
-
TOWN OF SCHODACK PLANNING BOARD
SITE PLAN/SPECIAL PERMIT PUBLIC HEARING
ROBERT SCANNELL/SCANNELL PROPERTIES

-

STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING conducted in the
above-entitled matter on Monday, the 4th day of June, 2018,
at the Schodack Town Hall, 265 Schuurman Road, Castleton,
New York, commencing at 7:15 p.m.

APPEARANCES:

Denise Mayrer, Chairwoman

Members of the Planning Board

REPORTED BY: THERESA L. ARDIA, CSR, RPR, RMR

INDEX TO SPEAKERS

SPEAKER	PAGE
STEVE BOISVERT, McFarland Johnson Presentation.....	4
JOHN PRIVITERA, ESQ. Birchwood Association.....	9
BARBARA SPINK.....	12
JOHN HABERMEL.....	15
HERB NEIMAN.....	16
CINDY MILLER.....	17
ADAM BRUNNER.....	23
SHAUNA LAMBERT.....	27
JENNIFER WILLIAMS.....	27
MARCI BRUNNER.....	44
ROBERT JANSING.....	49
MICHELLE WILSEY.....	51
CARL WENTWORTH.....	54

LAUREN SANFORD.....	48
JAMESON PHILLIPS.....	62
LAURA LEE ROSS.....	64
MARY ELLEN FRIEBERG.....	66
KENDRA.....	68
ROB PANASCI.....	70
ANDY VORIS.....	73
(Index to Speakers Continued on Next Page.)	

INDEX TO SPEAKERS CONTINUED

SPEAKER	PAGE
OTIS WILLIAMS.....	74
MARTHA SHERWOOD.....	77
JOE BASALI.....	78
STONY KIRBY.....	82
CRYSTAL SWINTON.....	83
BRIAN HART.....	87
NICOLE ALBERTINE.....	93
MARK SERVIDONE.....	94
JOHN SCHMIDT.....	95
TONY DEFRANCISCO.....	99
CHRISTINE VANDERLAND.....	102
EILEEN NATOLI.....	110
LISA ZIMMERMAN.....	113
PAUL MASACHICK.....	118

DAN.....	121
HEATHER BREHM.....	122
DAVID SPINK.....	124
JIM DOLAN.....	127

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRMAN MAYRER: The next item on the agenda is Scannell Properties. So I will allow you for a few minutes to re-present this evening, give a brief synopsis and any announcements that you need to make and then we are going to open the public hearing.

Before we start public comment, I just have a few announcements to make and that will be in the minutes. So go ahead.

MR. BOISVERT: Good evening. I'm Steve Boisvert with McFarland Johnson. What I would like to do is share with you the changes that occurred since our last meeting as a result of the Board's comments and, more specifically, comments raised by some of the residents.

The first additional change to the project relates to adding an additional means of purifying stormwater. The applicant has heard the residents and what we are proposing is sumps at the bottom of all catch basins and manholes with a hood that will be the first means of purifying stormwater runoff from the parking lot. The sumps will allow for solids to settle out and the hood acts as an oil-water separator. It's a complete watertight enclosed piping system that will drain to each of the three stormwater management facilities prior to discharging into the sedimentation basin.

It will be a second means to purify the water by an oil-water separator, a very large concrete tank, and then the discharge from that tank will go into a sedimentation basin. That sedimentation basin is a line basin that will also purify stormwater prior to it being discharged to the infiltration basin, which will then recharge the groundwater and purify the stormwater before it hits the aquifer.

So the applicant is going to an additional means, additional expense, to have three mechanisms to clean the stormwater before it is

recharged into the groundwater.

The other change we made has to do with a discussion that we had with the residents along the north property line, particularly in the

northwest property line, and these are the two residents here at the end of the cul-de-sac.

If you recall, we had the photo simulation that was prepared from each of the views along the north property line. The resident over the farthest west could still see the facility. So what we've agreed to do is add additional plantings along the property line but still save the existing vegetation which the residents wanted. But our applicant is willing to go through the additional expense to have these

trees, evergreens, planted by hand in order to save the existing vegetation.

And we'd be willing to meet with that resident out in the field and place these trees exactly where they would like to provide a solid screen so they can't see our project.

We are also increasing and lengthening the berm where we can physically from an engineering and topography standpoint and adding additional

landscaping on top of that new berm, again, to screen the residents that weren't a hundred percent screened as part of our photo simulation exercise that we went through last meeting.

The other change we made is in the southeast corner. We had a discussion with a resident that abuts our project and they maintain a very mature hedgerow that is on the applicant's private property. They are willing -- the applicant is willing to allow the property owner to keep that hedgerow and we're doing that by shifting the noise wall a little bit north to make sure that there's ample room to save that hedgerow. And then we're also going to be planting additional evergreens between the wall, the noise wall, and the property line to provide some additional screening.

Same thing with the north. If that resident would like to meet us out in the field during that placement of those trees, we'd be happy to do that and we certainly will meet with that resident to make sure that hedgerow is saved.

We met with the New York State DOT and we will be working with them over the next couple

weeks to address any concerns they have. And we have a meeting scheduled with the fire department very soon to discuss any concerns they may have.

CHAIRMAN MAYRER: Anything else?

MR. BOISVERT: That's all new that has been added since our last meeting. That's all I have.

CHAIRMAN MAYRER: Okay. Any other comments from the team?

(No audible response.)

MS. FUDA: Okay. Please take notice that the Planning Board of the Town of Schodack will conduct a public hearing on Monday, June 4th, 2018 at 7:15 on the following: Site Plan and Water Quality Special Permit Application.

Scannell Properties - Site Plan and Water Quality. Special Permit Application Location: U.S. Route 9, Zoned: PD-3.

The file is available for review at the Planning Office, Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

Said hearing will be held at the Schodack Town Hall, 265 Schuurman Road, Castleton, New York, at which time all interested parties will be given the opportunity to be heard.

This was also posted on the website and in the hallway here on the official bulletin board.

CHAIRMAN MAYRER: We're going to open the public hearing. A couple of ground rules. All comments are to be made to the Board. Questions that have to be directed to the applicant are still made to the Board and the applicant will be permitted to answer. So you will face the Board and you will direct your comments to the Board. Please remain respectful to everyone's comments, pros or cons. Everyone is entitled to their opinion. So please, as emotionally charged as this topic can be, I am requesting that you remain respectful to everyone's opinion. We will stay here until everyone is heard and as long as it takes. So however long it takes, it takes. Additionally, there's a stenographer here this evening to get your comments accurately. There's so much going on that we felt as though a stenographer, we would benefit from that.

So I see someone walking up that I think wants to be first.

MR. PRIVITERA: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Members of the Board, thank you for the

opportunity to be heard tonight. My name is John Privitera. I am a partner in the McNamee Lochner law firm in Albany and I represent a Neighborhood Association tonight with respect to this project called Birchwood Association. I have a letter that summarizes my comments. (Handing to the Board)

CHAIRMAN MAYRER: Thank you.

MR. PRIVITERA: And I'll be brief in reviewing them to give the people of the town an opportunity to speak.

Our position is that as a matter of law, you're required to develop an Environmental Impact Statement before making a decision on this project. That's required by New York Law and specifically, it's required by the regulations that support SEQRA, which state that an

Environmental Impact Statement is required when there's a physical alteration of more than 10 acres, when there's parking for more than a thousand vehicles; and this is particularly important because it's a scale issue, when a town having a population of 150,000 persons or less where a facility of more than a hundred thousand

square feet of gross floor area is proposed.

There's never been a case where three regulatory demands are met and an EIS is not done. The most important, I think, is the scale because the proposed project is more than a thousand

percent above the minimum threshold for an EIS. That's based on the ratio of development to population.

We think an EIS would help this town and help the Board, help the many engineers on the Board who understand what an EIS is and know how much thought is required before approving a project of this size.

One of the things an EIS does is it looks at the tax impact of a project, the socioeconomic impact. You can't really go ahead with this

project without knowing the socioeconomic impact of the project.

And also, it must explore the growth-induced aspects of the project. That's one of the most important things under SEQRA for a project of this size. It's going to impact schools. There's going to be collateral development. People are going to move into town to get closer to their

jobs. All of these things can be studied and have to be the subject of an EIS.

It's an ever-changing project, as we've learned tonight. An EIS requires that everything be put in one place and subject to a public hearing that is very specific comment on that.

It also gives the public an opportunity to study everything once the dust settles and the project sponsor knows exactly what they're doing to see if another hydrogeologist has a different opinion, a traffic engineer has another view that might make the project better and so forth.

So that's our request tonight, that you please do this, issue a Positive Declaration, and await the preparation of an EIS. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MAYRER: Thank you very much. Okay. Who's next?

BARBARA SPINK: I'm reading this letter for both me and my husband who have signed it. We are disappointed, to say the least, with the speed with which this mega warehouse proposal is progressing. Contrast that with the glacial progress of the new town zoning codes which we have been hearing about now for over four years.

At this point in time, we could be having a public hearing on the new zoning codes but, instead, we are having one on a project that will alter the future of Schodack forever and affect the lives of everyone in this town.

It is irresponsible of this Board to allow this project to go forward without a full environmental review as dictated by the size and scope of a project that has a footprint of about 20 football fields.

There is a profound conflict of interest to accept the developer's environmental review which contains many blanks and misstatements. For

example, the projected number of semitrailer truck trips per day are to be determined, page 7.

We have also heard from the developer's engineer that the project could be expanded in the future. How many truck trips per day then? Any traffic study without this critical information is seriously flawed.

The ERA also states on page 20, quote, "The sales distribution center will not significantly alter the character of the community as the 9/20 corridor is principally commercial use."

We have a double standard here in that the developers are only looking at a very small area in the environmental review but then look at all of 9/20 corridor to determine the community character.

Last we looked, the area in question is predominantly residential as the site just happens to sit right between two neighborhoods. Route 9 up to Maple Hill Road is predominantly residential and beyond that, quite a few residential areas as well.

Commercial development in this area includes such things as Dirty Bird Antiques, Samson's

Restaurant and Peppinos Kitchen. A major house of worship is just across the street. It is also outrageous that, again, we have a public hearing on a project where the buyer has been unknown for weeks and, more importantly, the products being shipped and housed is a secret. At least with Project Red, we knew it was food related.

How can this Board assess the ability of Schodack Valley Fire Department to manage and control a fire in this facility? A fire right next to Birchwood and Hillcrest is frightening at

best and will be heartbreaking at worst. And what about the effects of these products on the aquifer?

We are told that the Board is also in total ignorance of who the buyer is. It is surprising how easily the Board has accepted this cloud of secrecy and has asked no questions as to why the identity of the buyer is secret. No excuses or explanations for the secrecy have been offered. It is not okay for the identity to be revealed five minutes prior to approval as was done for Project Red. The public had no chance to respond to that knowledge and we should have known the buyer's identity prior to this public hearing.

If this is the way that the Planning Board conducts business and if this is the new normal, then we seriously fear for the future of the Town of Schodack.

Your job is to protect the interests of residents in the town, not the interests of Rensselaer County and state power brokers and party insiders, rich corporations and greedy developers who have no concern for the residents of Schodack.

CHAIRMAN MAYRER: Going forward, can we make sure that you announce your name? Because the stenographer isn't familiar with everyone here in Schodack. So just make sure you announce your name and where you reside so that the stenographer can get it and put it in the minutes.

MR. HABERMEL: My name is John Habermel. I'm at 52 Graw Road. And thank you for having us here tonight. I echo her thoughts completely and I'm sick with the development. A. Duie Pyle is expanding, you know, right down my street and I get told that, "well, get used to it" from a

member of the Planning Board when I called up this week. That's unacceptable to me. Because I want to spend my Saturday morning with my windows open, I have to listen to Jake brakes and idling down? That's unacceptable.

I come here just tonight and there's 10 A. Duie Pyle trucks, I counted 10 trucks just on Route 20 to here. How much more are we going to have with this development? And again, I echo the thoughts of the previous commentator. Thank you.

