

1 STATE OF NEW YORK COUNTY OF RENSSELAER
2 TOWN OF SCHODACK
3 *****
4 PLANNING BOARD MEETING
5 *****
6 THE STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES of a portion of the
7 above entitled matter on May 17, 2021 as it
8 pertains to Scannell Properties, by NANCY L.
9 STRANG, a Shorthand Reporter at 7:37 P.M.
10 transcribed from the live stream meeting posted
11 to the Town's website.
12
13 BOARD MEMBERS:
14 DENISE MAYRER, CHAIRPERSON (RECUSED)
15 WAYNE JOHNSON, ACTING CHAIRPERSON
16 JAMES SHAUGHNESSY
17 LAWRENCE D'ANGELO
18 ANDREW AUBIN
19 JOHN LAVOIE
20
21 ALSO PRESENT:
22 CHRISTOPHER LANGLOIS, ESQ., SPECIAL COUNSEL TO
23 THE PLANNING BOARD
24 NADINE FUDA, DIRECTOR, PLANNING & ZONING
25 MELISSA KNIGHTS, PLANNING & ZONING SECRETARY

1 DAWNE KELLY

2 STEVEN BOISVERT, PE, MCFARLAND JOHNSON

3 ADAM FROSINO, PE, MCFARLAND JOHNSON

4 DANIEL MADRIGAL, SCANNELL PROPERTIES

5 BRAD GRIGGS, SENIOR MANAGER, AMAZON.COM

6 SERVICES, LLC

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 CHAIRPERSON MAYRER: I made a request at
2 the last meeting for the applicant to be
3 prepared to reveal the tenant.

4 Go ahead.

5 MR. BOISVERT: Good evening. My name is
6 Steve Boisvert with McFarland Johnson. I am
7 here with Daniel Madrigal on video with
8 Scannell properties, Adam Frosino with
9 McFarland Johnson and Terresa Beckner with
10 Whiteman Osterman and Hanna.

11 We have a presentation for you tonight
12 that's going to go through the detailed
13 specifics of the project, but what we want
14 to do to kick off our presentation and
15 address your concern that was raised at our
16 last meeting to make an announcement on who
17 the tenant is. So, what I will do now to
18 kick-off our presentation is turn this over
19 to Brad Griggs, who will make that
20 announcement and he is on video.

21 CHAIRPERSON MAYRER: Thank you.

22 MR. GRIGGS: Good evening, ladies and
23 gentlemen and the Board. My name is Brad Griggs
24 and I am with the prospective tenant for this
25 project which is Amazon.Com Services, LLC. I am

1 a Senior Manager on our economic development
2 team. I lead our northeast and Mid-Atlantic
3 expansion efforts. I am here tonight to discuss
4 the proposed type of operations that we would
5 be considering at the location in partnership
6 with our development partner -

7 CHAIRPERSON MAYRER: I need to stop you
8 for second. I just need to interrupt you for
9 second. Thank you for that.

10 So, tonight's the public hearing and
11 you may not remember but the last time
12 because of the client, I needed to recuse
13 myself. I need to do that, as well. I will
14 be recusing myself from the public hearing
15 or any actions going forward for this
16 client.

17 So Wayne, it's you.

18 MS. FUDA: I'm going to read the public
19 hearing notice prior to the rest of your
20 presentation.

21 Please take notice the Planning Board
22 of the Town of Schodack will conduct a
23 public hearing on Monday, May 17th at 7:00
24 P.M. on the following site plan, water
25 quality special permit application, Scannell

1 Properties 508 LLC., for proposed sales
2 distribution center location U.S. Route 150.
3 Zone is PD3.

4 You may email your comments and on the
5 application to nadine.fuda@schodack.org or
6 request a review. Said hearing will be held
7 at Schodack Town Hall 265 Schuurman Road,
8 Castleton, New York which at that time all
9 interested parties will be given the
10 opportunity to be heard.

11 Now you can continue.

12 ACTING CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Just for the
13 record, my name is Wayne Johnson. I am taking
14 over as the Chair for this project only. I drew
15 the short straw.

16 You may proceed.

17 MR. BOISVERT: Brad, were you going to
18 share any more information on the operations?

19 MR. GRIGGS: Yes, I believe we planned
20 that we have a presentation this evening.

21 I think Daniel is having essentially
22 some issues connecting to the audio, but I
23 believe that we are in the process of
24 sharing the presentation.

25 Ladies and gentleman of the Planning

1 Board, thank you very much for your time
2 this evening. As I mentioned, I am Brad
3 Griggs with Amazon. I lead our economic
4 development and government relations efforts
5 throughout the northeast and Mid-Atlantic
6 region based here in New York, a little
7 south of Schodack, in Long Island and out of
8 our New York City offices for Amazon.

9 What we are here to talk about today is
10 one of our middle-mile facilities in our
11 logistics network. This is a location that
12 helps facilitate more efficient delivery of
13 our packages throughout our North American
14 logistics network. This site will operate
15 24/7 with prominently 18-wheeler
16 tractor-trailers coming in and out of this
17 building. The inbound traffic would come
18 from a variety of different fulfillment
19 centers. Those are where our products are
20 stored as inventory or first-mile sites.

21 As our products enter our logistics
22 chain, they are stored as inventory and can
23 be ordered on Amazon.com. Once you place
24 your order, it is then placed in Amazon
25 packaging, placed on the trucks and head out

1 into our logistics network. Locations like
2 what we are talking about here tonight serve
3 as an efficiency point or middle-mile
4 location to help bring in packages from a
5 variety of different areas heading into the
6 site. Those packages are then broken down by
7 pallets and sent out in outbound traffic
8 also via tractor-trailers to our last-mile
9 delivery station. So, it's taking packages
10 from a variety of different locations and
11 more efficiently bundling them together
12 inside of this warehouse or middle-mile
13 facility, putting them back on the trucks
14 and having them move efficiently into the
15 last-mile delivery location; whether it's
16 one of our Amazon last-mile facilities, or
17 whether it's one of our third-party partners
18 such as the USPS or UPS or sometimes FedEx
19 partners that deliver our packages for us.

20 This site will operate 24/7 with
21 prominently part-time associates working
22 four, or five or six-hour shifts. The shifts
23 will happen in different ways throughout the
24 day prominently beginning with shift times
25 throughout the evening and daytime periods -

1 again, 5 to 6 hour shifts. Sometimes
2 beginning during the overnight; midnight to
3 1:00 A.M. with the next shift at 6:00 or:
4 7:00. Additional shifts would be at 8:00,
5 or 9 o'clock and then those departing in the
6 early afternoon, noon to 1:00, to 3 o'clock
7 and then later in the evening, 5:00 to 6:00
8 with the shifts heading back out and it
9 repeats itself. We have trucks arriving
10 basically throughout the day in standard
11 amounts. Again, we will get into the exact
12 traffic accounts as it relates to how many
13 associates, how many tractor-trailers and
14 the box trucks in and out that also help
15 facilitate our delivery and efficiency
16 network. But this is a middle-mile, more or
17 less, truck terminal location.

18 As you can see here, we have loading
19 zones on the two long sides of the building.
20 They are demarcated in that sort of pinkish
21 purple color to facilitate the
22 inbound/outbound transfer of the product to
23 create the more efficient delivery routes or
24 trucking routes in and out of the site. Then
25 you can see the trailer marking and blue

1 around both sides and then the left of the
2 facility. Our Amazon associates park in the
3 yellow areas. Again, mostly part-time with
4 some full-time shifts in this location. The
5 predominant amount of workforce in this
6 facility when it gets moving forward and
7 when you get started would be part-time.

8 All of our associates on-site earn at
9 least \$15 an hour. The full-time folks who
10 have comprehensive benefits are the same as
11 the Amazon corporate team that is on the
12 line; medical, dental, vision, 401K and
13 parental leave. Our part-time associates
14 have a more flexible work schedule. They
15 will be provided stipends to help go towards
16 benefit coverages. But again, they are only
17 prominently working about on average 20 to
18 25 hours a week on that part-time shift
19 throughout the day.

20 So, with that, I will pause and we
21 certainly can answer any questions you may
22 have as it relates to the operations for the
23 proposed middle-mile facility here this
24 evening.

25 ACTING CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: We are really

1 here to listen to you present what you're going
2 to do. So, it's not now open for questions. We
3 will take as much information as we can get.

