of disturbance, the grading of the gravel drive. Attorney Golden asked if it was possible for them to go ahead and mark those trees to be taken down with yellow tape so it's clear for the Board members to drive by and see which trees are being taken down. Vince Xavier said you cannot see from the road, as you would have to drive in there, but he would mark those trees. Jane Schanberg asked about the equipment outside the fence if those locked boxes, as there kids in the area, they get curious, hit things with sticks, asking what are the safety issues with anything that is outside the fence (area).

Mike Musso noted that it is private property with a pond on one side in the wetland area but the equipment has to be installed via common electric and grounding cods and there's lock and key, lockout, tagout type of controls that is standard.

Amanda Gotto asked about the mowed area, which Attorney Gaudioso stated they would weed whack around the fence area but leave the area

outside the fence natural. Lyle Nolan asked if there were any herbicides as it is near wetlands. Attorney Gaudioso stated that they do not spray, with the gravel compound, it is fairly impervious to weeds and if there is a weed problem, they do maintenance like weed whack, but they don't spray with any type of herbicides. Amy Cohen commented that there seems to be a lot of materials needed for this project, for the tower, the fencing, the roads that you're constructing and asked if they had any figures on how many truck trips for your supplies will come through the Town with all that rock and all those materials, from your experiences, do you have any estimates on that? Vince Xavier stated he can give them a more reliable number than some quick math; Ryan Cornelison stated he could do that as well and compare. Amanda Gotto asked if they were going to stockpile the materials. Vince Xavier stated that they won't bring all the gravel, or the steel, the fencing to the site at the beginning and slowly use it as it gets delivered and brought to the site as it is used, so they won't be stockpiling everything all at once. Vince Xavier explained to the Board the process of putting in the access road stone first then the process of installing the conduit on the ground then tree cutting. Vince again stated he would mark the trees that are being taken down. Wetlands were discussed briefly.

Deputy Chair Nolan commented if no one had anything else, let us get back to the SEQRA Part 2.

Amy Cohen asked where they are at with the potential of other locations, as she was under the understanding that they were going to other places or other spots were identified. Attorney Gaudioso noted that they had submitted on July 15<sup>th</sup> the alternative site analysis from Mr. Xavier, as he went through and excruciating detail, maps, setback, topographical maps showing all the various reasons why the alternative sites are either not available from a landlord perspective, do not provide the necessary coverage for Verizon Wireless, a report from their engineer and most importantly Mr. Xavier's reports shows that they wouldn't meet either the setback requirement as two times the height of the tower or the special 500 foot setback from the schools, camps, daycare center, and parks.

Vince Xavier went through his July 6 submittal that was submitted to the Board especially the Factors starting on page 7 thru the end of the submittal.

Deputy Chair Nolan stated the next goal is to go over the SEQRA part 2 with the Board's engineer.

Attorney Golden noted to the Board that the whole purpose of the SEQRA analysis that the Board is about to undertake is a substantive way in this Part 2 is to ensure that environmental issues are considered as part of your decision making but it is also recognized by SEQRA and their regulations, specifically that it is not the intention of SEQRA that the environmental factors will be the sole consideration of decision making but to make sure the Board is not ignoring the environmental issues, noting that the Board, at the end of the Part 2 the Board will have to make 1 of 3 choices: No significant adverse environmental impact, which is a negative declaration, or, there is a potential for at least one significant adverse environmental impact which will be a positive declaration and going on to an environmental impact statement, or thirdly, which is not specifically set forth in the regulations but is recognized was really created by the courts but now it is recognized by the DEC as a valid third course even though it is not in the regulations and that is to give the applicant even if there is some potential significant adverse environmental impact is that you give the applicant the opportunity to address the board's concerns as to that potentially significant adverse impact to try to modify the plan or do something else that would reduce it down to no significant adverse environmental impact, commonly known as an expanded Part 3 EAF.

After a short discussion on the SEQRA Part 2 and the Part 3 determination, Ryan Cornelison reviewed the Part 2 EAF the Board with the following results:

Question 1 – Impact on Land – Yes as construction is going on

- a. No
- b. No
- c. No
- d. No (after determining with SEQRA workbook not Moderate)
- e. No
- f. No
- g. No

Question 2 - Impact on Geological Features - No

Question 3 - Impact on Surface Water – Yes

- a. No
- b. No
- c. No
- d. No only in the buffer so No

- e. No
- f. No
- g. No wastewater not being created so No
- h. No/Small - roadway not being paved, compacted so No
- i. No
- j. No pesticides and herbicides discussed earlier so No
- k. No

Question 4 – Impact on Groundwater – No

Question 5 – Impact on Flooding – No

Question 6 – Impacts on Air – No removed generator

Question 7 – Impact on Plants and Animals – Yes

- a. No/Small– mapper tool notes Indiana Bat and tree clearing addressed in their plan
- b. No
- c. No
- d. No
- e. No
- f. No
- g. No/Small
- h. No
- i. No – herbicides & pesticides will not be used

Question 8 – Impact on Agricultural Resources – No, no Ag designation on his property.

Question 9 – Impact on Aesthetic Resources – Yes

- a. Yes, Moderate to large impact - Mohonk 2.5 miles away, Scenic Byway, Wallkill Rail Trail within a mile of the site, put more time into this, look at first Saratoga report. Applicant to provide additional information.
- b. Yes, Moderate to large impact - same as a.
- c. Yes, Moderate to large impact for both seasonal and year round - same as a. applicant referenced photo simulation and will provide additional information.
- d. Yes, Small impact for routine travel by residents; Moderate to large impact for recreational or tourism based activities - same as a. Board to provide Ryan with feedback if any

- e. Yes, Small impact - county road not a minor road, used frequently by residents as cutover road, frequently traveled
- f. Yes, Moderate to large impact - applicant to address those similar projects in the area

Question 10 – Impact on Historic and Archeological Resources – No

Question 11 – Impact on Open Space and Recreation – No - applicant submission package a letter provided of no effect on impact on open space and recreation.

Question 12 -Impact on Critical Environmental Areas – No

Question 13 – Impact on Transportation – No

Question 14 – Impact on Energy – No

Question 15 – Impact on Noise, Odor and Light – Yes (changed from No after discussion on lighting of the facility, no tower lighting,

- a. No – Town noise ordinance, daytime hours, no blasting
- b. No
- c. No
- d. No/Small – works with e. below
- e. Yes, Small impact – no light on adjoining properties, will be addressed by applicant by Town Code requirements for lighting

Question 16 - Impact on Human Health – No, no rf emissions

Question 17 – Consistency with Community Plans – Yes

- a. Yes, Moderate to large impact
- b. No
- c. Yes, Moderate to large impact
- d. No UC PB response.
- e. No
- f. No
- g. No, students online from college, not coming back this semester

Question 18 – Consistency with Community Character – Yes

- a. No
- b. No
- c. No
- d. No
- e. Yes, Moderate to large impact

f. Yes, Moderate to large impact

Attorney Gaudioso thanked the Board for the time, adding they would like a copy sent over for them to work on the Part 3, which Ryan agreed to send to Pat for distribution.

Attorney Golden added that as a Board “you have paid close attention to this EAF Part 2 process more than most Planning Boards who simply rush through it or simply say Yeah, whatever the engineer says or the lawyer says, so that’s good for us so I commend all of you”. Mike Musso agreed with his comments.

**Motion 1 by Jane Schanberg to adjourn.**

**Motion 2 by Stana Weisburd. All in favor. Meeting adjourned at 9:45pm.**

**Attachment A**

**Attach memo from Terry Merrill here dated August 5, 2020**