MR. NEIMAN: My name is Herb Neiman. I've been a resident in Schodack since '79. I own 1930

Route 9. And probably the easiest is I have a short statement and it's a petition that says, "We, the undersigned residents/town businesspeople, wish to express our enthusiastic support for this project. Specific benefits would include hundreds of new jobs, a significant increase to the local property tax base, significant new income for the local school district, property tax relief for property owners and the beginning of the installation of sewer, water and natural gas along a portion of U.S. Route 9."

I have 71 residents and property owners who signed this and I provided it to Nadine, but subsequently, I picked up another five. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MAYRER: Thank you.

MS. MILLER: My name is Cindy Miller. I live on Route 9 next to the proposed warehouse. I have many, many concerns surrounding this warehouse project from the lack of tenant information, environmental and sound impact, increase in traffic, lack of consideration to all of the neighbors affected, et cetera.

Through the whole process before tonight, Scannell Properties keeps telling us there is no tenant, although I've heard rumors that Dollar Tree is once again trying to build.

So why are we letting a million square foot building be built and why are we even entertaining this proposal without a tenant? How can you do a sound impact study without knowing what type of business will be going there? Do we want to push the proposal through when we are being treated like we are stupid?

I'm very disappointed that the Planning Board has not pushed more for tenant information. What I don't understand is why we are letting an out-of-state company dictate how we will live. I do not see Scannell Properties offering to put this in their background. I have yet to see

anyone come to my property or my neighbors to see how our lives will be affected. I invite any of you here tonight to visit my neighbors or myself just to see how the quality of life will be affected.

Then, I recommend that you also go sit down at Pilot and see what type of truck traffic will

be introduced to the area. How many trucks will drive down the median to turn left into this facility?

I see trucks all the time when I'm at Pilot driving down the median. How many trucks will end up lined up in the median blocking my driveway? Trust me, if that happens, I will call Schodack Police every time I can't pull into or out of my driveway.

Maybe to control the traffic, all trucks should be limited to Exit 11 if they are going I-90 West or Exit 11E if they are going I-90 East, make it a right turn only into the warehouse and a left turn only out.

I have to turn left into my driveway. Do you know how many times I've almost been hit by cars driving in the median to turn into Samson's? Now, I have to worry about getting rear ended by a trucker.

Yes, we all know Route 9 is zoned commercial, but you seem to forget it's also residential. We are the ones that have been here the longest, pay school and property taxes, and support the local businesses. Maybe members of the Planning Board

need to consider putting this in their yard.

I have read the first couple of pages of the application, which is over 700 pages, submitted by Scannell and found two extremely inaccurate statements, the biggest one being the school district.

They're not in the Schodack School District, they're in East Greenbush. Schodack is half a mile down to the south. Thus, no money for Schodack schools, no decrease in your school tax rates.

Public transportation does not run on Route 9. It either ends at Route 150 or goes out Route 20. Who wants to get off the CDTA bus and walk half a mile on a major road with truck traffic? Will CDTA be rerouted with a special turnaround just for them?

The noise study that Scannell submitted said there would be no increase in any noise. But according to the application, there's going to be increase in noise from the construction. I want to know where and when the sound study was done. Did they sit down at Pilot and say, "Yep, that's the sound it's going to be, it's not going to be

any higher than that, we're good"?

You've never been to my house and it's very quiet at night. I invite you to come and sit in my yard one night. It sounds to me like they are thinking "You won't hear it in my yard in Indiana." How many more inaccurate statements are also in the 700-page application?

I've also read the Comprehensive Plan on the Town of Schodack website, and on page 11, Guiding Principle 4, it states: "Encourage and target business growth to build a strong tax base for public services and to provide appropriate retail and service businesses for Town residents."

I don't see what type of retail or service a million square foot warehouse will bring to the town. We already established that the school taxes will not go to Schodack.

Also, in the same plan, page 8, Principle 2, it states: "Promote quality of life assets in the Town which are consistent with the rural nature of the Town and which maximize use of its natural resource features, assets and history."

My quality of life includes trees lining the property, animals roaming freely in the field and

minimal noise that's heard presently, not diesel trucks, air brakes, light blazing 24/7, pallet trucks unloading and loading trucks, trucks hooking up and unhooking trailers.

To minimize these effects, they want to build a wall. I didn't just invest 15 years to look at a wall. Anyone else think my quality of life isn't affected?

There has also been talk of a traffic signal being installed at the entrance. So now we will interrupt the flow of traffic to give an empty warehouse the right-of-way to pull out on Route 9. How many people will run the red light on Route 9 and how many will have to slam on their brakes for a trucker pulling out for the red light? If this warehouse gets a light, then I want one at the end of my driveway, too. I currently have to sit two to three minutes every morning if I don't get out of the house before 7:00 a.m. for traffic to clear before I can pull out.

There is also a suggestion of a right merge lane for those trucks turning right out of the warehouse. So now you're not only taking part of my property but I will also have to sit even

longer and cross three lanes trying to pull out
or pull into my driveway.

I do not see Hannaford, Duie Pyle or Pilot
with a traffic light or merge lane, so why is this
warehouse so special?

It has been stated at previous meetings the
only ones making out on this deal are Scannell
Properties and the landowners selling their
property. If this warehouse does go through and I
am forced to move, who's going to buy my house?

I sure hope the Town of Schodack has extra
money, because they will be the ones buying my
house for the reason I won't be able to sell it.
I will also promise you if I do move, it will be
out of town completely. My tax dollars will be
taken elsewhere.

MR. BRUNNER: Adam Brunner, Julianne Drive.

I'll speak directly about the traffic even
though I find many issues with this project. Both
traffic and safety issues remain a major concern
that must be addressed by this Board.
Construction vehicles required to excavate and
build this warehouse alone would cause tremendous
traffic concerns.

When safety is compromised, it is a responsibility of this Board to ensure the safety of its residents. It is upsetting to hear that our Town Supervisor believes that we should hire our own professionals to assess the risk of this type of facility.

Countless hours have been spent researching the failing of the Town to ensure residents have accurate information. A big misconception people have about this warehouse is they will receive tax relief. This is a myth and the Town still has not been forthcoming on exactly what the benefits will be. The increased and unsafe traffic volumes will be the most impactful thing people will notice immediately if a warehouse like this goes in, which brings me to the traffic analysis performed by Scannell indicating zero pedestrians.

You all need to take a closer look and drive by various times and you will see that we have consistent walkers on this road and a young man in our neighborhood who walks daily to and from work. So I'm not sure how this study indicated zero.

In addition, you will also notice that tractor trailers currently park in front of gas

stations and Dunkin Donuts which doesn't allow people to see when pulling out. Another major concern. This factor could potentially increase by 30 trucks per hour. Add snow, mass transit buses and school buses, which were excluded from the study, and results will be dramatically different.

This facility is in East Greenbush School District, yet, the district has not been notified on how it will affect bus routes and time delays. This entire project has been thrown together at best and requires a full impact study. The Planning Board has a moral responsibility to the taxpaying residents of this town to ensure our safety. The safety concerns regarding traffic patterns with a facility this large requires a full traffic impact study. Making no changes to the road infrastructure as recommended by Scannell is wrong.

Since we were told that we needed to hire our own professionals and do our own research, I have created a simple diagram that I will hand in of major intersections of concern that I believe require further review to ensure the safety of

everyone.

Birchwood Estates' only exit is via Richwood Drive onto Route 9. If approximately 400 employee vehicles per warehouse shift with 24/7 operation were added to our area without major road redesigns, traffic accidents and deaths may occur. Trying to safely turn left out of Richwood Drive onto Route 9 heading northbound during one of the employee's start or end shifts in addition to the 30 tractor trailers per hour would be virtually impossible and extremely unsafe.

There is a blind turn after the 9 and 20 split heading south on Route 9 where vehicles are up to full speed at 55 miles an hour or more. At the last Planning Board meeting, there was a

discussion from a Board member about the direction of trucks coming from South Schodack from Exit 12 and turning in but no mention of Exit 11.

Again, who is looking out for all of us? No resident in any town should have to endure the anguish from being steamrolled by town officials, some who have been on boards far too long and continue to make the same mistakes.

Until a full traffic study is completed and

is satisfactory to the public, the Town needs to slow down before it is too late and irreversible damage has been created. The Town Planning Board has dragged its feet on defined zoning laws which is why we are in this situation.

As detailed above, there are still unanswered questions leaving people to ask: What else is missing or inaccurate?

MS. LAMBERT: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Shauna Lambert. In 1976, I moved to my current address on Van Hoesen Road. At that time, there was an establishment over on Route 9; it was called Bee's Truck Stop. How quaint, I thought. Not once did it occur to me that 42 years later, we would not have expanded our vision for this town beyond that initial image.

I would love to see Schodack grow and prosper, but I don't think a project that might add air, noise, light or water pollution or one that brings heavy commercial traffic would be either appropriate or beneficial.

With respect to the people presenting this proposal and with my gratitude to all of the truck

drivers on whom I depend for countless things, I would still ask: Do we really want our town to become nothing more than a glorified truck stop?

MS. WILLIAMS: Good evening. Jennifer Williams. 1666 Julianne Drive. I'm back again. I got a lot to say. So if you need a Dunkin

Donuts run, I'll run afterwards for you.

Also, if I could, through the Planning Board to McFarland Johnson, I am that property owner that complained to him. So I appreciate that they listened and I hope their ears are cleaned of wax today, because I got a lot to say again. But I appreciate that you listened and that you responded, but I got a lot more homework for you to do.

Good evening. I would like to address the Town of Schodack Planning Board as well as the mysterious applicant on the Scannell Properties with the following comments, concerns and suggestions that need to be addressed prior to the approval and Positive or Negative Declaration determined by the Planning Board.

Number one. There's a lot of them. From the previous Planning Board meeting, the following

concerns have been brought to you by residents and have yet to be addressed by the developer as well as the Planning Board:

A. The fire department capacity to service such a building.

B. The town sewer and water capacity, hookup and infrastructure cost to those belonging to the water and sewer district.

C. The proof of which that the applicant will not apply for a PILOT like Hannaford and the numbers to show stabilization of the tax base.

D. The environmental impacts on the aquifer.

The status of the aquifer as well as the holes in the proposal submitted to the Planning Board.

And the traffic modifications, the traffic study modifications, made to DOT with no documentation by the applicant to modify their traffic study after such changes were made.

And lastly, investigation of comparable towns zoning laws. Let's dig a little bit deeper upon each of these valid points.

Does the Town of Schodack have the capacity with fire and police currently to maintain the

safety of the Town without additional services?

If there are additional services needed, are those going to be included in the Town's current budget or will taxpayers then see an increase to pay for additional trucks, cars or employment needs?

So you may provide stabilization for my property taxes, but that does not mean that my police and fire department taxes won't go up to support those.

With a one million square foot building that's forty-five feet tall and one thousand two hundred employees or more, how can the current emergency services accommodate in case of fire, evacuation or hazmat? Do current police and fire have up-to-date training for a building this size?

We don't even know what's going to be stored in the facility to be properly prepared. Are they equipped to provide medical assistance to their own employees as we rely on a volunteer ambulance service that could definitely not manage a major event with so many employees.

Is the Town of East Greenbush aware that the proposal is asking to connect to their sewer

lines? I know what the answer is; they don't.

If the Town of Schodack and the Town of East Greenbush both approve this sewer line, is there a study that will look at other businesses down Route 9 that will likely buy property for sale and also want hook-up? Long term, how does this

affect our usage limit agreement with the Town of East Greenbush?

If the idea is to expand the tax base along Route 9, how can we do so knowing that we depend on services from another community?

Guideline Number 5 doesn't take into account when developments are dependent upon other services from another town and when the town itself maxes out if you are both developing simultaneously.

In any event, to open the sewer and water district, you'll have to have another public

hearing to notify these residents or businesses. Are you going to explain that although the hookup is at the applicant's expense, years from now, the increase in their bill will be due to the maintenance of the new infrastructure?

As we said at the last Town Board meeting, Dunkin Donuts has already had to replace their

pumps twice. At whose expense? With such a large building and with the further expected development down Route 9, the possibility of fast food chains or other businesses such as was said to capitalize on this monstrosity, who will pay for the maintenance?