4 MR. BOISVERT: Okay, that's fine. Before
5 we get into the detailed project specifics, we
6 just wanted to offer the Board any questions
7 for Brad. There is none so we will continue.

8 ACTING CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Any Board
9 Members or Rich - anything you want to ask
10 right now?

11 MR. BOISVERT: So, we will go through a
12 detailed description of this project, but we
13 want to start with reminding the folks that
14 this particular site - this exact site has
15 received special use, SEQRA and site plan
16 approval for two sales distribution centers.

17 In 2011 McLane Food Services proposed
18 roughly a 400,000 square-foot sales
19 distribution center which received
20 approvals. In roughly 2016 there was a Boces
21 project that also had roughly a 200,000
22 square-foot sales distribution center
23 located on this exact property that also
24 received SEQRA, site plan and special use
25 permit. This site has seen a lot of activity

1 and approvals in the past.

2 The overall project is 56 acres. It is
3 comprised of two parcels that were
4 subdivided during the last approval that I
5 just mentioned in 2016. We are proposing to
6 combine those two parcels into one parcel.

7 Access to the site - three access
8 points off of 150 starting with the
9 easternmost which is a truck enter only
10 access point. The middle driveway is
11 employees which will be a full driveway in
12 and out and the last driveway is for truck
13 exiting only. So, truck circulation enters
14 and angles in a clockwise circulation around
15 the site and you can see that there is no
16 interconnection with the employee parking
17 lot.

18 Employees will enter in the middle
19 driveway and then there is a drop-off area
20 or drop-off zone in this location in the
21 parking lot so circulation will come and
22 make a right drop-off on the passenger side
23 of the vehicle and then exit down the main
24 drive and avoiding any conflict with the
25 main entrance of the facility.

1 Utilities will be brought to the site
2 from roughly 800 feet away at the
3 intersection of 150 and Route 9. Water is
4 currently at that intersection as well as
5 sanitary sewer. There will be roughly an
6 800-foot extension to the property into the
7 building. Electric is on Route 150 and we
8 are currently working with National Grid for
9 gas extension.

10 Drainage on-site will be handled with a
11 closed drainage system and draining into
12 three or four various infiltration ponds.
13 The drainage system will also contain sumps
14 for all catch basins and manholes, as well
15 as an oil/water separator prior to being
16 discharged to the sediment basin and once
17 water has filled up the sediment basin, it
18 will overtop into the infiltration basin. We
19 do that as a means of cleansing the
20 stormwater because we are aware that this is
21 in the aquifer protection zone. So, we want
22 to make sure we protect the aquifer in
23 recharging the groundwater after it goes
24 through this series of three sediment
25 controls.

1 There are wetlands on the property -
2 very small wetlands. One is in the northwest
3 corner and then there is a stream along the
4 eastern property line. We recently did an
5 updated wetland delineation and flagged the
6 wetlands and surveyed them and we are
7 avoiding all impact to the wetlands.

8 Fire protection in this facility will
9 be state-of-the-art. It is an EFS system
10 which is an early fire suppression response
11 system which is above code and is actually
12 designed to suppress or put out the fire,
13 versus a normal sprinkler system which
14 simply contains a fire until emergency
15 responders can arrive. The system prompts an
16 enormous amount of water in a very short
17 period of time to actually put the fire out.
18 It is above code. It is supported by a
19 250,000 on-site storage tank which will pump
20 the separate fire protection system loop
21 around the building and the sprinkler system
22 in the building with the 2,000 gallon per
23 minute pump.

24 We are proposing extensive landscaping
25 - not only to enhance the site, but also to

1 provide screaming particularly along Route
2 150 in along the south property line.

3 We also are aware that we are not only
4 in the aquifer protection zone, but we are
5 in the wellhead protection zone. A small
6 portion of the property in the northeast
7 corner falls within that zone and there are
8 additional restrictions with regard to what
9 we can or cannot do. There is a series of
10 requirements in your code that we have
11 addressed point by point and we have done
12 extensive soil borings in this property to
13 determine the depth of the groundwater and
14 we are significantly higher than the
15 elevation of the groundwater. So, we are in
16 no way impacting the wellhead protection
17 zone.

18 We are going to improve access signage
19 to the site using not only typical enter and
20 exit signage and employee entrance, but we
21 are going to try to convince the DOT to
22 provide exact duplicate signage on the other
23 side of the road so there is no way they can
24 miss that truck enter sign. Employees,
25 again, will know to enter the center

1 driveway and once they are on site, trucks
2 will exit.

3 There is no way with the guardhouse
4 located right here for trucks to
5 inadvertently come out the enter. There is a
6 guardhouse in and guardhouse out.

7 This project will also employ the same
8 snow removal and salt management practices
9 as the Amazon facility currently in
10 operation. We have specific stockpiles of
11 snow throughout the site that will occur
12 either in the parking lot or immediately in
13 the lawn area, but not in the stormwater
14 management facilities. Self-management will
15 be employed with a minimized amount of salt
16 only when necessary.

17 The original application we made and
18 then as you are aware we have had some
19 meetings and received a few comments from
20 the Planning Board and the general public.
21 We have actually addressed those and want to
22 present them tonight, specifically to
23 address your concerns.

24 The first is a noise wall. There will
25 be more later on the detailed noise study we

1 did, but the original proposal had roughly a
2 600-linear foot noise wall, 15 foot high in
3 the southwest corner of the truck parking
4 lot. We heard a lot of comments and concerns
5 about extending that noise wall so we are
6 now proposing to extend the wall another
7 1,000 feet for a total of roughly 1,550
8 linear feet along the south property line.
9 It is primarily extending to the location of
10 the guard entrance house and 15 foot high.

11 We also heard that we wanted to screen
12 the project as best we could and try to
13 break up the vastness of the 15 foot high
14 1,550-foot linear wall. So, we've actually
15 added landscaping throughout the southern
16 property line between the wall and our
17 property line.

18 We also heard that our original
19 proposal had 40-foot high poles. You will
20 hear in a little bit that we reduced the
21 pole height - the mounting height to 25
22 feet. We have rerun the analysis.

23 We have included all four building
24 elevations in our submittal and I just want
25 to touch upon the highest building elevation

1 as the north elevation, or the front of the
2 building which is 48 feet, 11 inches. The
3 other elevations range from 44 feet, 11
4 inches to 47 feet, 7 inches on the south
5 elevation.

6 This is a bird's eye perspective view
7 (Indicating). We have created a very
8 detailed 3D model of the entire project. As
9 you can see, there are three entrance
10 points; fire protection, storage tank and
11 the building itself. This model is actual
12 geospatially referenced on the property with
13 accurate topography and that will come into
14 play later in the presentation when I share
15 the visual impact analysis that we did.

16 We did a very detailed environmental
17 assessment report, over 500-some pages that
18 contained all of the detailed studies that
19 we prepared including some, as I mentioned,
20 wetland and archaeological, etcetera, as
21 well as the impact on zoning, land and
22 water.

23 What I want to share with you tonight
24 is the detailed analysis that we did with
25 the concerns that were raised in the

1 previous Planning Board meetings. That is
2 the visual resources, traffic study and
3 noise. So, what we did do to address the
4 visual impact is we, as I mentioned
5 previously, prepared a 3D model of the
6 project that incorporated the actual
7 topography of the lay of the land and the
8 topography of the surrounding area. Then, we
9 went around and took photos at various
10 locations you can see on the screen and we
11 took nine photos around the site. So, what
12 we did is we prepared a before and after
13 shot and the after shot is obviously with
14 the model dropped into the photo. So, this
15 is view two in the upper left-hand portion
16 of the screen and that is the truck exit
17 driveway.

18 View three is the employee driveway and
19 what we want to show here is that we have
20 proposed some significant landscaping to
21 screen the building from the vantage of
22 Route 150 (Indicating).

23 View four is along Route 150 at the
24 truck entrance and again we have
25 strategically located landscaping to screen

1 the building as well as adding in some berms
2 to raise the ground.

3 View five - this is the bridge over the
4 Moordener Kill (Indicating) and what we want
5 to demonstrate here is the left-hand view is
6 what you will see with the proposed project.
7 What we want to demonstrate on the
8 right-hand view though is - what we did is
9 we dropped the project in the photo by wire
10 frame just to demonstrate and prove that the
11 project is in the photo on the left. What we
12 did is show the outline of the building, but
13 it will be screened by vegetation.

14 The same thing with view six. This is
15 the bridge over 90 and 150. Again, the shot
16 on the left is what you will see after the
17 project is built but we had to ghost in or
18 prepare the wire frame to demonstrate that
19 the building is in the photo on the right.

20 This is view seven, which is along
21 Route 150 at the residential house at the
22 bottom of the hill. Again, same thing. You
23 won't be able to see it with the existing
24 vegetation on the left and on the right you
25 can see the building wire framed in the

1 photo on the right. Again, it is primarily
2 screened.

3 This is the view from the intersection
4 of 150 and 9 20. Again, just to due to
5 topography you are not going to be able to
6 see the building.

7 This is the view from 9 and 20, south
8 of Route 150 and again you're not going to
9 see the building behind the existing
10 building there is vegetation. We dropped the
11 wire frame in on the right-hand photo and
12 brought it up front to demonstrate that the
13 building is in the photo on the left.

14 View 10 is from the resident on
15 Julianne Drive. In the upper left-hand photo
16 is what it will look like today after the
17 building project is built, but what we were
18 asked to do is also assumed that the
19 neighboring property between our project and
20 Julianne Drive is harvested and logged
21 completely so we were asked to photosim what
22 that would look like. That is in the bottom
23 photo. You will see that you can see the top
24 half of the noise while there actually -
25 right in the view. Again, that is the

1 situation that is assuming that the
2 neighboring property is completely clear-cut
3 all of the vegetation which we know will be
4 a temporary impact if that is allowed. I do
5 believe the harvesting or logging
6 regulations also require replanting. That
7 view, although you can see the building,
8 will be very rare in a very short timeframe.

9 We did a detailed noise study and we
10 started that study by taking field
11 measurements in mid-March with four
12 locations from the project, as you can see
13 located on the screen. What we did is we
14 took the actual noise readings basically
15 throughout a 24 hour. So, we have the
16 ambient or the existing noise levels as a
17 basis for conducting our model. Then what we
18 did was we created a noise model with the
19 project and all its noise generators and
20 combine them into one overall model that
21 would model and demonstrate what the maximum
22 noise level is from employees entering the
23 facility, trucks entering the facility and
24 the entire HVAC system which is on the roof
25 running at its peak and also the mules. The

1 mules are the vehicles that stay on-site and
2 move trailers from the loading docks to the
3 parking spaces and vice a versa. So, all
4 those noise sources were combined and added
5 together to create what basically if you
6 will a noise contour scenario. We analyzed
7 nine locations where the noise would be
8 emulated either at the property line, or at
9 sensitive receptors. You can see that we
10 have done or analyzed noise along Julianne
11 Drive - along their property line, two
12 locations K and J, right at our property
13 line. Location B which is in the residential
14 house at the bottom of Route 150 and then C
15 and D. What we determined is that based on
16 our model and the installation of our noise
17 wall, the noise levels along the Julianne
18 Drive neighborhood range in decibels was in
19 the high 40's which is well below the
20 ambient noise level. Then the noise level at
21 our property line, just beyond our noise
22 wall at K and J also fall within that 56 to
23 59 decibel range, well below DEC criteria.
24 This table demonstrates what the analysis
25 results are in that we have the measured

1 ambient levels on the left-hand side and
2 then you go through adding in all the HVAC,
3 the trucks, the employee parking and the
4 total on the far right-hand side and then
5 you can see the change.

6 The last slide is a comparison between
7 existing and proposed and you can see we are
8 significantly reducing the noise levels
9 which is demonstrated by the difference on
10 the far right-hand side from a maximum of
11 lowering the noise level by 22 decibels to
12 basically a one or two increase in decibels
13 but DEC and all experts say that anything
14 less than 3 decibels is not perceptible by
15 the human ear. In essence, there would be no
16 increase.

17 With that I will turn it over to Adam
18 to talk about lighting.

19 MR. FROSINO: Good evening. I'm just going
20 to go into a little more detail on the
21 lighting. We did have an updated lighting plan
22 reviewed by our leading consultants by lowering
23 the light poles from 40 feet down to 25. We
24 also had them change the color temperature
25 which is also a comment from the Board and the

1 Town Engineer to all to be 3000 K. We use local
2 air fixtures that have a G3 level of glare
3 associated with them. In the figure that you
4 see here, the outline in green is the limits of
5 any measurable light intensity based on the
6 model created and based on the proposed light
7 fixtures. As you can see, we are away from any
8 of the property lines. We do spillover into the
9 DOT right-of-way a little bit which is actually
10 preferred for the driveway entrances.

11 I just wanted to highlight that it is a
12 mixture of different light poles. We have
13 the site lights for the parking areas and
14 that would be the higher 25-foot poles and
15 we have the lower pedestrian ones at the
16 front entrance which are also lower
17 wall-mounted lights at each of the entrances
18 to the buildings, as well as some higher
19 mounted lights around the building to supply
20 light for the loading docks and things of
21 that nature.

22 Moving onto the traffic study, I did go
23 to the traffic study and relative detail in
24 the previous presentation, but I will do a
25 summary for the record and if there are any

1 questions that have developed since then --

2 We did complete our study of the
3 intersections highlighted on this figure
4 (Indicating). I won't read through them all,
5 but the traffic study is all the same
6 intersections that were studied for the
7 Amazon facility that was recently built to
8 the south. In addition to those
9 intersections, we also obviously added on
10 three driveways to go into and out of the
11 proposed site. For this study, we used
12 background volumes from the previous study
13 that was completed. We did count new traffic
14 counts for the new study. However, due to
15 Covid, those volumes were lower than the
16 volumes used in 2018, so we did use the more
17 conservative volumes of 2018.

18 Also, the Amazon volumes were little
19 bit lower than what was projected as the
20 peak or worst case scenario for the facility
21 that's currently open. So, we did not use
22 the actual counted traffic from that
23 facility either. We did use the more
24 conservative worst-case scenario traffic
25 generation from the facility. When we

1 included all that, we use the trip
2 generation directly from Amazon. I know Brad
3 highlighted some of their shift changes. We
4 did use their worst possible shift change
5 and we did align that with the worst
6 possible commuter traffic on the adjacent
7 roadway. In all likelihood those will not
8 line up however to be conservative we did
9 line them up again to do that worst-case
10 scenario which is what we did on the
11 previous Amazon project which is also
12 probably when we physically counted those
13 numbers after the fact they were lower than
14 what we had in our study. Then we always go
15 very conservative and we have done the same
16 thing here. With that, we did submit the
17 traffic study to the New York State DOT and
18 they did provide their response.

19 Actually we can go over the
20 improvements that we are recommending the
21 traffic study. What we are recommending was
22 an addition of left-turn lanes on the east
23 and westbound approaches at the intersection
24 of 150 and 9 and 20 and then to go with
25 those left-turn lanes we would also have a

1 signal phase to allow what's called
2 protected movements at that phase
3 essentially having an arrow so you would get
4 a green arrow when you can turn. This will
5 allow the proposed truck traffic as well as
6 the employee traffic to have a dedicated
7 turn movement at that intersection to turn
8 left and head north to get to I90. The
9 westbound approach was also added to match
10 and mimic the intersection for safety.

11 We also proposed adding widening on New
12 York State Route 150 to allow for dedicated
13 left-turn lanes at each of the entering
14 driveways. This was all, as I said before,
15 reviewed by New York State DOT and Steve
16 also mentioned earlier that the truck
17 entrance signage which just graphically
18 shows that on here to show that a sign
19 similar in nature would be a truck enter
20 roadway sign that we will submit as part of
21 the highway work permit to New York State
22 DOT to help clearly delineate the entrances.

23 So, we did get a review letter from New
24 York State DOT at the end of April. They
25 agreed with our traffic study. To highlight

1 the key point of their letter was that they
2 said that the off-site roadway improvements
3 or off-site roadway system did not require
4 any mitigation outside of what we have
5 already proposed in that there was adequate
6 levels of service and operations with our
7 proposed mitigations. They did have some
8 comments in their letter related to
9 intersection geometries as it relates to
10 sight distances and visibility at the
11 driveways.