Our town employees will be paid to maintenance and replace parts with taxpayer and water and sewer district funds. It is evident that the impact will be great by basically installing a commercially exclusive water and sewer line down Route 9.

I doubt you will offer the surrounding residences a hookup and even if someone's well goes bad, you won't help them. The studies, evidence and long-term effects for the current participants of the water and sewer district as well as those to come have not been addressed, yet would be in an EIS.

Bills will go up even if your tax base is stabilized as proposed. Yet, here we are at a public hearing where a comprehensive proposal is not clear.

The property is in the East Greenbush School

District. Although the Supervisor has suggested that this proposal will help the tax base, are there numbers to prove this statement? If the building applies for a PILOT and based on the Hannaford's PILOT of \$15,000 for 489,000 square feet, how would \$30,000 relieve the tax base for the homeowners of Schodack?

It was discovered that Hannaford only pays \$5,000 in school taxes. This is approximately double of what I pay as a homeowner with significantly less property than one million square feet.

The cost to educate one child in an average New York State school district is at least three times what Hannaford pays. I know, because I'm a schoolteacher and I know how much it costs to educate a kid and \$5,000 doesn't cut it.

The idea that big building equals big money is naive. I am deeply concerned that we are putting all our eggs in one basket and relying on the good faith of a Fortune 500 company. It's almost laughable. It would equalize or even negatively deplete the tax revenue received by surrounding homeowners who cannot apply for large

business tax breaks but will most likely try to grieve their taxes. Furthermore, East Greenbush School District will suffer because of those grievances.

So are you asking residents to approve a sewer connection but then taking away their school tax revenue used to educate students in the district, not in the Town of Schodack?

Another potential impact is employees moving or seeking residence to the Town of Schodack. The 1,077 parking spaces proposed offer approximately 800 jobs as projected by Scannell Properties at the last Planning Board meeting. I doubt 10

percent of our population, 1,200, will be employed at this facility. Yes, that's correct, a Census conducted in 2010 said our population was 12,794. The current employment opportunities will be

roughly slightly below 10 percent of our current population.

Let's think about that. Whether they choose to commute or move, the majority of the jobs

offered will be minimum wage, \$15-an-hour jobs, and there's no way that the majority of the jobs will be filled by the residents of Schodack.

How can a family with one or more parent making minimum wage afford to move here? Wikipedia states that the median income for a household in this town is \$55,176, and the median income for a family is \$63,622. Males have a median income of \$40,090 versus \$31,278 for females.

If the taxes are so high and there aren't low income housing or even large apartment developments, where will they go? Can the Schodack School District afford the influx of children even though they won't be getting the school tax revenue?

All of these considerations would be looked at as part of a growth-induced impact statement. In order to make an educated decision regarding whether our town can handle the effects of this proposal, studies and information need to be

collected and organized. Yet, here we are at a public meeting with no comprehensive plan and outlook to evaluate the needs and benefits to our town.

Would you ever agree to a surgery or a consequential diagnosis from a doctor without a

thorough physical, bloodwork or other tests? A town is a living, breathing body of collective people and needs that require maintenance and quality care. We are here tonight to evaluate and give input as though we are the doctors. A Positive Declaration is necessary to perform cumulative and growth-induced EIS.

As a Planning Board, you are the doctors who have the ability to order the tests from the professionals before a final decision is made.

There are significant environmental considerations to be studied. The amount of erosion in the aquifer this excavation will cause is crucial. Some of the plans show the building and the parking lot within 300 feet of residences. How will the parking lot be graded in order to prevent water not from backing up into peoples' basements and backyards with a torrential downpour?

Snow removal is proposed to happen on site with no specifics. To pile that snow up against residence property borders will result in flooding when temperatures rise. The amount of excavation and grading could result in compromised wells as

some of the residences in Birchwood have their wells border the cornfield property line.

The stormwater facilities proposed do not solve the problem of separating the salt from all the snow that will dissolve in the water that they intend on letting back into the aquifer. Over time, this could have devastating effects on your water supply. We don't have the answers to the questions and water is a finite source in the world. No town municipality should be so quick to put a finite natural resource in jeopardy without evaluating the facts carefully.

Traffic is a major concern for our residents. I'm glad that the applicant took into consideration the difficult entrance and exit into their facility and modified their application to DOT. However, where is that listed in the documents they've submitted based on their traffic study?

Why was there not another traffic study performed with the proposed traffic light and designated right-hand turn? How can you know whether traffic will back up between the 9 and 20 split to the site's entrance without actually

evaluating their changes? Is that good practice?

On a daily basis, I leave my home at the peak hours of commute they are proposing to take my daughter to school and go to work. It's a trick blind spot from the split to Richwood Drive. I've seen close misses and trucks come barreling down the road.

A lower speed limit was suggested by a member of the Planning Board; however, that doesn't

ensure safety. And let's be honest; if you're running five minutes to work, tell me you don't speed up in the last stretch. That's where I'm supposed to make a left-hand turn at the peak of traffic out of the home with my daughter in the back seat. What will it take? A fatal accident for you to hear our concerns?

An objective traffic study with the changes submitted to DOT needs to be studied. Another Planning Board member cited that 9 and 20 was built before I-90 was constructed and can handle the traffic. That's an interesting statement. I've never seen I-90 have an entrance or exit for residential homes or a complete stop and start to an entrance/exit like 9 and 20 does almost every

five feet along the roadway.

You and your predecessors allowed the homes and small businesses to be built on this roadway knowing it was PD-3. I-90 is now in existence and has removed a lot of the traffic that was suggested 9 and 20 has the capacity to hold.

Upon Googling the history of Schodack, because I'm a teacher so I do my research, I

found this fun fact: "The Old Post Road between Troy and New York was doubtless the first improved turnpike running through the Town of Schodack and is said to be one of the oldest public highways in the state. It was originally called Kingsbrut and is believed to be constructed by the English

during the French and Indian war. The road known as the Farmers' turnpike along the river was constructed soon after the war of the Revolution. The Boston and Albany turnpike was laid in the year 1800. These and the other roads were the courses used by the numerous early stage lines which passed through every part of the town."

Are we proposing that Old Post Road could be used as a highway as well? Just because it has the capacity doesn't mean it's good practice to

test its limits. As a teacher, I'm evaluated on best practices. Just because I can do or the curriculum says I can do it doesn't mean it's the best practice for the variety of learners sitting before me each year. I adapt to the needs of my students and never teach the same lesson the same way.

You depend on me to do that as an educator; you trust me with that. I am depending on you to evaluate the traffic on Route 9 the same. Don't we tell children just because you can do something doesn't mean you should? That's the big issue here. You have no follow-up data to ensure the safety of the residents of Schodack as well as the projected 800-plus employees that would begin working at this facility.

On a more personal note, it was brought to my attention that it was said that our homes, Birchwood Association, shouldn't really be there. This comment is offensive and basically implies that we don't belong in Schodack and our input is less than a resident who doesn't live along 9 and 20.

Members of the Planning Board voted to allow

our development to be built and there was an expectation at the time that our development was only the beginning of a much larger housing development. The precedent is set; the houses were built in a PD-3 area that was approved by the Planning Board, the Town of Schodack Planning Board, and we are here regardless of what your opinion may be.

The challenge set before you is to value the balance between the needs of your residents versus the needs of the applicant. Anything else, such as those opinions, are fruitless to problem solve the situation set before you.

Recently, the Town of New Scotland amended their zoning laws and ordinances to deal with this very type of proposal. They created a hamlet and a size cap law to preserve their community and promote growth without becoming a warehouse district on large pieces of property that were formerly farming land.

The amended Zoning Law 2018 Local Law 1 -- I photocopied the first four pages for you just for fun -- states: "The hamlet was developed to encourage mixed use of the hamlet area. It found

that the commercial district was too large for the community and areas of the former commercial

district should be rezoned to encourage the preservation of open space, encourage residential development on smaller lots that would promote a walkable community, links to their rail trail, and the development of a town center with local shops."

It also states: "The law was intended to prevent the development of a commercial zoning district in the hamlet to big box shopping centers."

I've included the first four pages of the new zoning law for your preview. I encourage you to go on the Town of New Scotland's website and

consider this type of zoning for our town. This could be the solution to the never-ending problem and issue of encouraging economic growth without damaging the aquifer and the character of our town.

I know I'm losing your patience and I only have one more paragraph, I promise.

These concerns impact an entire community. You, each one of you right here, have the great

responsibility of responding to these legitimate concerns for this project. Before you pave paradise and put up a parking lot, there is much work to be done by the applicant and the comprehensive proposal after a cumulative EIS is completed.

It is your obligation as a Planning Board to consider this proposal with integrity and adherence to the law as it is your lasting legacy of the Town of Schodack. A famous quote: "Your deeds are your monuments." You know that new movie Wonder with the little boy? It totally came from there. It's a great movie. It's a precept saying that what you do in life is what people remember you by.

As a Planning Board, this proposal will be your monument. Are you confident and prepared to make a 45-foot tall monument that could

potentially cause irreversible effects to our water, roadways and economic growth without the proper facts to back up your decision?

If there are doubts or you are left with questions for all involved, then I urge you to do what's necessary to accurately evaluate this

proposal with a Positive Declaration followed by
a cumulative and growth-induced impact statement.

Addressing these concerns and following the
prescriptive law provided for these types of

proposals will benefit everyone regardless of the
final decision made.

I thank you for your time and listening to my
long-winded statement. I appreciate the public
service you've committed yourself to as the Town's
Planning Board and I hope that you, too,
appreciate my thoughts as a resident of Schodack
who hopes to be here my whole lifetime.

MS. BRUNNER: Marci Brunner, Julianne Drive.

I would like to bring to your attention that
this public hearing is not listed on the Schodack
website under the public notices where I would
have expected to see it. A few neighbors received
mailed letters around May 26, although we also
live in Birchwood but we did not receive.

I would recommend the Planning Board evaluate
the process for notification and bring all public
meetings to the forefront of the website and send
notifications to all affected people more than a
week in advance.

I would also like to point out that I requested that all the documents regarding this proposal be placed on the website by contacting a Town Board member on April 14th and then again followed up at a Town Board meeting on May 10th.

I am glad to see that this has finally been done, but it would be beneficial if the

information were organized in a chronological order and labeled so that residents could easily identify what they're looking for.

Also, for future projects or updates, I would encourage the Planning Board to take a more proactive approach prior to residents having to request this information.

Over five years ago, Birchwood Estates presented to the Town for consideration a petition signed by nearly 94 percent of residents in the development requesting a change in zoning.

In case you've forgotten, we asked that an amendment be added to the local zoning laws for our neighborhood to be changed from PD-3 to residential.

Residents deserve an update on this request as we have been waiting much longer than the

application in front of you this evening and can't help but wonder why residents of Schodack who have paid taxes in these developments for years aren't entitled to a timely response.

The dragging on of these new zoning changes continues to plague this community. And who is in charge? The Town Board points to the Planning Board and the Planning Board points to the Town Board. Wouldn't it make sense if we could all come together and make this a priority?

This evening, we are here regarding the Site Plan and Water Quality Special Permit application for Scannell Properties for a one million square foot building directly next to residential neighborhoods.

I would like to bring to your attention that on April 6th, 2018, on the Facebook page of Mr. Harris, Supervisor Harris, he stated that "Any project, especially one of this size, will present challenges and concerns that will need to be

addressed and taken into consideration by the members of the Planning Board before any approval is made."

It is important to note that due to the

ambiguous zoning in this town and that we have never been able to get a clear definition of a sales distribution center, we are again left in the dark to what constitutes proper use when a project changes itself from being called a warehouse to a sales distribution center.

If the special permit before you this evening should be granted to the applicant for the specified use, which again is in direct conflict from the Supervisor's April 6th statement, you are required to review the considerations set forth in the Code at 219-71. The addition of a regional warehouse or distribution center alongside an established neighborhood is exactly the type of disruption that the Comprehensive Plan was enacted to avoid.

In addition, there are many potential large impacts that must be reviewed under SEQRA. Traffic remains a major safety concern for all. A full study is necessary and not one that ends at Maple Hill Road as was recently presented.

The Birchwood development has no other exit. What happens if there is an emergency? A few questions that we need answers on for all

residents here tonight and for everybody to fully understand is, one, tax relief. Will this provide tax relief to residents? Our taxes have never decreased; instead, climbed over the years.

Weren't we promised tax relief with Hannaford and also the Pilot gas station?

When Supervisor Harris was asked this question, he stated taxes will stabilize, not decrease.

Water and sewer benefits. We now know that if the Town Board approves an extension to include new properties within existing water and sewer districts, those new properties will be

responsible for a proportionate share of any annual debt service repayment, capital charges, within the district regardless of connection.

Upon connection to the public water/sewer system, those properties would also be responsible for operation and maintenance charges as approved by the Town Board.

Jobs. We've heard a lot of numbers about varying jobs for this proposal. Do we know how many are actually seasonal, temporary or if the number is even accurate? How could we when we

don't know what this building is?

Is it a fulfillment center as some of us have heard? Will drones be used and replace these promised jobs? And how can the current

infrastructure, police, fire and emergency, in place handle a facility of this magnitude?

We all want and we all need to know: What are the benefits to Schodack? These are the types of questions and answers that should be provided prior to holding a public meeting so people can make informed decisions on what is best for all of us. Thank you.

MR. JANSING: Bob Jansing, 6 Star Terrace.

I encourage everyone to take a look at the Schodack Town website and on the website, you will see the following description of Schodack: Buffalos in a field. Sunflowers. People gathering. Flowers on a fence. Creek through the woods.

I assume this is done to attract Schodack for people who might want to move upstate or anywhere. If this project is allowed, ethically, you're required to include a picture of this monstrosity on your website. There could be no other reason

not to have it.

Anyone looking to relocate to Schodack had better not take Exit 11E or 21B, because what they will see is this monstrosity. If you have not seen a million square foot facility, I have. Route 81, Interstate 81 in Pennsylvania. You drive past that going south.

Someone asked me: Why didn't you take a picture of it? And I said, "I didn't have a helicopter, because I was not able to take a picture of it."

I am a retired faculty member of the State University of New York where I taught an ethics class for many years. And while I appreciate Scannell Properties' presentation, using their noise and traffic study as a basis for your decision is a classic case of conflict of interest.

If I was still teaching, I would use this in my class as a classic case of conflict of interest.

I was away for several months and when I came back, I was really taken with the word of my neighbors that the Town Supervisor required

police presence at a town meeting and that we should hire professionals to take care of our problems. I thought that was the Town's job to look after us. I'm speaking for myself here. The fast-tracking of this project, the condescending attitude of the Supervisor, the police presence at meetings suggests this is already a done deal; again, I'm speaking for myself, and nothing that can be done as a Planning Board or as concerned citizens matter.

In the ethics class, we discuss when an ethics situation comes about, you look at risk/benefit and, in this case, I urge you to look at risk/benefit; risk to the community and benefit, and I think the answer is clear.

This is your legacy, okay. In coming years, if this project is approved, you can drive by this monstrosity and point out to your loved ones, mom, dad, significant others, children, this is what I accomplished.

We're not opposed to sensible development. That's been a myth that's been pushed forward by a number of people. We want sensible development. This is not it. Again, this will be your legacy.

Thank you.

MS. WILSEY: I'm Michelle Wilsey. I've lived in Schodack since probably about '86. I lived in the Birchwood Estates area that borders right along there and I've since moved out. I'm at Bellwood Lane now. So I'm still in Schodack. But I'm not in Schodack because we've made wise decisions.

My question to you folks would be: Why? Why are we standing here today? Why have we not done a better job?

That property we are talking about, that cornfield, that was owned by Nick Wood who developed our neighborhood there. He wanted to put residential homes in there where they're

looking to put this warehouse in, but we didn't allow it because we wanted the infrastructure built first because it wouldn't be right if we didn't have all of the infrastructure in place to put all these homes in there.

And here we stand how many years later? That was in, what? The late '70s, early '80s? And now we stand here looking at a picture of this?

I mean, I'm all for development here. I'm

all for increasing the tax base and decreasing my taxes. And I think everybody, no matter what side you're on, you're for that. But I would encourage you guys to just think: Why? Why? Why can't we let somebody on the outside look at this project and say, "Does that make sense?"

Are we really going to get a tax benefit.

I doubt it. When I looked into Project Red -- I haven't read the 700 pages of this document. I'll tell you I was the first one, I don't know the acronyms any longer, but when I was looking into Project Red and all those other ones, I knew the acronyms, I knew what we needed to do. Why are we moving so fast with this project? Why, I would ask you.

In these 700 pages -- have each of you read the 700 pages? Do you know what you're going to be agreeing to? Probably not, because you don't have the time and I understand that. There's no time for it.

But allow an outside agency to do an independent review to make sure we're actually getting the things that they're promising you that we're going to get. I would have to encourage you

to answer Birchwood Estates on that rezoning. Why have we not? Why have we taken our time on that but sped through this process? There's something not right.

And like Bob said, ethically, I would challenge you. Is there something going on here? Are we doing something different with this project than we do for our own town residents? That concerns me. That concerns me a lot.

Think about what you're doing and read that document. If you're not going to have an outside person, an outside evaluation, read that document. Look at all the inconsistencies they're talking about.

Adam spoke about no pedestrians. You know how many times I almost got hit by somebody jogging on Route 9 and we're going to add some more trucks to it?

Just at least let somebody independent of the developer do these tests, do these studies.

That's all I'm asking. I'm all for increasing my tax base. You look me up; my taxes aren't cheap. I see people, the body language here, you don't really want to listen but you really need to

listen, because people are going to move out of this town.

We've not made good decisions. I've stayed here because of community members, not because we're smart when it comes to development. It's really bad. Thank you.

MR. WENTWORTH: Good evening. My name is Carl Wentworth and I am appearing as a member and Chair of the Board of Commissioners of the Schodack Valley Fire District.

This proposed warehouse is sited wholly within the Schodack Valley Fire District. The district has been contacted by two firms, Camoin Associates and McFarland Johnson, both contracted directly or indirectly by the project's developer.

Camoin seeks information on topics ranging, among others, from the district's budget to its staffing and equipment to the impact on our equipment.

McFarland Johnson, as part of their SEQRA process, seeks information regarding Schodack Valley Fire District's ability to provide emergency services to the facility and a sign-off

that the district can and will do so.

Both of these firms could not or would not provide any information to the district on the contents of this warehouse. Faced with a facility whose size is without precedent in the fire district and with unknown contents, the Board sought and received legal counsel from the district's attorney.

Our attorney has advised that while the district is obligated to provide fire protection to the best of its ability given existing apparatus, equipment and personnel, it is not obligated to acquire additional resources to do so.

Along with our attorney, we believe the size of the building will impact apparatus needs. Without knowing the building contents, it is purely speculation whether the district can effectively provide fire protection.

We have been in contact with the National Fire Protection Association, the NFPA, to clarify standards pertaining to fire department operations and responses to this type of structure. Although we are awaiting additional information, one such

standard cited the probable need for aerial ladder apparatus.

The Schodack Valley Fire District does not house such apparatus. The nearest aerial ladder is two districts away. Our attorney has advised that under mutual aid agreements, it is not contemplated that such district is going to be constantly supplying such apparatus.

The impact on firefighters and taxpayers in another fire district in another town will be felt. Based upon the general number of employees and the traffic trips generated by that number of employees, along with truck traffic entering and exiting off Route 9 and making their way to and from I-90, motor vehicle accidents will occur necessitating additional fire department responses likely outnumbering responses to the warehouse facility itself.

It is our reasonable expectation that the building and related responses will result in wear and tear on our existing apparatus and additional operating expenses to the district. Mutual aid responses from other districts will result in the same, if not greater to them.

The Schodack Valley Fire District should not be placing our residents and taxpayers in a position in which they will shoulder any additional costs associated with this project. We cannot emphasize enough the potential impact this warehouse will likely have on our already limited number of volunteer firefighters.

Any use of apparatus and firefighters from other districts will only serve to stress those already limited sources, especially their personnel. Volunteer firefighters are deeply dedicated, highly trained and love what they do but they are family first. Existing call volumes, hours of mandated training, together with apparatus and equipment upkeep, will simply stretch them thinner.

It is unlikely that the Schodack Valley Fire District will sign off in a positive manner on this project.

Finally, I will point out that during a Planning Board meeting regarding one of the last two warehouses proposed in the Schodack Valley District, a developer or representative of stated that, and I paraphrase, "The fire department is

okay with the project." That was absolutely false.

This fire district was never asked for input on either of those projects. Thank you.

MS. SANFORD: Good evening. My name is Lauren Sanford and I reside at 1668 Julianne Drive. I moved to Schodack just over two years ago as there were many appealing characteristics in the neighborhood that influenced my decision to purchase my home. I love the peaceful setting, the beautiful view of the trees and wildlife that currently surround my home and the convenience of living 10 to 15 minutes from my employer, my family and the grocery store.

I grew up in the City of Rensselaer and there are many reasons I enjoy living close-by. When I heard about this treacherous project that you will be voting on tonight, I was devastated. Putting in this massive sales distribution center will defeat the purpose behind choosing my home. I work at Regeneron Pharmaceuticals and my commute from Schenectady where my husband and I first purchased our first home was beginning to take a toll on me.

I wanted to move closer to work and to my family, so I could spend less time driving and more time enjoying life. I enjoy my 12-minute ride home every day without the hassle of the highway and traffic. By adding an additional one thousand to twelve hundred cars to the mix, that joy will soon diminish.

This sales distribution center would basically go right in my backyard. Let me ask you how you would feel if you had to listen to tractor trailers loading and unloading throughout the night 200 feet from your bedroom window. I have a feeling that you would not be welcoming to this unwanted noise, not to mention the bright lights and air pollution from the large number of trucks.

Have you also considered what this will do to the crime rate? Adding 1,200 employees increases the chances of potentially dangerous people in our neighborhood. Right now, I feel safe. Is this something that you desire to take away from me?

A few weeks ago, my husband came home to find a stake used for the photos the land surveyors were taking right next to one of my favorite

trees. Nobody asked me if they could walk on my

property when I was at work trying to support myself and pay for the home I have worked so hard to purchase.

This has already given me a sense of violation and this will only get worse if I must stare at a one million square foot sales distribution center. There are several safety factors to consider that will have substantial impact on the community if the Planning Board decides to vote in favor of this project. Our local fire department does not have the resources necessary in the event of a fire. This would put many lives at risk in addition to the surrounding structures should the fire spread.

Additional resources would include the need for a larger number of law enforcement representatives. How do you plan on covering the cost of these additional resources? I would

assume that this would be left in the hands of the taxpayers. This is not something I support and I am willing to bet the residents of Schodack are not in favor.

What are the benefits of this project? The only people that would benefit are the individuals

selling the property, the newly identified Fortune 500 company and those individuals that are receiving a kickback to push the decision through. If you think we need more jobs in this area, you are sorely mistaken. The unemployment rate in Rensselaer is less than five percent. There are multiple companies that are actively hiring right now. Garelick Farms, Regeneron, FedEx and Dunkin Donuts are just a few examples. There are many opportunities for employment in this area. So why not use the resources that already exist?

It is my understanding that the Birchwood Association has been referred to as "the mob" by members of the Schodack Planning Board. Isn't it your job to do what is best for our community? How about approaching this project with an open mind and thinking about the Birchwood Association as a group of concerned neighbors banding together to protect the community that we love for what it is, peaceful and friendly.

Please deny the request to put this massive sales distribution center in my backyard so that I may enjoy the peaceful silence and serene view. Please do what is right for our town and ask

Scannell Properties to consider a different location.

I ask that when making your decision tonight that you please consider the negative impact that this project will have on our community. Think about the safety concerns, the environmental

concerns, and the fact that Schodack will be forever changed. Thank you for your time and I hope you can find it in your hearts to do what is right for Schodack.