12 We are going into a little more detail
13 on the next slide here.

14 After the follow-up meeting with them,
15 they did request that we use a 51 mile per
16 our design speed, even though the road is
17 posted at 45, their calculated 85th
18 percentile speed is 51 miles per hour. So,
19 we did have to modify our site distance
20 analysis based off of that. We have updated
21 our analysis and we still recommend similar
22 to what we proposed before of tree clearing
23 as well as the 51 mile per hour. We will
24 need to do some grading within the New York
25 State right-of-way to cut down the berm

1 which is highlighted in yellow there

2 (Indicating).

3 We do have a meeting set up tentatively
4 right now for later this week with New York
5 State DOT to talk through these with them
6 and make sure we are all on the same page
7 and let them understand how we are
8 mitigating the additional speed to 51 miles
9 per hour.

10 So with that, I don't know if there's
11 any questions for myself, or Steve or Brad
12 again.

13 ACTING CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Rich, do you
14 have any questions?

15 MR. LABERGE: No, nothing at this time.
16 I'll wait to take a look at all the details
17 once it is submitted.

18 ACTING CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Is the
19 presentation complete?

20 MR. FROSINO: Yes.

21 ACTING CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: We have some
22 questions from the public.

23 MS. FUDA: Okay, so at this time I'm going
24 to ask Marci Brunner to call in. My number is
25 518-376-7875, so she can read her presentation.

1 MR. AUBIN: I just have one question. The
2 current Amazon installation - is it fully
3 staffed at this time? Is the projection for
4 employee counts up to or - where are we with
5 employee counts based on what was presented
6 earlier?

7 MR. BOISVERT: I will have to reserve to
8 Brad.

9 I don't know if Brad, you can answer
10 that question, if you are still on. If not,
11 we can get back to you on that.

12 MR. GRIGGS: I will need to get back given
13 the launch timeline to the other facility in
14 Schodack as to whether we have reached full
15 employment or what was presented to the Board
16 previously for that site, or if we are still in
17 the process. At this in the year we would be
18 leading into getting staffed up or in the
19 process of starting to look towards our Prime
20 Day during the summer. I believe for standard
21 operating, we should be close to full levels
22 but I would just need to confirm that and we
23 can certainly get back to the Board with that
24 information.

25 MR. AUBIN: We would be interested in both

1 when you think you have reached that number and
2 what that number is.

3 MS. FUDA: All right, Marci, go ahead.

4 MS. BRUNNER: Dear Members of the Planning
5 Board: There are a few things that I wanted to
6 start with. This public hearing is scheduled
7 for a project that has not disclosed who tenant
8 was going to be.

9 I also did not receive a notice of the
10 public hearing through U.S. Mail, which I
11 thought was required for residents who live
12 close by, nor is it posted on Town's website
13 under public notices where other public
14 hearings have been listed in the past. So, I
15 just wanted to bring that to your attention.

16 Also in reviewing the minutes, I did
17 not see the question Mr. Johnson asked on
18 3/20/21 when he asked for an idea of what a
19 sales distribution center is and not a
20 warehouse and what the product would be.
21 That is a question that would've been
22 helpful if the applicant could have provided
23 information during the last meeting on May
24 3rd when they requested this public hearing
25 to give the residents and the Board help

1 with questions. As this was item number five
2 - actually, I think it was number four on
3 the agenda and was the same developer as
4 Amazon. In the building of picture two on
5 the website, it listed the exterior as
6 Amazon Prime blue. I did assume correctly
7 that this was an Amazon warehouse and really
8 do not understand why the big reveal has to
9 be a secret. To avoid confusion, in my
10 letter and as I speak this evening I'm going
11 to refer to the original Amazon over on the
12 other side of Birchwood as Amazon 1 and this
13 new proposal as Amazon 2.

14 As this is a project that affects many
15 residents for various reasons, it is also
16 the deadline to file 2020 taxes, and it
17 honestly feels more like Groundhog Day. But,
18 in saying that, I wish that you could
19 request an additional public hearing to be
20 considered to ensure all interested parties
21 receive notification and time to provide
22 comments, if they so wish.

23 I would like to start by acknowledging
24 my appreciation to a few of the Planning
25 Board Members in particular: Mr. Johnson,

1 Mr. Shaughnessy and Mr. Aubin as well as Mr.
2 Laberge who have asked questions during the
3 last meetings on behalf of residents. I
4 would still encourage each of you to visit
5 Amazon's website where Amazon refers to
6 themselves as a warehouse not a sales
7 distribution center. I am still waiting for
8 a response from whomever made the final
9 determination that Amazon was not a
10 warehouse and therefore allowed to build in
11 a PD3 zone. Can you also please ask the
12 applicant or Mr. Briggs, because he is
13 present this evening, why they refer to
14 their facility as a warehouse, but it is
15 presented as a sales distribution center in
16 their applications. Residents deserve to
17 have an answer to this before another
18 disguised warehouse is approved in a zone
19 that does not allow warehouses. If this is
20 Amazon, which we know it is now, then this
21 is a warehouse.

22 When Scannell presented the original
23 Amazon 1 project to the public, they assured
24 everyone that this was a long term
25 commitment from Scannell. They are quoted as

1 stating such in the June 18th public
2 hearing.

3 Amazon 1 warehouse opened less than a
4 year and Scannell has already sold the
5 building to another put out of state
6 company. Is a long-term commitment meaning
7 less than a year for a developer to come in,
8 turn neighborhoods upside down and leave
9 sound like a long-term commitment to you, or
10 did they tell you what they thought you
11 wanted to hear and are they doing this once
12 again? We cannot and should not view Amazon
13 2 now as a standalone. History must be taken
14 into consideration for the big picture.

15 During this time Scannell also told
16 Birchwood that there were no other parcels
17 large enough in immediate area to fit a
18 million square foot warehouse and they had
19 no other alternatives. What alternatives
20 have been investigated for this newest
21 project? If they really do not want to cause
22 cumulative damages to the aquifer and to the
23 same area and neighbors, there are many for
24 sale commercial properties available down
25 Route 9 which is zoned for warehouses and

1 could accommodate a 300,000 square foot
2 facility. Did they look anywhere else or
3 just the Valente parcel? A parcel further
4 down Route 9 would benefit the Schodack
5 Central School District. Amazon is now on
6 tax roll at \$115 million value and majority
7 of tax benefit goes to East Greenbush
8 Schools and this newest proposal is also
9 located in East Greenbush Schools. Don't get
10 me wrong - Birchwood residents are also in
11 East Greenbush Schools, but does two
12 warehouses in East Greenbush district make
13 sense for smart economic development in
14 Schodack? And why does the tax roll indicate
15 a truck terminal as its classification for
16 the Amazon 1? Truck terminals are also not
17 allowed in a PD-3 zone. You need to ensure
18 you are not approving a project in a zone
19 not allowed by law, once again.

20 I heard Mr. Briggs also refer to this
21 project as a truck terminal. Truck terminals
22 are only allowed in PD1 zones with a special
23 use permit.

24 During the last meeting on May 3rd
25 Mr. Johnson, Mr. Shaughnessy and Mr.

1 Aubin were all asking pointed questions
2 regarding screening, noise impacts, sound
3 wall and lighting in particular items of
4 concerns from residents that will now be
5 directly impacted by two large warehouse
6 type buildings on both sides of the
7 Birchwood and that was greatly appreciated.
8 Unfortunately for many of us, simulations
9 and Studies presented for Amazon 1 vastly
10 differed from reality. I have sent along an
11 email and an attachment labeled Reality to
12 be included in record to detail just a few
13 of the issues we residents have to deal with
14 every day. I am once again begging you to
15 make sure every mitigation is made if this
16 project is approved. And also to note the
17 noise study did not include fire alarm
18 testing - which Amazon performs and goes on
19 for consecutive days and heard from inside
20 homes or vehicles, blaring loud noises all
21 hours of the night. Was this included in the
22 noise sources? Are there structures on
23 trucks that were promised with Amazon 1, but
24 not all trucks have them? No consideration
25 was given for the year-long construction

1 noise. This should also be included in the
2 measure of ambient levels which Mr. Boisvert
3 just reviewed.

4 A partial sound wall is not sufficient
5 and needs to be addressed not only for
6 visual impact, but for sound as well.

7 Also, I will note in the newest EAF for
8 the Scannell project, answers to questions
9 appear almost identical. Construction hours
10 indicate 6:00 A.M. start times, which
11 Scannell then promised to change for the
12 Amazon 1 after requests from Planning Board
13 Members in June of 2018, but the final
14 approval did not reflect what was promised
15 by Scannell and Town did not follow through
16 to ensure this revision was included in the
17 approved site plan.