MR. PHILLIPS: Good evening. Jameson Phillips from Silver Bridge Road. I'm a resident here probably six, seven years now and I hear everyone's concerns and I think there's pros and cons to every project to consider.

You know, I've heard people mention New Scotland. I'm familiar with that project. That is on a two-lane road and I can understand why, you know, the residents in that community didn't want a Big Box store in their town. I mean, it was a two-lane road.

This location here is on, you know, a five-lane major highway, you know, 55 miles an hour. To me, I didn't grow up in this town, but

when you go and drive down the road, it screams to me that it's a commercial industrial corridor. It's not a residential community of pulling on and off, by any means. Yes, there are houses there that are grandfathered in or that have been there but, you know, if it's a PD-3 community or PD-3 zoning, then you know, it's deemed for that kind of development.

You know, I understand peoples' concerns of the aquifer. You know, I would wonder that the farm fields that have been there and that have been taken -- you know, used for crop, you know, the fertilizers that they've put down over the years and how that's impacted the peoples' wells around them, I haven't heard anyone voice concerns about that, about how that has impacted their, you know, community there.

You know, I think, like I said earlier, there's pros and cons to every project and to me, this project has a lot of pros to it. You know, I like the idea of increased job growth. We lost a Burger King. That couldn't even stay in business in town. We've lost a lot of other things.

There's not restaurants, there's not a lot there.

If you ask me, when I first moved here, it probably, you know, wouldn't be my first choice, you know, but I enjoy the town and the community and I'm happy that I live here now.

But to me, the pros outweigh the cons in this situation and that's it. Thank you.

MS. ROSS: My name is Laura Lee Ross and I moved here about 15 years ago from New York City because I wanted to come to a rural town and have a peaceful existence. And I'd like to ask the Board: Have you heard of the opioid epidemic? I'd like to ask all of you, have you heard of the opioid --

CHAIRMAN MAYRER: Excuse me.

MS. ROSS: -- epidemic? All right. I'm just asking: Have you heard of it?

CHAIRMAN MAYRER: Can you approach the bench for a second?

(Pause in the proceedings.)

CHAIRMAN MAYRER: Okay. Go ahead.

MS. ROSS: I would just like to say that I'm now working with 18 young women in a rehab in South Albany and I'd like to say that they come from every class and every community.

And I also think that they have given me a lot of information that maybe other people don't have privy to and that is that truckers and prostitution go hand in hand, and drugs and prostitution go hand in hand.

And how do you think the opioids go from the Canadian border or from Florida across the country? They go by plane, they go in cars, they go on trains, and they go in trucks. There can be 99 wonderful truckers who live very clean, family lives. There just needs to be one who opens up his hubcaps and fills it with Fentanyl and brings it into our community. It is very hard to get rid of that once it starts.

And I am not advocating that these young women are doing the right thing, but I also know that they come from homes just like the homes in Schodack. They are not all from poor communities. They are not all terrible young women. It breaks my heart to see what they have done because they've become addicted to drugs and they do

things in South Albany and in areas that are industrial warehouse areas late at night that I do not want anywhere near this community that I have

grown to love. Thank you.

MS. FRIEBERG: My name is Mary Ellen Frieberg. I live on Schodack Valley Road, Route 150, and I urge you to reject the plans for the sales distribution center proposed for Route 9 by Scannell Properties.

The massive size of the project is not consistent with the intent of PD-3 zoning designated for this part of the town and will negatively impact not only nearby neighbors but other residents of the town as well.

We enjoy living in Schodack because of the quiet beauty of the natural world. Allowing the construction of a huge distribution center with the resulting noise and traffic impact is not part of that picture, is not consistent with promises made by the current Town Supervisor and could damage the reputation of the town.

Schodack government leaders should be engaged in bringing in new medium and small businesses that will actually help town residents, such as retail stores and professional services.

The Environmental Assessment report states that 70 percent of all traffic from the

distribution center and nearly all of the truck traffic will head north on Route 9 to reach I-90 Exit 11. Total daily vehicle trips are estimated at over 2,000. That will mean a huge increase in traffic passing through the intersection of Routes 9 and 20 with Route 150 every day.

That intersection has been the site of numerous accidents over the years, including a serious accident several weeks ago between a tractor trailer and a car. Both the volume of additional traffic and the likelihood of more accidents are serious concerns.

Furthermore, the Board should factor in the traffic expected from the nearby Valente property under development on Route 150 just off Routes 9 and 20, which will include another sales distribution center.

Please do the right thing and put the residents of Schodack first, not giant corporations which buy their way in at the expense of your citizens.

KENDRA: Good evening. My name is Kendra. I live at 65 Thompson Hill Road and I stand before you tonight in support of the project with

personal experience to living behind one of these types of distribution facilities.

Tompson Hill, my home is directly across from the FedEx facility in East Greenbush. When this project was initially being proposed, the residents of Tompson Hill did have some of the similar concerns to the residents in Julianne Drive being light pollution, traffic, noise, all of the above.

Having lived there for several years now with the FedEx facility in my backyard, I have had no issues with light coming into my bedroom windows. I sit outside on my patio, have a lovely evening, see the stars. There's no concerns with that. I have to say that Scannell Properties is Class A all the way.

They maintain their facilities with good landscaping and you drive around some of our neighborhoods and there's likely more than one home that either has overgrown landscaping, they're using their front yards as junkyards or they're vacant and abandoned. I have to say those properties are the ones that are really devaluing our homes, not a Scannell Property or property

like that, who really makes the investment to maintain their properties.

Additionally, I think it's undeniable that this project will create economic growth. It's somewhat depressing to drive 9 and 20 and Route 9 and see all the vacant retail and commercial space along the main corridor, but these spaces can't be filled without the population, without the consumer there, which this project will provide. I, 27 years old, want to stay in East Greenbush. I grew up in East Greenbush. I want to stay in this community, but I want to see it grow and prosper. I want to fill those retail stores with the mom and pops, small to medium size businesses that was just said, but those businesses aren't viable without the consumers and population base. So those are my comments. Thank you for taking them.

CHAIRMAN MAYRER: Thank you very much.

MR. PANASCI: Thank you. Rob Panasci, P-A-N-A-S-C-I, Isabel Court. A couple things to start. I am a municipal attorney. The first thing I wanted to start with is I'm a resident of the Town of Schodack. I've been here since 2007.

9 and 20, I don't live in this community that is directly impacted, but the whole town will be impacted by a project of this size. There are 13,000 people in the town, 65 square miles of this town. So this project as a whole should be considered.

Mr. Privitera, the attorney for the homeowners' association, had said you're required to do an EIS. That's not the case. I look here, I see four PEs on this Board. That is highly unusual for members of a community to have such a well qualified board.

So I feel as if there was a question about the ethical duties of this Board and, yes, you shouldn't take the word of a developer, but you have people here that are experienced in this field that can make a determination one way or the other supporting a project. There's no need to proceed with an EIS. That was the first point.

The other point is that with 9 and 20, since 2007, I can't remember one developer that has come in that has been approved. One gentleman talked about the Burger King, which is an example of something that can't even stay in our community.

Nothing has been able to support people, mom and pops, to come here.

You have a project come in with 1,200 jobs. People need to eat. People need to come here. They're going to eat; there are going to be sales tax revenues. People talk about the IDA; they talk about the fact there's going to be tax breaks. We don't know that for sure, one. Two, even if there is, even if they're paying 50 percent of the taxes, it's going to be a lot more than what they're paying now. So we need to consider those impacts as well. I think that was it.

I just wanted to make sure -- I just wanted to say one thing. You guys are doing a good job. I understand how difficult it can be to be on a board and have a controversial topic like this. I don't see a conflict of interest with the Board. I don't see the need to have another third party come in to determine whether you can make this decision or not.

So I urge you to take your time, but do this on your own and decide whether this project is a development project for our town. In my mind,

it's good for the town as a whole. There are 12,000 people in the town and, again, you can't just take the word of, I think it's one percent of the people; granted, they have a higher impact than others, but you have to consider the town as a whole. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MAYRER: Thank you.

MR. VORIS: My name is Andy Voris. First of all, I take a little bit of offense at anybody talking about truckers. My dad built his house in Schodack in 1963 and raised 12 kids in the Town of Schodack so, you know, they paid a lot of taxes into the town.

We all grew up here; we understand the impact this would have. I ask that you consider it very carefully before you do it. I think the town needs growth and the people here should understand that. Their taxes are through the roof. You can balance that with good commonsense and growth in the town.

I'd also ask that you consider a project this size and the jobs in the community building the project. Are they guaranteeing project labor agreement that would guarantee local contractors

to build the project?

Are they guaranteeing a prevailing wage which would guarantee that the men and women that do build the project would require a good-paying job and be able to put money back into the community. Studies have shown that when the construction workers on those projects do get that kind of wage, they put it back into the community and it helps the community in the long run.

So I would ask that you consider those things when looking at this project, whether it's going to go forward or not. I thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN MAYRER: Thank you.

MR. WILLIAMS: Good evening. I'm Otis Williams. I live at 1666 Julianne Drive, the north end of where the building's going to be built. I have major concerns of this mega one million square foot warehouse. My concerns are this: The increased traffic on Route 9 for a lot of the residents running up and down Route 9; the actual queue line that they're proposing, the 13-truck queue that they're proposing, that is not going to back up traffic and that traffic light that sits right in the middle, that's going --

I'll get into that when I get there.

Staffing at the warehouse. Make sure they're staffed 24/7 to make sure they can handle that amount of capacity that they're pumping in and out of there so it doesn't back up Route 9.

And holiday time. What are they going to do with staffing and shipping? What are their peak hours? We talk about studies being done, the traffic. That was done in April and in March. Non-peak shipping times, especially for a retailer, if it's a retailer, they're going to be summer and then the time between Thanksgiving and Christmas when everything heats up with shipping.

So let's talk about Route 9. They proposed a traffic light at Route 9. With that traffic light, it's going to bottleneck everything up. Right? It's going to affect all the people that are trying to get to Route 9. They're trying to get to work, trying to get to school, trying to get home. That just can't happen.

If you think about it, 10 trucks an hour is more like 20 trucks an hour. Truck drivers are going to be early, truck drivers are going to be late. It's going to bottleneck things up.

It brings me to my next point, the queue, the queue of 13 trucks. I worked in a Fortune 500 company for four years in Latham. We had a smaller warehouse with a production and manufacturing distribution center and we had trouble keeping 10 to 15 trucks off of the street with a 12-truck queue, and that was 12 trucks.

My other concern is, like I say, I worked at this Fortune 500 company is the staffing. They never had the correct staffing to move as many loads as they could. The police were called several times to the facility, because we couldn't get those trucks off the road. It was endangering the lives of the people that lived on that road.

I live right off Route 9; a lot of these people here do as well. That is a major concern for us. Like I alluded to a little bit earlier, the holiday time, the holiday time, the peak

holiday for a retailer is summer and then the time between Thanksgiving and Christmas.

I worked at this Fortune 500 company and they had struggles. They had struggles. They had struggles during the holiday time. They had

struggles during these times. The traffic study that was done was done during those months, March, and April, slow shipping season, no bad weather.

We live in the northeast, folks. We get bad weather in our peak shipping season. We need to evaluate that, take that into consideration.

Lastly, I know it's been touched on a million times, but I'll touch on it myself a little bit. So the emergency response services that we have in town, they are community, like the gentleman with the fire department said. That being said, we are not equipped to handle a major catastrophe at the facility.

Like I said, I worked at a Fortune 500 company. We did have a major accident; it was a fire. So one of our floor scrubbers that was run by propane exploded in the building. Several other district fire departments were called. They had a ladder truck. They put out the fire. It took a long time, but they eventually got it out.

Are we equipped to handle that here now? Let's put that in perspective. If that building catches fire and we're not able to handle it, it's going to burn down all the trees around it and it

can catch the surrounding residents. You need to take that into consideration. Please protect the safety of this town. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MAYRER: Thank you.

MS. SHERWOOD: My name is Martha Sherwood. I live down here on Salatay Lane. I would ask the Planning Board to extend this hearing until they can provide the community well before the next hearing if you agree to extend it with an outline of exactly what the Planning Board is expecting to look into and answer for the community before a decision is made. Terrible, terrible concerns about the fire and the police. And folks forget we do have the state police here in town, but they would not be adequate for a major occurrence.

No offense to the company, but I think the Planning Board itself needs to look into the

impact on the aquifer. So many of us -- I have a well. Many, many, many people in the town have a well, depend on that for our water, and we cannot lose that.

So again, I ask: Could you outline for the public exactly what steps you will be taking

before you make a decision and extend the public hearing to cover comment on that? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MAYRER: Thank you.

MR. BASALI: I'm Joe Basali. I live on Sunset Road, 1381. I've been a resident since 1981, a professional engineer, and 17-year member of the Planning Board here in Schodack and served along with Denise and Wayne and Paul. So I have a little bit of history here.

One of the things I wanted to say was, you know, your decision tonight is going to depend very, very much on a definition that is sales distribution center.

So if you go and you look obviously in the town code, there's no definition that's given. If you do a Google search, you won't find a definition. You'll find something that says

distribution center and you'll see that that's generally taken to mean the place that's smaller than a central warehouse would be for a given company. So something like a distribution center would be, in my view, something like Hannaford.

Sales distribution center, I think the closest thing in Schodack that we have to

something that might be called, particularly if you put the word and in there, sales and distribution center. So if you look at something like that, one thing that immediately comes to mind is Dunkin Donuts. They sell there, they also manufacture there and they distribute there.

Another example would be power distribution up in Empire State Boulevard. And I can't be sure, but it seems to me that the term "sales distribution center" started with that power

distribution, the forerunner. I'm not sure what the name was. But it's basically small. Nothing like this, what's being proposed.

So I think you've got a very difficult problem on your hands legally if you move ahead on the basis that that is a sales distribution center.

The second thing I want to mention is that if you look on the website at the DEC guidelines for what constitutes a Type 1 action, I think you'll find that something like that will easily fit that definition. So if you try to bypass this by doing some kind of a negative dec or whatever you're going to require, short of a full-blown EIS, I

think you're setting yourself up for a lawsuit.

The third thing is the Aquifer Protection Plan, or the Aquifer Protection Law. I'm sorry. You know, we've had years go by and nothing's ever been done with the town zoning code and I can guess why. Part of it is I was on the Planning Board when that law was passed. It was easy to pass it. They did a negative dec. The reason was simple. You were adding protection.

Try to reverse that. Make a change to the Aquifer Protection Law. It's going to require a full-blown EIS, because you're taking away things which are currently protected.

The third thing, I don't know, I wasn't here for all of the hearings but I would say this; one of the residents talked about wells. There's a significant recharge area. That's what the Aquifer Protection Law was all about. A lot of down-slope wells, there's a lot of pavement there. So there's going to need to be -- there's going to be a lot of runoff.

That runoff needs to -- instead of going into the ground, hopefully, you've got some plans to take that into account.

Then, I think lastly -- two other points. One is fire protection. I think people have mentioned that. A facility of this size is likely to have the need for sprinklers. I don't know where they're going to get the water for it. I know in previous jobs, I was the public health engineer down in Tompkins County for a few years and we had a giant swimming pool at one plant, but it was nothing of that size for the fire protection, for the sprinkler system.

And lastly, a project of this size, if this ever was built and it failed from a business point of view, what are you going to do with it?

So I would urge you as part of an EIS, a full-blown one, to take a look at what you're going to do with that thing if it fails. Thank you.

MR. KIRBY: Hi. My name is Stony Kirby. I can appreciate where you're all coming from because I've worked in government for over 40 years at town, county and state level and you always tend to get stuck in the middle. And you have two different sides, some saying something positive on one side, other people saying other

things positive on the other side.

The fact of the matter is, though, I am personally against this, but that doesn't do anything. You're the folks that have to do something here, so you have to make a decision. To really go with the neg dec at this point is a disservice to this entire town. I mean, we're talking about noise, we're talking about air quality, we're talking about lighting, we're talking about traffic and, most importantly, we're talking about water. Okay.

Now, to have a firm, and it's a very good firm, to be coming up and telling us what's the truth and you gotta believe this and for you to declare a neg dec would be a disservice to this entire town.

As Joe pointed out just a little while ago, a positive declaration is the way to go. I don't think you have another choice. And even though we got some PEs here, and some pretty good ones, I know that, you really need to have it done right and have an independent person come in and do this. That's the correct way to do it in government. Do the right thing. Thank you.

MS. SWINTON: Hi. Good evening. Crystal

Swinton, 1861 Route 9. I'm just going to read some excerpts of a letter I sent to you folks on June 1st.

First of all, my husband and I purchased our home here in Schodack about three years ago and partially for the same reasons that it's attractive to developers; it is conveniently

located to some of the highways making our commute really easy, but it was so much more than that.

There's just something about this rural community and the feeling that we have here that made us want to just live out the rest of our lives in our home. But I cannot express the

extent of my disappointment in the handling of this proposal. The attempted fast-tracking of the project by you, the Planning Board, without the necessary information and impact studies is irresponsible at best.

The preliminary site plan and review conducted by Laberge Group identified several concerns and inaccuracies in the Environmental Assessment report submitted by Scannell, including the need to know the products which will be warehoused in the building and has been brought up

several times tonight, a conference of the emergency services to determine the capacity to serve the proposed project and we already heard a little bit about that tonight from the fire department, the capacity of the wastewater contract with East Greenbush, facility hours of operation, details of the similar facility used in the comparison studies and multiple issues with the traffic study presented; yet, you still chose to move forward to a public hearing.

So unless this public hearing period is extended into the coming months as additional information and research becomes known, this is a disservice to the town that you were appointed to serve.

The traffic concerns, which I know have been raised multiple times tonight, but with a facility this size that operates 24/7, they just can't be ignored. The effect of increased traffic on those of us who reside on the northwest end of Route 9 between the 9 and 20 split and the proposed site will find ourselves trapped in our homes during peak hours.

When I asked a representative from Scannell

about this concern, he indicated the current

traffic figures showed there would be enough of
a gap to accommodate the increased traffic flow.

It's estimated that 400 vehicles will be traveling south from the 9 and 20 split to the facility during the morning peak.

With no traffic lights or stop signs to slow the 400 approaching vehicles, how will there be gaps in the traffic to allow us to enter Route 9? This is just one concern regarding traffic. The study submitted was incomplete and it only went as far as Maple Hill Road and their data sources of similar facilities are unclear and questionable. The increased truck traffic during school bus stops is also a safety concern. And a recent collision involving a truck and passenger vehicle on the corner of 150 and 9 and 20 illustrates how dangerous the highly traveled intersections can be with mixed use traffic.

Concerns about the impact on the aquifer has not been adequately addressed. When asked about this, I was told by the planning director that, quote, "it didn't matter" with complete disregard for the Aquifer Protection Law.

The questions of the occupant and inventory remain huge concerns. Why haven't you required that this information be revealed? How can you make a sound decision without knowing who or what will be in this million square foot facility?

How can we, the residents, weigh in at this hearing without all of the relevant information? It causes one to question the intent in calling for a public hearing so soon.

A facility of this proportion and nature 24 hours is inconsistent with the character of Schodack and will destroy our community and diminish the values of our homes. I understand that you act within the limits of the zoning law, but at what point and by whom are the best interests of the town considered?

Has anyone conducted a cost benefit analysis to determine the long-term effect a development of this nature will cost the Schodack Town residents?

As town representatives, you have been entrusted with great responsibility and the residents expect that you will be looking out for their interests and the future of Schodack long after you leave office. Thank you.

MR. HART: I'm Brian Hart of East Greenbush, New York. I've lived in Schodack a good part of my life and Castleton as well, but I see this project and I just learned at the last meeting what it was. I wasn't sure, and I'm still not sure if most of the audience here knows what it is. But if Route 9 isn't the proper location for this project, I'm not sure what is.

For so long, I've tried to develop properties on 9 and 20, get East Greenbush going and we would love to have a project like this in East Greenbush.

(Audience members commenting.)

CHAIRMAN MAYRER: Thank you. All right, folks.

MR. HART: So I know what Schodack struggles with. I know you've got a lot of talented people here. I've served on town boards and planning and every other board you can imagine, as a lot of you folks have, and we didn't quite have the talents you guys got here.

But I know you guys are doing your due diligence and you certainly understand the water quality and the impact to the community. But as I

look at this now, I know the property, but Route 9 -- and I travel it all the time, and I don't see the same concerns as a lot of the people here, but I certainly don't live in back of the project as well. I sympathize with everybody.

And I'm not sure what the right answer is, but I do know in several towns that I've worked in, and I've worked in a lot of them, that, you know, it always seems to get worked out. You guys do a great job. The young lady in the back said something about FedEx and the impact that was going to have on East Greenbush. And believe me, they've done a great job. The lighting levels and the impacts of the neighbors have settled down. But everybody, like this, I've been to several meetings regarding that project and it all seemed to get resolved.

But Scannell Properties, I've never worked for Scannell, but I can tell you I do agree that they're one of the top companies in the country; that if somebody's going to build this, it's good to see somebody like that building this project. But I just don't know what else would go here. I mean, we've had other properties that instead of

doing that, is 500 apartments a better fit for this property? The concern about the drugs and bringing people in. I'm not sure if that's a better fit, but I would -- I'm in support of the project.

Herb Nieman got me here tonight, because I had signed a petition that he had and I'm just tired of seeing young people leave this area with no job opportunities. The taxes -- you know, I have three daughters that grew up in East Greenbush that volunteered for church groups, soccer fields and all now have moved out of the area because they can't afford to live here.

I think Rensselaer County needs something. I think it's time we get something. Whether this is truly the right project, I can't really -- I don't know enough about the project to tell you that. But I do know Route 9 to me is a good fit for the project. And I guess I'd like to tell you, you know, obviously, you guys know more about it than the rest of us here, but I just hope you can make the right decision and the community can get together and work together on getting this thing approved. So thank you.

CHAIRMAN MAYRER: Thank you very much.

I'm going to take one more --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: No. You said you'd stay all night.

CHAIRMAN MAYRER: I am. I'm going to take a little break and I'll be right back. So one more and then a five-minute break, if that's okay.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: My name is (unintelligible).

REPORTER: I'm sorry?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: My name is (unintelligible). I live on 1677 (unintelligible) Lane. Certified public accountant by trade. So I'm pro business, pro growth so to speak, so I came today to listen and based on what I heard, I'm 180 degrees from where I started.

I'm also an auditor, so too many red flags came into my head as I was listening to people. It comes to three different points: Who, what and why. Who's going to be occupying this one million dollar square foot warehouse? I think that's something that you, as a Planning Board, and we, as the taxpayers, should know.

I understand they don't have to tell us, but

I think it's our responsibility to know if these are a good corporate tenants. You know, they say, "Well, we don't know because we don't have a tenant yet."

Who builds a million square foot warehouse without having a tenant? I just don't believe that. I mean, it just doesn't happen.

The second thing is what. What is going to be stored there? I think we have heard from the fire chief about his concerns. Those are legitimate concerns. Every time I turn my TV on and I see a chemical fire, it's a whole different ball game when you deal with that kind of fire versus a mattress burning.

So I think we need more information to assess whether we have the capacity to deal with those kinds of risks.

Why? Why are we building this mega facility here? Well, I heard the reason, well, it will create jobs. The employment rate is 11.3 percent. Whoever wants jobs has jobs.

I got news for the company moving in there; try and find a thousand people in Rensselaer

County to give those jobs to. Good luck. I been

trying to hire people for the last six months and I can't find anyone.

Then, we talk about property taxes. We heard the school district is not going to benefit, but we know that we might get stabilization for our property taxes. Well, I don't know what stabilization means. I think we should be getting reductions in our property taxes, especially if we are getting a huge corporate warehouse here.