18 Residents dealt with construction 6
19 days a week, almost 14 hours a day.

20 In review of the Scannell application
21 package, we remain concerned about the
22 buffer. I did hear tonight when you went
23 through the details - I do appreciate - it
24 sounds like you are making some
25 modifications to it. Again, it is very hard

1 to see what they are and it would've been
2 nice to have this information prior to
3 public comment which is why I am asking for
4 another public hearing.

5 I did want to bring a couple things to
6 your attention. Including appendices V and M
7 as supplemental photos which appear to be
8 conflicting regarding the visual impacts
9 which I will preface, could be changed based
10 upon the information that was presented
11 tonight. Appendix B said the visual impact
12 session therefore provided in Appendix J
13 shows that the proposed building and parking
14 area should not be visible from this
15 residence. It also said the remainder of
16 this site should not be visible due to
17 existing vegetation. As for lighting, for
18 Amazon, they are going to have lighting from
19 inside a 24-hour facility that is going to
20 be visible to neighbors. In Appendix B they
21 say should not be visible in here they say
22 shouldn't be visible there. I'm not feeling
23 really confident with that and again saw
24 anywhere that they incorporated the lighting
25 that's going to come from the facility

1 that's going to come from a 24-hour
2 warehouse.

3 Also in Appendix B, SEQRA Part III
4 lighting talks about the lighting and it
5 being 300 feet away from the nearest
6 residence and again 500 feet from the
7 residence to the south. Again, lights on the
8 inside were not evaluated.

9 There was also a supplemental visual
10 impact rendering that was submitted on 5/17
11 which showed the building was visible but it
12 had some fake greenery which is not accurate
13 and will definitely not be accurate once the
14 harvesting is done. So, I'm glad to see they
15 have added some more greenery there as well.
16 Again, greenery is only here in this
17 location six months of the year so we have
18 to be very careful of what greenery is being
19 proposed.

20 Appendix M also talked about the
21 proposed truck exit. It says does not
22 currently have the necessary site distance
23 available due to the presence of vegetation
24 along New York State Route 150. This
25 vegetation, which is within the DOT

1 right-of-way, will need to be cleared in
2 order to achieve the necessary sight
3 distance. That was contradictory to what the
4 visual showed. So, my question that
5 vegetation needs to be moved, is being
6 reflected in the photos that have been
7 provided? It does not appear so. I hope it's
8 not something discovered after the fact and
9 too late for Mr. Conlin on Route 150 as it
10 has been for so many from the Amazon 1
11 project.

12 I would like to give thoughts for
13 consideration for Planning Board and
14 requesting contingencies if project is
15 approved and moves forward. These are
16 outlined in the letter that I just sent.

17 1. Requiring Developers as a condition
18 of approvals to meet with residents to
19 discuss potential concerns which may
20 adversely affect neighborhoods.

21 2. Require an as-built report for
22 comparison of what was approved to gauge how
23 to handle future projects by same proposer.

24 3. Town needs to proactively determine
25 needs for hiring additional personnel to

1 oversee such as compliance officers and
2 inspectors who are full-time and on-call at
3 all times and included in consideration of
4 approvals.

5 4. Updated studies. Many studies are
6 outdated. Now that Amazon is here - any and
7 all studies would need to be re-done to take
8 into account a million square foot warehouse
9 on the other side as topography and wildlife
10 has been considerably changed.

11 5. A sound wall the length of the
12 building/project with the height to be
13 determined dependent of final building
14 height and elevation and preferably a
15 neutral color and agreed upon by residents
16 directly affected. This wall should be
17 constructed first.

18 6. Additional landscaping to be placed
19 on the wall facing neighborhood for green
20 cover year-round such as tall pines. Let's
21 make sure the landscaping is not shown what
22 it will look like 10 years from now. We need
23 to make sure there's adequate coverage on
24 day one and year-round. The inclusion of
25 visual impacts from lit up warehouse and

1 mitigations be addressed. Especially when
2 roof units are added to a 40-45 foot
3 building and a water tank for fire
4 suppression systems that was just described.
5 Was that included? I didn't see it anywhere
6 in the paperwork and I'm wondering how tall
7 that is going to be.

8 7. Photos from Birchwood homes during
9 each season with the ability to add
10 additional landscape as needed to adequately
11 screen.

12 8. Modification to construction hours:
13 Revision of start time of at least 8:00 A.M.
14 to minimize noise impacts to residents.

15 9. Identification of personnel
16 responsible during construction and after.

17 10. Request Scannell to investigate GPS
18 issues and resolve before this project comes
19 in.

20 11. Look at alternative site layout as
21 proposed and sent on 5/3/2021 - if you
22 approve this project, the developer should
23 be suggesting alternative layouts to
24 minimize impacts to all; this includes
25 changes to truck terminals and exploring

1 other available parcels and be able to tell
2 you why their current proposal is their only
3 option.

4 12. An updated traffic study to include
5 impacts from two locations close by as
6 incidental traffic patterns which it will
7 cause. Primarily increased traffic on Route
8 9 down to Exit 12 and recent accidents that
9 have happened. And the additional public
10 hearing to learn updates on items brought up
11 this evening and an opportunity for
12 additional public comment.

13 I am respectfully requesting each
14 Planning Board Member to pay careful
15 attention to the proposed site plan and each
16 Member ask tough questions. No one is
17 against development, but it is not fair that
18 we need to once again suffer through
19 construction and after affects with not a
20 single gain for any of us. Instead, we are
21 tasked with ensuring compliance and
22 following up. If Scannell wants to build
23 another warehouse - what are they offering
24 neighbors directly affected? This should be
25 a two-way street and not residents left to

1 fight for themselves.

2 It is your responsibility as Planning
3 Board Members to know exactly what you are
4 approving and not be afraid to ask questions
5 and continue to demand accountability on
6 behalf of all the residents you represent.
7 Many of us are more than willing to work
8 with whoever we can to ensure projects
9 benefit all and not just some. I hope you
10 agree what is being asked as a resident is
11 not unreasonable. As residents we have no
12 other choice but to put our trust in you to
13 ensure above all safety and quality of life
14 of over 50 homes which will be affected. Too
15 many of us have already incurred added
16 expenses to fix lawns, mailboxes and yards
17 from effects of Amazon 1. Again, see the
18 reality PDF that was included in this email
19 which ranges from flooding to lost drivers,
20 not to mention countless hours and costs
21 incurred to bring to the attention and hire
22 an attorney to file to stop blasting as Town
23 was unaware of a Local Law and had no idea
24 blast mats were in place. We also have
25 incurred costs to test our wells as we

1 remain concern over long-term impacts as our
2 drinking water comes from wells and we were
3 not offered access to public water. Why do
4 residents have to incur costs due to
5 negligence?

6 Not to be skeptical, but ask yourselves
7 - if our wells go bad - will Scannell or
8 Amazon be around? Doubtful - safety and
9 well-being is not something that big
10 developers worry about. Words in EAR used
11 like should not be and not likely don't make
12 me feel confident. Another reason why a full
13 Environmental Impact Statement and a
14 positive declaration is important to take
15 the time necessary to study all aspects
16 instead of a quick pull of old studies and
17 fluffy presentations. So far, image and
18 Amazon presenting themselves as a good
19 neighbor in press is one thing, but actions
20 speak louder than words. After viewing our
21 reality, don't you think we deserve
22 consideration especially in light of the
23 cumulative impacts we will now have to deal
24 with? Let's all be pro-active this time
25 instead of being re-active.

1 Thank you for your time tonight in
2 listening to my concerns and suggestions.

3 MS. FUDA: Marci, will Mr. Brunner be
4 reading his?

5 MS. BRUNNER: Yes, he will. Would you like
6 him to call in next?

7 MS. FUDA: Sure.

8 MS. BRUNNER: Okay, thank you.

9 MS. FUDA: Okay so at this time if Mr.
10 Brunner can call in at 518-376-7875.

11 ACTING CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: If Mr.
12 Brunner is listening, can we please have him
13 try to make the presentation short and not read
14 the entire letter, if it's possible? The issues
15 have all been addressed and they don't all need
16 to be repeated. We did get the letter.

17 MS. FUDA: Adam, okay, go ahead.

18 MR. BRUNNER: Dear Members of the Planning
19 Board: My comments this evening are related to
20 item # 5 - Proposed Sales Distribution Center,
21 Scannell Properties #508.