I'm not in the business of giving corporate welfare. Somebody said they'd be happy to get 50 cents on the dollar. No, I don't want 50 cents on the dollar. I want a hundred percent of what they're going to be costing the taxpayers of Schodack.

The fire chief talked about the special kind of equipment, very expensive, that we might have as taxpayers to purchase. I'm not paying for those equipment. They should be paying. That's something that we should be clearing tonight with the developer. They can come here through you, Madam Chairwoman, and tell us that. Nobody asked for any PILOTS. Nobody asked for any sales tax receipts. Nobody's going to be asking for any

kind of special treatment from IDAs. Those are things big and clear for us tonight. Thank you. I know it's a thankless job. Thank you for listening to me.

CHAIRMAN MAYRER: Okay. Five minutes.

(A short break was taken.)

CHAIRMAN MAYRER: We're going to resume the public hearing.

MS. ALBERTINE: My name is Nicole Albertine. I live at 13 Michael Road. I just wanted to say that we bought our house in Schodack when my daughter was four months old, because this community had so much potential. We could have chose any community and this is what we went with, we wanted to live here.

I just can't imagine how this project wouldn't bring so much more to Schodack and I wonder how many projects are we going to turn away before the right one gets here? And I would just like to say that one neighborhood does not represent all of Schodack.

CHAIRMAN MAYRER: Okay. Thank you.

MR. SERVIDONE: Good evening. I'm Mark Servidone of A. Servidone, Inc. Our business is

at 1364 Route 9 in the Town of Schodack. As a long-term business who has been on the Route 9 Corridor since the early 1950s, we are open to the Scannell project for a variety of reasons.

Number one: The creation of greater than 800 new jobs, plus additional craft labor to construct the facility. Infrastructure improvements to the Corridor, including gas lines, water and sewer for additional development. Traffic improvements to Route 9 and 9 and 20. Traffic light to slow

traffic for easier access in and out of Richwood Drive. Re-planning of the Route 150 intersection to improve flow. Vegetative buffer as proposed on north and south buffers for shielding the site for all parties. This location is well suited for this use based on proximity to I-90 and Route 9 that is a five-lane highway.

The proposed use is allowable under the current PDS zoning and has been for many years.

I have been around similar projects in the northeast which have been valuable assets to the community. The owner of Scannell and its engineering consultants appear to have done a very thorough job and they are wide open in the process to

address additional concerns by all. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MAYRER: Thank you.

MR. SCHMIDT: Good evening. John Schmidt, Birchwood Estates. Proud member of the mob. Eleven years ago, Jackie Whitbeck, a real estate agent for Caldwell Banker, brought us to look at a property in Birchwood Estates. We were recently retired and anxious to find a house in the Capital Region close to our two daughters and their families who had already settled here. What

Jackie showed us was exactly what we were looking for, a relatively newer home, only one previous owner, in move-in condition. The neighborhood was quiet and peaceful with only one way in and out so there would be no through traffic. While it was rather secluded, it was also very conveniently located near I-90. My wife and I looked at each other after viewing the house and said, "This is it."

No one could ask for a better neighborhood to live in. We have caring, friendly, respectful and helpful neighbors. In the past 11 years, we have helped care for our four granddaughters without any concern about their safety. As homeowners, we

are naturally concerned about the value of our homes. Many of us have made improvements to our homes and properties. We all maintain these the best we can.

When the time comes to sell, we expect to see a return on one of the biggest investments many of us have, our homes. Anyone who thinks that property values will increase with building of the proposed warehouse has a rude awakening coming. How appealing is it to live next to a warehouse? The minute this proposed deal goes through, our property values begin to decline. As much as I love living where I do, I have to think about how much I can reasonably expect to get in the next few years. It's a tough dilemma that we all will be forced to face.

Will this cause a mass exodus from Hillcrest and Birchwood Estates? And does anybody care? I'd like to close with a short fictional story. If you find any similarities between it and this million plus square foot proposed warehouse, it's purely coincidental. Some will say it has a sad ending. I'll let you decide.

There was once a man who had a shoebox.

Nothing very unusual about the shoebox. He decided he wanted to put something in the shoebox and happened to mention it to his family. His daughter said, "That shoebox would be perfect for my matchbox car collection." His son said, "It would be just right for holding my school supplies." His wife told him that she had some tools in the back room that the shoebox would be great for.

The man politely listened to all of them and announced that he had the perfect solution. "I'll put an elephant in the shoebox." His family

responded together: "You've got to be kidding." His son said, "What about the smell?" His daughter inquired "What about all the increased traffic bringing the elephant food and medical attention?" His wife wanted to know about the valuable water supply located nearby.

Well, the man listened politely to their concerns and said, "Not to worry. I've done studies that show conclusively that no one will see, hear or smell the elephant. I'm confident that it will not change the character of the shoebox at all. It's what we call reasonable

development. Here, look at these computer enhanced pictures that show how beautiful everything looks."

His family had to admit that the pictures were rather convincing. Well, long story short, the man got his way and put the elephant in the shoebox. Turns out he should have listened to his family because, in fact, the elephant did change the character of the shoebox. The smell, the sight and sound of the elephant drove people away. Far away. Sad to say, the man and his wife got a divorce, irreconcilable differences. The kids didn't want to have anything to do with him. It didn't take long, though, for someone else to put another elephant in the shoebox and before you knew it, you guessed it, elephants in shoeboxes as far as the eye could see. Thank you.

MR. DEFRANCISCO: Hi. My name is Tony DeFrancisco. I own 9 and 20 Auto Body. I've been operating that now for 22 years. I first moved into Schodack in 1967. I've been here a long time. I'm actually for this. I'm a business owner along with other businesses in the area.

I've seen many businesses that have failed,

gone out of here back when we had Grand Union, we had a Sears, we had Aubuchon Hardware, we used to have a Burger King. We need some more people, some more businesses. We need to develop.

When I bought my property in 1996, there were plans for the area for a Hannaford super center or something that was happening. I went through the Planning Board to get variances that were preexisting resolved, so I could open up my business and I've been there 22 years. Most

people don't want a dirty body shop with, you know, dust and paint fumes and everything else but we pay our taxes. We do a fair job. A lot of these folks are in the neighborhood right around me. I think that this plan is great for that area. We need things here.

I don't know the group personally. I looked online. They seem to be doing a great job in 44 states. They've been well recognized. They're trying very hard to adapt and modify to help the residents of the area. We need to move forward, do things that are positive for this community. We need to excite, bring in business. We need to energize this town.

I'm sorry, we've always been a bedroom community. A lot of our businesses go across the river, they go up through the woods, they go everywhere. We need places here, we need businesses here, and we need to attract people here to help.

I realize we've got a certain percentage, and we were here a couple years ago fighting the gas main that was coming across for the fracking and running lines through and, if I'm not mistaken, we had hundreds and hundreds of people against it and everybody did what was right.

I don't see hundreds and hundreds of people here against this. I think we are doing something that's right, and I applaud you. I realize there's a lot of work you have to do and I recognize that. I hope that we can come to a fair decision that everybody can be happy with.

They've heard some of the suggestions for improvements. A lot of folks have said that it's a small barrier, but I believe it's 500 feet. I have been running a body shop for 22 years. I have seen accidents on Route 9. A lot of them are caused by speeding. A lot of them come in out of

Richwood, mostly cars. I've seen many times -- I have not seen any accidents to my recollection and I'm at my shop from like 7:30 some mornings until 10:00 o'clock at night. All right? Traffic's never super heavy. We've got a beautiful four-lane highway with a center median that will be maintained.

Our town, our county do a great job of maintaining it in the winter. I can't see how we can't deal with a few more hundred cars. I've seen it when I-90 was closed and broken down

because of accidents and the whole traffic from I-90 come down that corridor. It's handled just fine.

And I think if they put the signal lights in, they're going to deal with the traffic flow. It'll probably be easier for these folks to come out and pull in and out and I think it's going to be a positive thing. I appreciate your time.

CHAIRMAN MAYRER: Thanks, Tony.

MS. VANDERLAND: Good evening. My name is Christine Vanderland and I live on Route 9, a bit south of where this is proposed, south of the Lake Road intersection, actually.

I think I beat most of the people in this room to say that our house has had one continuous family owning it since it was constructed and it will celebrate its 200th anniversary next year.

Our property is a former farm. Before this was a bedroom community, it was an agricultural community. It is still in part an agricultural community. And to harken to some of the comments other people have made about community character and what Schodack is and what Schodack could be in the future and how this fits, we really don't have to look farther than the Comprehensive Plan for the Town of Schodack which sets out the principles by which development projects, including this one, should be evaluated and the policies to be upheld and the principles in the Comprehensive Plan that speak to development. This proposal, because of its scale and the dramatic potential impacts that it brings with it, does not fit.

So I'm going to mention a couple parts of the Comprehensive Plan that this does not accord with. Guiding Principle Number 2 talking about all

projects affecting transportation seek that we provide a family-friendly environment, quiet and safe residential neighborhoods. Perhaps, this

project could coexist with safe and quiet residential neighborhoods, but because it is

proposed to be sandwiched between two residential neighborhoods, I don't see how this principle could possibly be upheld by this project.

Guiding Principle Number 3: Protect vital assets, particularly the water resources of the town. And here is where this project needs much further study and analysis and the town and you, as decision-makers, can benefit from independent analysis of the potential impacts of this project on the aquifer, because it is in the direct recharge area.

On the face of it, it would seem incompatible with protecting our water assets, but that's

certainly something meriting further study.

The applicant cites Guiding Principle Number 4 about business growth. This project, however, does not provide retail or services to town residents and that principle about business growth speaks to those kinds of businesses, those kinds of services being developed in the town as we grow commercially and these are not offered by this project.

It also is talking about business growth. It talks about businesses near residential areas reflecting retail and service needs. This is right next to residential areas and it will not offer anything to those neighborhoods in terms of retail or services.

It also specifically states that in looking to larger commercial businesses, which this would be one, there should be, quote, no disruption to major existing residential areas. So at this scale, as proposed today, what you are looking at in front of you, I don't see how anyone could look at that on the face of it and say it's not a major disruption to existing residential areas of our town.

Many of the people who've spoken here tonight have talked about traffic impacts, specific concerns very close to the facility itself. As someone who lives on Route 9 farther south and we experiences A. Duie Pyle truck traffic, we experience some of the trucks that go to Hannaford Plaza or Hannaford's warehouse and also to Pilot, the traffic analysis that was -- you know, we will be feeling impacts all along Route 9 in the

vicinity of this from exit 11 to exit 12. The trucks will travel in both directions.

And the study for noise and, certainly, some of the truck traffic, the movement of the trucks, the backup horns on the site is one aspect of noise. But for the people along Route 9, not as close in the vicinity of the facility, we also will be affected by increased noise on the corridor. And that's not accounted for in the noise study that's been submitted by the applicant.

If you live on Route 9 like I do and maybe some of the folks in these neighborhoods also know that Sundays are quiet days. Sundays are a blessing in the week because you don't have those peak periods. If there's a day I go out on my bike, because I have to ride on Route 9 to go anywhere at all, that's the day I would choose to out on my bike and get onto the quieter streets off Route 9 to do it. Those are the days we enjoy our side yard where we can be closer to the road and not have the noise versus sticking to the back to have the protection of our house and not have the noise that we have in the evenings and other

parts of the week when it is more traffic. And having a 7-day a week, 24-hour a day facility, we're not going to have the quiet times.

So we also will feel impacts. These are not evaluated by the current studies submitted by the applicant and I would ask you, again, this is another reason to give this a Positive Declaration under SEQRA, take the input that I and others are giving you, get some independent analysis to

fact-check what the applicant is telling you, and then have a really full evaluation of these impacts, ways to avoid them, minimize them and mitigate them.

And if you fail to do that, if you say, "You know what, we've got a 700-page document from the applicant, that's pretty exhaustive, we're going to give it a neg dec and we're going to put some conditions on it," you're giving away a lot of ability there. You're giving away a lot of power that under municipal home rule and under SEQRA, the state has given to you as our Town Planning Board.