22 Thank you for the opportunity to
23 provide comments on the Scannell proposal
24 regarding the reality of traffic impacts to
25 our area. Please provide this information to

1 all Board Members for review.

2 Since the applicant has just now
3 discloses the tenant, is a bit unfair to
4 residents to provide adequate feedback.

5 Regardless, this evening, I am
6 requesting updates and revisions to the
7 Traffic Impact Study, Appendix M, which was
8 submitted for this project proposal as part
9 of the EAR from McFarland Johnson. Only nine
10 traffic areas were included in this study.
11 This is similar to the traffic study
12 McFarland Johnson prepared for the original
13 Amazon Warehouse in Schodack when they
14 excluded studies past Maple Hill Road
15 heading south on Route 9. All
16 tractor-trailer traffic exiting Amazon is
17 directed south toward Exit 12 including many
18 residential side roads and the Pilot
19 trucking facility down Route 9, yet this
20 area was excluded.

21 These unstudied areas have seen a
22 significant increase in truck traffic and
23 will see more if this new warehouse is
24 allowed to be built in the proposed
25 location. There have already been numerous

1 Amazon related accidents near Pilot, the
2 Amazon Warehouse and Richwood Drive due to
3 the Amazon traffic. This new proposed
4 warehouse will only compound existing issues
5 in these dangerous locations.

6 For your reference, I am including with
7 this letter, a few photo examples labeled
8 Traffic Photos from recent accidents
9 resulting from Amazon tractor-trailer
10 traffic. I ask that you consider the
11 concerns I raise and ask the applicant to
12 address them to ensure resident's safety.

13 In addition, these accidents occurred
14 during the Covid Pandemic and there likely
15 would have been more accidents under normal
16 circumstances. The traffic impact study does
17 mention this, but has not been fully
18 addressed.

19 This evening I am proposing
20 collaborative meetings with the town,
21 developer and residents to discuss all the
22 issues raised in this hearing to ensure the
23 surrounding neighborhoods are treated fairly
24 with public safety being the center of
25 attention.

1 This public hearing is being held
2 without knowing the identity of the tenant.
3 Obviously, now we know that. We are assuming
4 this proposal is another Amazon warehouse
5 based on what is known from public documents
6 and we know that now. It is critical to know
7 if this is another Amazon warehouse as this
8 does affect public comment as well as the
9 studies performed. The original Amazon
10 warehouse was proposed and approved by the
11 Town in three short months disregarding
12 pleas from residents over various safety
13 concerns. Residents were caught off guard
14 and had to scramble to gather information. I
15 am pleading with you once again not to make
16 the same mistake and continue to put public
17 safety first. Please help us and demand any
18 proposals by any developers address
19 residents' concerns especially when they
20 involve safety. Inaccurate studies with
21 outdated trip data does not reflect reality
22 and should never take the place of common
23 sense safety precautions.

24 With another warehouse project
25 producing more tractor-trailer traffic, in

1 addition to this potentially being another
2 Amazon facility - I respectfully request the
3 following five items be subject to further
4 investigation:

5 1. Richwood Drive intersecting with
6 Route 9: Tractor-trailers and vehicles will
7 be going back and forth between the two
8 warehouses in a most likely scenario, as
9 well as heading to Pilot and Exit 12. This
10 will definitely adversely affect residents
11 entering and exiting Richwood Drive which is
12 the only exit for the Birchwood
13 neighborhood. This neighborhood is
14 sandwiched in between both the Amazon parcel
15 and new proposed Amazon warehouse parcel on
16 Route 150. A good portion of the trucks from
17 this new proposed warehouse will most likely
18 head south on Route 9, increasing the
19 likelihood of more accidents on Route 9
20 between Exit 11E and Exit 12. I do not
21 believe the residents directly affected
22 should continue to be put at greater risk
23 with new proposals without mitigations.

24 2. Route 9, from Maple Hill Road to
25 Exit 12: To reiterate as indicated above -

1 this warehouse will produce more
2 tractor-trailer traffic in that area and was
3 not studied for the original Amazon
4 warehouse. This will also lead to more truck
5 congestion around the Pilot travel center -
6 an already scary place to drive where there
7 has been countless accidents. I believe that
8 residents and travelers in this area deserve
9 to have safe roads to travel on.

10 3. Schuurman Road, Brookview Road and
11 Sunset Road: These are alternate roads
12 people may use to travel to get to I-90 to
13 avoid the new truck traffic. With a
14 warehouse that will bring more tractor
15 trailer traffic to an already busy and
16 dangerous intersection at Route 150 and
17 Route 9 & 20, people will use alternate
18 routes increasing traffic flow on these
19 three alternate streets. These intersections
20 should be added to the study and reviewed by
21 the Town to see the cumulative impacts;
22 Especially Sunset Road which now has
23 increased traffic from the new Stewart's
24 approved last year.

25 In addition, and most importantly, the

1 Appendix M - Traffic Impact Study submitted,
2 is outdated from 2018 and has incorrect
3 data. Peak hour traffic count data from
4 Tri-State Traffic Data was derived from a
5 2018 study prior to the Amazon warehouse.
6 This data indicates no pedestrian crossing
7 at the intersection of Route 9 & 20 and
8 Route 150.

9 We know this is inaccurate information
10 considering numerous Amazon workers are
11 crossing this intersection on a daily basis.
12 I am requesting that any decisions on this
13 warehouse proposal be on hold until
14 coordinated meetings occur with the
15 developer, Town and residents with up to
16 date reports.

17 4. Important issues overlooked during
18 proposals: Residents have investigated
19 concerns trying to diagnose issues such as
20 loud booms coming from the Amazon warehouse.
21 After weeks of disturbance, process of
22 elimination, and video evidence, it was
23 determined that the loud booms are from the
24 tractor trailers on the wrong side of the
25 building. This is due to poor signage in

1 front of Amazon. Tractor-trailers are
2 pulling into the employee parking side of
3 the building and hitting speed bumps
4 creating the loud boom sounds when the
5 trailers bounce over them. Pulling out of
6 Amazon, there is a right turn only - this
7 causes concerns with U-turns on the highway
8 for trucks wanting to head north on Route 9.
9 Trucks are performing illegal and unsafe
10 U-turns traffic maneuvers on Route 9 as well
11 as pulling into adjacent neighborhoods to
12 turn around in residential areas.

13 Additionally, some of these
14 tractor-trailers can be found parked along
15 the side of Route 9 with drivers sleeping in
16 their cabs. This has been the responsibility
17 of local residents to address and want this
18 avoided with any new proposals.

19 5. Safety: Sidewalks and lack of
20 lighting down Rt. 9 to Amazon. These items
21 have been a concern from the onset of the
22 Amazon warehouse and this situation will
23 worsen with added traffic from a new
24 warehouse. Is Scannell offering to address
25 and remedy this existing concern in their

1 newest proposal, correcting safety issues
2 and deficiencies from their first warehouse?
3 If this proposal is another Amazon
4 warehouse, which we know it is, this is a
5 cumulative effect and needs to be
6 re-evaluated. The traffic study approved for
7 the original Amazon warehouse indicated that
8 there were no pedestrians who walked on
9 Route 9. This statement is inaccurate. Their
10 study also mentioned a CDTA bus line
11 directly to the warehouse and sidewalks to
12 be added. None of this was done. As
13 residents, We do not want another repeat.
14 Amazon workers have walked over a mile from
15 a bus stop on Route 150 to the Amazon in the
16 dark while crossing over the Richwood Drive
17 entrance. With no sidewalks or lights from
18 the bus stop to Amazon, there have been
19 numerous close calls as vehicles do not see
20 these walkers on Route 9.

21 I have recently observed a Prestige Van
22 going in and coming out of Amazon during
23 shift changes.

24 Perhaps, this quick fix is a shuttle
25 between the bus stop and Amazon? If so, I am

1 happy to see that after-the-fact safety
2 measures are being taken, however why did it
3 take residents like myself to continually
4 follow up with Scannell and the Town voicing
5 concerns for something to happen? A shuttle
6 van helps employees, but does not help
7 vehicles trying to get in and out of
8 Richwood Drive.

9 The Town has the ability to be
10 proactive and force the developer and tenant
11 to mitigate reasonable concerns we have.

12 For the original Amazon warehouse, DOT
13 would not consider a turning lane into
14 Richwood Drive during the Amazon proposal.
15 It remains very dangerous trying to pull
16 into Richwood Drive without someone almost
17 rear-ending you from behind with speeds in
18 excess of 55 miles per hour. This concern
19 will only get worse when another warehouse
20 is added north of Richwood Drive on Route
21 150. I realize the Town has no say over DOT,
22 but you do have say over what is approved
23 and can request the developer to work with
24 DOT and explore alternatives for public
25 safety reasons.

1 With all these open issues still
2 unresolved from the original Amazon, the
3 Town is now reviewing a new 24/7 warehouse.
4 To avoid compounding issues, I propose that
5 these existing open-ended issues be resolved
6 before any new proposals are entertained.
7 Many residents would be happy to meet to
8 discuss in greater depth at any time. Some
9 members of the Planning Board have been
10 forthright and responsive to our concerns
11 and that is greatly appreciated as these
12 decisions have a lasting impact on people's
13 lives.

14 In conclusion, I feel strongly that
15 this project should not be approved as is. I
16 am not against development, but mitigations
17 and further studies need to be addressed as
18 well as residents' concerns. Prior to
19 approval, any costs would be the
20 responsibility of the developer and not of
21 the Town and emergency resources to clean up
22 after the fact. At the end of the day, who
23 is looking out for the residents and most
24 notably the neighborhoods directly impacted
25 by these warehouses. We implore you to do

1 the right thing and work with us to ensure
2 our safety.

3 Thank you for your time.

4 MS. FUDA: Thank you.

5 Next I have a letter from Jennifer
6 Williams.

7 Jennifer, if you're out there
8 listening, can you please call in and you
9 can read your letter at 518-376-7875? Again,
10 Jennifer Williams if you're watching and
11 would like to read your letter, please
12 contact us now at 518-376-7875 and just for
13 the record all letters that were submitted
14 have been given to the applicant, their team
15 and all the Planning Board Members by email
16 and in hard copy to the members.

17 So, I have Morgan Ruthman that would
18 also like to call in. Morgan if you want to
19 call in at 518-376-7875.

20 MR. RUTHMAN: Thank you. Morgan Ruthman
21 speaking. I'm with Van Hoesen Station, LLC. We
22 are the adjacent property located immediately
23 to the south of the proposed project.

24 Thanks for the opportunity to provide
25 some comment tonight. I have previously

1 submitted a letter to the Planning Board and
2 based on Nadine Fuda's comments, I
3 understand that has been submitted to the
4 applicant.

5 Some of the remarks in that letter
6 related to the acoustical impacts of the
7 proposed project. I appreciate some of the
8 additional remarks made tonight by the
9 applicant in response to those concerns.
10 Before we remark on the acoustical impacts
11 just briefly, in response to some of the
12 comments that the applicant made tonight
13 regarding the visual impacts of the property
14 - and there were some comments made
15 specifically made to our property.

16 Our property is in pre-development
17 currently and is in the process of being
18 developed. There is some timber harvesting
19 taking place right now in anticipation of
20 that, but the remark that is going to be
21 temporary in nature is not correct. So, that
22 property is in development. And I would just
23 reiterate that the Planning Board's comment
24 from their prior meeting ultimately it's the
25 applicant's responsibility and not the

1 responsibility of the adjoining property
2 owners to screen their project from the
3 other properties.

4 Relating to noise impacts, we haven't
5 seen the revised acoustical study that was
6 referenced tonight, but I appreciate some of
7 the additional comments that were made. I
8 look forward to having the opportunity to
9 seeing that. Steve obviously pointed out
10 that the noise wall did not extend along the
11 entire property line. That apparently has
12 not been rectified. Steve also pointed out
13 that there were no receptors located on the
14 property and so the acoustical impact of the
15 proposed project on our property was not
16 taken into account or reflected. Just using
17 the visual depiction of the acoustical
18 impact of the project, there was a
19 significant and unreasonable impact on our
20 property, again, in the absence of a noise
21 wall. But with the revised analysis, which I
22 understand has been performed at this time,
23 I'd like the opportunity to see that and see
24 if there are any receptors located on our
25 property. I think it's also going to be

1 important to see the height that is being
2 proposed and what impact changes to that
3 height it would have on the acoustical
4 impact.

5 As far as some general remarks, there
6 was a comment made earlier regarding the
7 fact that two projects have been previously
8 approved on that particular property. That
9 is true, but I'm not sure they necessarily
10 possess the same characteristics or if they
11 were for a 24/7 operation. In any event, PD3
12 zoning doesn't conclude any specific setback
13 requirements, as I'm sure the Planning Board
14 is aware but the Planning Board has the
15 ability to make a discretionary
16 determination on what reasonable parameters
17 are and in this instance, what it would
18 effectively propose with a zero setback
19 project and in consideration of the truck
20 traffic and the noise impacts, we would
21 request that the Planning Board take that
22 into consideration and consider all the
23 alternatives including a site modification
24 and modification to the layout that includes
25 an increased setback with increased

1 buffering and increased noise buffering
2 measures.

3 Lastly, as it relates to the noise
4 impacts, the comment I made in my letter was
5 for the roof HVAC units. I know that the
6 Town Engineers made a comment regarding the
7 rooftop HVAC units. I did not hear any
8 comment today from the applicant regarding
9 what mitigation measures might be brought to
10 their rooftop HVAC units, but parapets or
11 enclosures that would mitigate sound coming
12 from those units would be highly recommended
13 from my standpoint and will probably have a
14 beneficial effect.

15 I appreciate the opportunity to provide
16 comment tonight. Thank you to the Planning
17 Board. At minimum, I would request that the
18 public hearing remain open until such time
19 as others have an opportunity to review the
20 revised analyses that were presented and
21 discussed in tonight's meeting and what
22 changes I understand the applicant has made
23 in response to comments from the public and
24 Planning Board. But again, to my knowledge,
25 they haven't been made public yet and we

1 haven't had an opportunity to adequately
2 review. That concludes my comments and thank
3 you for your time tonight.

4 MS. FUDA: Thank you.

5 So, we do have another letter from the
6 Schodack Valley Fire Company, but I'm not
7 going to actually read into the record,
8 unless Dawne wants to stand up and read it
9 for the fire company.

10 I also have a letter from Patrick
11 Gebbie if he is out there and listening and
12 would like to call in and read his letter,
13 please call in now at 518-376-7875.

14 Again, also, if Jennifer Williams
15 wanted to, otherwise all the letters that
16 were submitted will be part of the record.

17 I don't see anybody else out there.
18 There's no email and no other text.

19 This is Patrick that will be reading
20 his letter.

21 MR. GEBBIE: Planning Board: I'm writing
22 in regards to the proposed sales distribution
23 center proposed off Route 150. We live on South
24 Old Post Road at the intersection of Brookview
25 Station, and while it may not be obvious how we

1 would be directly impacted, we are just under
2 3,000 feet away as the crow flies. I have some
3 serious concerns about how this massive project
4 would impact our groundwater community
5 character, local traffic conditions and add to
6 the ever increasing light pollution in the
7 area.

8 Let me start by saying I am not against
9 smart development, if done in the best
10 interest of all stakeholders. However, I
11 don't think turning Schodack into a series
12 of oversized warehouses and parking lots is
13 really the best interest of the Town
14 generally, and more specifically don't think
15 the project fits the location. The documents
16 provided reference the Town's desire to
17 encourage business growth around the I-90
18 exits and the Route 9 & 20 corridor to build
19 a strong tax base for public services and to
20 provide retail and service business support
21 for Town residents. First, this project is
22 not on the Route 9 & 20 corridor, but off
23 Route 150 that quickly become much more
24 rural.

25 Also, as described, this particular

1 project appears to have no so such retail or
2 service benefit and would only further
3 overload our roads with delivery vehicles.

4 Topping the list of concerns of this
5 proposed project is the certainly for even
6 more light pollution.

7 We moved to Schodack 10 years ago for
8 its rural character, and gladly pay our
9 taxes to live that way, but have been
10 increasingly disappointed over the years
11 with the growing light pollution. Some,
12 admittedly, is from the west towards East
13 Greenbush and Albany, but most recent it has
14 been from local development including the
15 other Scannell warehouse, Dunkin Donuts and
16 new Stewart's. On a clear, dry night it is
17 almost tolerable, but if there is any
18 precipitation or cloud cover whatsoever the
19 glow is amplified and it's as though there
20 is a baseball stadium across the highway.
21 Based on this real-life experience, I
22 vehemently dispute the statement in Appendix
23 B regarding lighting that I quote the
24 project will not have a significant impact
25 on aesthetic resources, end-quote. It is

1 simply not true, and I urge the Board to
2 push back on this specific aspect to help
3 minimize the impact this 24/7 facility will
4 have on our night skies. There is simply no
5 need for full-on lighting all night, every
6 day. They say there is minimum lighting
7 needed for safety, but perhaps the really
8 issue is the 24/7 operation?

9 My second biggest concern is the
10 traffic impact this proposed facility might
11 have. Aside from the obvious traffic impacts
12 nearly 1,000 cars and 360 trucks at peak
13 might bring in a day, I have issues with the
14 lack of consideration given to the
15 additional traffic potentially heading West
16 down Route 150 towards Brookview Road. The
17 study did acknowledge roughly 10% of
18 workers, passenger cars, might head that way
19 but what about delivery drivers? I don't
20 think it's any secret now that this is an
21 Amazon Prime delivery logistics-type
22 facility; what restrictions can be added to
23 prevent lost drivers or overzealous drivers
24 from using side roads like South Old Post to
25 cut through?

1 Also, previous residents have brought
2 up the issue of enforcement and rightly so.
3 What good is the process with design
4 reviews, public meetings and soliciting
5 resident feedback that result in
6 restrictions if they are not followed? There
7 is no doubt there were, and likely continue
8 to be, issues with the most recent warehouse
9 Scannell constructed - they overpromised on
10 local jobs work hours, soundwalls,
11 landscaping, lighting, along other things -
12 and under delivered with no apparent
13 retribution from the Town. I urge you to not
14 be pushed around by these large developers
15 that have nothing but a financial stake in
16 this. They won't be the ones actually living
17 with the traffic, light pollution, bad tax
18 deals and compliance issues through
19 operations. This specific type of planned
20 development absolutely will alter the
21 character of community regardless of what
22 picture Scannell's application tries to
23 paint. You have a second chance here at
24 doing this right and keeping this area from
25 heading in the wrong direction.

1 In closing I believe this project would
2 still have a significant detrimental impact
3 on the local neighborhoods, aquifer/water
4 quality, air quality, traffic flow and the
5 future of the community that this very same
6 Board is trying to achieve via the Town
7 Plan. As many residents stated, this is just
8 one of many more obscenely large warehouses
9 by big out-of-town developers, if approved.
10 I respectfully request you push back further
11 on this project to prevent our community
12 from rapidly turning into one big, noisy,
13 bright, 24/7 parking lot. Respectfully,
14 Patrick Gabby. Thank you.

15 MS. FUDA: Thank you.

16 ACTING CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: If there's
17 anyone else in the Internet world that would
18 like to make a comment, you can still call
19 Nadine for the next few minutes, but we will
20 proceed with some other issues.

21 It has been proposed to hold a public
22 hearing open for 10 days to accept comments
23 - written comments, but I would like to
24 discuss that first. Does anyone have an
25 objection to holding the public hearing open

1 for another 10 days for written comments?

2 MR. D'ANGELO: I support leaving it open.

3 ACTING CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: That was
4 Larry D'Angelo. The next meeting which is June
5 7th, we will close the public hearing.

6 Should we be doing in a motion for
7 that?

8 MS. FUDA: Counsel, motion to leave it
9 open?

10 MR. LANGLOIS: Can't hurt to make a
11 motion.

12 ACTING CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Can I have a
13 motion, please, to leave the public hearing
14 open.

15 MR. D'ANGELO: So moved, D'Angelo.

16 MR. LAVOIE: Second, LaVoie.

17 ACTING CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: All in favor.

18 (Ayes were recited.)

19 Opposed?

20 (There were none opposed.)

21 So, it will be left open until June 7th
22 for written comments.

23 MS. FUDA: As soon as Scannell gives me
24 the PowerPoint - I think I've got it. I will
25 get up on the website as soon as I possibly can

1 and we will go from there.

2 ACTING CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: And if the
3 developer has plans that can be brought in so
4 that people can come into Town Hall to view
5 them because that's one of the comments that
6 was made by just about everyone that spoke
7 tonight was they want to see the new plans and
8 not just the old plans. If you have something
9 that you're going to change, try to let
10 everyone know that there's a change, but
11 there's going to be comments coming in from our
12 engineer and if the Planning Board Members have
13 questions or comments that they want sent to
14 the developer, we should probably give them to
15 the engineer to pass along. I know I have a
16 few.

17 MR. LABERGE: I can certainly incorporate
18 the Board's comments, but whatever Members are
19 comfortable with. So, if you want to send them
20 to me, I can get them into the format of a
21 comment letter or if you do comment through
22 Nadine, just copy it so I am aware. That would
23 be helpful.

24 MS. FUDA: And I will send the
25 presentation to all of you.

1 ACTING CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: For future
2 meetings if the developer has anything they
3 want to present to the Board, please make sure
4 it is available to the Planning Board Director
5 a week before the meeting. We need to have some
6 time for the engineer to make comments and for
7 the Board Members to have a look see. It would
8 be greatly appreciated.

9 MR. SHAUGHNESSY: This is member
10 Shaughnessy. It would probably be helpful for
11 the developer, for Scannell and Steve to maybe
12 prepare a formal set of responses to some of
13 the comments you heard tonight from the public.
14 I would guess that you probably would do that.
15 But just if we can try to address the majority
16 of them as much as we can to try to increase
17 the dialogue, that would be helpful. Thank you.

18 ACTING CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Do you have
19 any other plans to go to DOT to address all the
20 issues that you have with them?

21 MR. BOISVERT: We have a meeting scheduled
22 for this Thursday to meet with DOT to discuss
23 the site distance for the exit - truck exit.

24 ACTING CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: One of the
25 things that maybe you could ask them - I don't

1 know if it's a thing that won't work, but when
2 I look at the truck turn movements it seems to
3 me that you have a conflict with the trucks
4 coming out conflicting with the trucks turning
5 in and if you went with the trucks going into
6 the second driveway the trucks going out the
7 first driveway would not be meeting each other
8 in the middle of the road.

9 MR. BOISVERT: There is actually a worse
10 site distance condition if we reverse the enter
11 and the exit truck driveway. We can certainly
12 show you that in a narrative and submit that to
13 the Town. The issue is on Route 150 there is a
14 hump, a crest in the road and actually it takes
15 longer for a truck to exit, given the time it
16 takes for to accelerate and get into speed and
17 move into the travel lane versus a truck
18 sitting in the left-hand turn lane and making a
19 left in. So, it actually worsens the site
20 distance situation that is out there. We can
21 certainly describe that and explain that
22 scenario in a written form for the Board to
23 review.

24 ACTING CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: But there's
25 not a big issue and having the conflict with

1 the trucks turning where you have a truck
2 coming out that meets the truck that's turning
3 in?

4 MR. BOISVERT: Correct, because we are
5 proposing a left-turn lane for all entering
6 vehicles and a truck so they will sit in a
7 left-turn lane and waiting for trucks or all
8 vehicles to travel west before they make their
9 left-turn in so they have adequate sight
10 distance actually to see oncoming traffic and
11 will wait for a clear zone to make a left-turn
12 in.

13 ACTING CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Maybe we need
14 to correct the site distance, then. Do we have
15 any other comments or questions from Members?

16 (There was no response.)

17 All right, we are done for tonight.
18 Hopefully we will see you. I don't know if
19 you have plans for next meeting or the
20 meeting after.

21 MR. BOISVERT: We will certainly submit
22 everything that we talked about the next day or
23 so and then we would welcome to be on the June
24 7th agenda.

25 MS. FUDA: The public hearing will still

1 be open.

2 MR. BOISVERT: So, we will be here.

3 ACTING CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: See you next
4 meeting. Thank you.

5

6 (Whereas the above entitled proceeding
7 was concluded at 8:43 PM)

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATION

I, NANCY L. STRANG, Shorthand Reporter
and Notary Public in and for the State of
New York, hereby CERTIFIES that the record
taken by me at the time and place noted in
the heading hereof is a true and accurate
transcript of same, to the best of my
ability and belief.

Date:_____

Nancy L. Strang
Legal Transcription
2420 Troy Schenectady Road
Niskayuna, NY 12309