A Positive Declaration, a Full Environmental Impact Statement that comes with the ability to

look at ways to avoid impacts, ways to minimize impacts and then ways to mitigate, and the plans that have been presented to you so far jump right to mitigation. For noise, they're going to use berms, they're going to use a huge wall, that's it.

They've given you the study that looks at how you mitigate and what the noise is, that one

technology or approach. But there are other approaches to mitigating noise at these facilities and they should also be looked at and I'm looking to you and I think others here are looking to you to go that route and do that fuller exploration.

I'd like to pick up on something that Joe Basali was saying before and that has to do with the definition of this project and how it's being evaluated. And it does matter whether this is a warehouse, whether this is a truck terminal, whether this is a sales distribution center or sales and distribution center. These words matter because the uses, what is allowed, what is prohibited, particularly the water quality control law, which one it is determines whether this is prohibited in the aquifer recharge area or if it's

a use of a special permit.

Reasonable people may disagree. I advise you and suggest that you get a legal opinion, perhaps, from the attorney that serves the Planning Board, perhaps, from somebody else, but to look at what this facility is. If you look at the water quality control law and the definition of truck terminal, this seems to be a much better fit

because it lacks any on-site sales. They are not making their products here or if they are, none of the plans indicate that.

Those are the kinds of qualities that would push it to the sales and distribution center type of proposal. So take a close look at that. We really do need to uphold our water quality control law and protect our direct recharge areas.

You have one shot really up here, all of you. If this proceeds to some kind of approval, whatever conditions get set, whatever mitigating features get set, whether it gets shrunk or not, once it's approved and built, that's it. There's no coming back later and trying to fix the things that can go wrong and the kinds of things people are bringing to your attention today.

So this is the time; this process of exploring the project and the environmental impacts and using SEQRA to the fullest ability and your power under SEQRA really matters now.

And this is a long night, so I'm going to conclude there, but I also plan to submit a letter describing some of what I said tonight and then also some of the other impacts that I see this facility having because of the number of trucks for air quality as well. Thank you.

MS. NATOLI: Good evening. Eileen Natoli, Lake Road resident for 30 years. I look around this room tonight, both behind me and in front of me, and I see a lot of common ground. Everyone here enjoys our safe community. Our children have attended or are attending the finest schools in Schodack and East Greenbush.

We enjoy a bucolic environment, yet, we'd like to have more business to provide goods and services to increase our tax base. I believe that the majority of us here tonight throughout the town, people who grew up here or have moved here moved here with these objectives in mind.

Development, what kind, how much and where

plagues and challenges towns across the state and across our nation. One of the most important factors that homeowners and developers share in common is the desire for predictability. We all want to know what we can expect long term in our neighborhoods and for our businesses.

We don't have the information tonight to address any particular needs we may have because we have not been provided with the details. So we're handicapped tonight and I hope that the Planning Board will keep the public hearing open so that those particulars when they do become available can be addressed by the public.

And that's what brought us all here tonight, that we don't have enough information. And when people don't have information, they're left to their imagination. And often, when people are left to their imagination, they think the worst and that's what's happening here tonight.

I don't see people who are NIMBYs, Not in My Backyard. I don't see BANANA people, people who say Build Absolutely Nothing Anywhere Near -- Build Absolutely Nothing Anywhere Near Anyone. I don't see that.

We have 14 towns in this county, we're about the largest, and we have something very special that I've been passionate about since I was involved in the town and that is the protection of our aquifer. It's 12 and a half miles long. It runs north and south and the Route 9 Corridor is the eastern side of it, border of it.

It's exposed; a third of it is exposed near the land, up near the surface, and that makes it very vulnerable. And I wanted to quote someone who was a Schodack resident and our former County Executive, John Buono, who said in 1989, and it was true then and it's true today, "Protecting the integrity of the natural environment must always go hand in hand with growth in Rensselaer County. 42 percent of the population in this county is dependent upon groundwater supplies, the largest which potentially lie within the aquifer. Because aquifers are underground, they are especially vulnerable to contamination from development which sits above and they are nearly impossible to treat if contaminated," end of quote.

In 2003, when the Water Quality Act was revised and enacted, it now includes a vast number

of businesses. It's an exhaustive list really that would provide goods and services to our town and provide jobs and be a low potential threat to our aquifer.

Please look at that law and I encourage the people of the town to do the same, because wouldn't it be a wonderful thing if the Planning Board and Town Board came together and tried to encourage and promote those type of businesses so that this kind of a scene where people have to come out of their homes, be worried and have all this controversy would be so much less in our town if the Town Board and the Planning Board could get together and look at that list and start promoting those businesses.

I don't think anyone here needs to be told not to trust a man behind the mask. We don't know what this project is. We don't know what the contents of the building are going to be. Let's pause and remind ourselves that these are not our resources to risk. They are not our futures at stake.

There is a saying that "A society grows great when old men plant trees whose shade they'll never

sit under". So please think hard before you
decide to swing that axe.

MS. ZIMMERMAN: Hi. My name is Lisa
Zimmerman and I have a business on 3930 U.S. Route
20 and I've lived either on Route 20 or in the
Town of Schodack for 59 years, so I know Schodack
very well.

One thing that I am concerned about is the
traffic. If you've ever lived on any of the major
roads and stood by them, you've seen at least one
bike fatality every year. This includes 20, I'm
not sure about 9, but the roads are quite
dangerous when you have big trucks going down,
especially on Route 20 where they thankfully
lowered the speed limit.

So I think that there needs to be major
consideration to the traffic going in and out of
there. I know that the landowners who live next
to it have very big concerns and you need to
really look at the type of planning that needs to
be done.

When I built my building in 1992, I had to
have a traffic review and I also had to have a
SEQRA statement and I also had to have Clough

Harbour come out and do a full analysis of my property.

So I think that someone needs to get independent review of all those three things. I think it will help with the community. We need to make sure that this is safe and we need to make sure that the planning that goes into it is not being ignored.

And with that amount of trucks, I think you're going to have a tremendous amount of traffic. How can you not have traffic? It's impossible.

And I will have to say that one time, there was an accident. Well, maybe the gentleman who spoke before didn't see a lot of this, but people couldn't get into my business for 30 minutes

because of all the traffic that had to now go down 20.

So if you have any kind of increase in traffic, you need to plan, you need to know exactly what you're doing, what you're getting into, especially if there's a disaster, an accident.

I heard the fire department chief speak and I

think he has legitimate concerns and that would be a big concern for a facility of this size. Who's going to pay for this? Who's going to actually make sure that that's available?

There was a lot of talk about taxes. When I built my building, I had an IDA loan and I got a lot of tax relief, but I'm spending a tremendous amount of money every year. I think that this company should have to pay the full taxes and they should have to contribute to the community, not get a big break. And we need to know that as taxpayers, how is that going to help us?

As far as the trucks and the noise, if you've ever been near any kinds of trucks, you hear beep, beep, beep, beep, and it's really annoying. If you go listen to that for hour after hour, day after day, it's going to drive those poor people crazy.

So I really hope that whatever buffer they put in is a big one and it's very soundproof, because I feel for them. And I also worry about the character of the town. I like the fact that we're rural, that we have farming and that we have some agriculture in our town. And I think we're

starting to lose some of that in the hopes that we'll develop.

I'm not totally against development, but I think that we do have a segment of our population that relies still on the farming and the agriculture.

And that brings us to the aquifer, which I think is a huge concern. That aquifer is very wide. If you look at the hydrology study that was done by the federal government back in the '90s, it was extensive. It studied the aquifer, how it recharges, where it goes. There's thousands of areas where the wells can recharge at just unbelievable rates.

So when water goes off those areas into the aquifer, what happens if they have an unknown pollutant in it? We don't know what this company is. I think that's a big concern of all of us. We don't know if it's going to be chemicals. We don't know if it's going to be polluting. What's in the warehouse?

So part of our concern is: What is in that company? What are they storing there? Is it toxic? How is it going to impact us?

The other thing is some of the things that the town does or doesn't allow us to do as business owners, I can't have a sign out front that exceeds, I think it's like four-by-six or something. But now we're allowing this enormous warehouse that's 45 feet, takes up a million square feet of land. It's huge.

So I think there's a little disconnect between what the town allows for some of the businesses and what we're actually asking us to accept. And I'd like you to consider that as a town businessperson, what are we actually doing here? What are we allowing to come into our town?

And one of the big concerns is jobs and employment. Well, I hire 35 to 40 people and just like one of the other people said, it's difficult to find employees and to find good ones that you want to retain and cherish and really keep to add to the community. And now, you're asking for an extra thousand.

So you know, that company has to consider that. Where are these people coming from? Where are they staying? It's a big task. And I think that as the Town Planning Board, you also need to

consider that.

So I wish you would certainly, you know, have the reviews done. I feel as a businessowner

already, I was required to do it and I'm a much smaller business than this and I think they should be, too. And they should have a SEQRA and a Full Environmental Impact Statement. Thank you.

MR. MASACHICK: My name is Paul Masachick. I live on Maple Hill Road and I am an environmental professional for over 32 years. I had a chance to breeze through the paperwork today and I think we have to look at opportunity here, and we have to look at facts.

So people have spoke with a lot of opinion and a lot of emotion, and I can respect that. But it is my understanding from looking at that document that hazardous materials will not be stored in that building. So I'd like someone to confirm that for me today.

The other thing I'd like to confirm is I'm understanding that there's going to be no fuel oil, gasoline or petroleum stored on-site there. I think the box was checked no.

And I think the other thing I think we have

to look at is the benefits from the infrastructure. We are going to pick up, let's say, approximately three quarters of a mile of infrastructure. How does that lead into our

future development? Because the 9 Corridor is prime for development, but I don't know if you can be accessible to find solutions to help these developers come here and then when they come here to hold them accountable.

So Scannell appears to have a very good reputation, but are they going to continue to manage this property or are they going to lease it out or sell it to the person they're buying it for or the company they're buying it for. So we need to know that.

But I think people should consider the opportunity. Because if they bring in five hundred, eight hundred, a thousand new jobs, even a small percentage coming to our town is going to help our school district. Our numbers are going down. We need more rooftops. With more rooftops and more people, we get additional services. Additional services mean more tax base.

How many things can you put on the Route 9

Corridor that would not use production water, not going to draw from the aquifer, that would not store petroleum or chemicals? Obviously, we don't want a hazardous waste facility.

I spent a good portion of my career cleaning up sites and doing due diligence for people like Scannell just so they can build. This situation, I would guess that site is pretty much pristine with potential amidst agricultural fertilizer issues.

So I would say that I am for this project because of the opportunity. I think it's incumbent on the Board to evaluate this paperwork. PE, PE -- four PEs and a lot of experience. You know, I'm familiar with some of you people, I expect you to do your jobs. If there's

compliance, you should approve this. And as a community, we should hold whoever comes in here accountable for noise, for traffic.

I think putting lights on Route 9 is going to be a great benefit. I think people go too fast now. A couple lights breaks up the traffic, slows them down.

So I agree for this, and I'd ask you to get

them to answer the questions, hazardous materials, tanks, no draw off the production water. And can they tell us who's coming in there and who's going to manage the facility, not tomorrow, not a year from now, but 10 years from now, and how do we hold them accountable? So I vote yes. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MAYRER: Thank you very much.

DAN: Ma'am, board members, thank you for your time. I'd just like to say -- Dan, 13 Michael. 12-year fire service member. Do I have concerns about this project? Yes, I do, as I would any new construction. But other than that, I have all the faith in the Board and the developers and I just appreciate your time on this. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MAYRER: Okay. I appreciate that.

MS. BREHM: Heather Brehm. I'm on North Hillcrest, so the tractor trailers will be my new neighbors. I never dreamed I would have to worry about ever feeling like I lived in Clifton Park here in Schodack. If I wanted the business district of Clifton Park, I would have moved

there. But I grew up around here and I intended to stay here because I personally enjoy a quaint

quiet town we currently have.

I do travel out of town into Albany for work, but I also prefer it that way and I have no complaints. I have no issues having to drive 10 minutes to East Greenbush to the grocery store because I chose to live where I do. I like the green space, I love the quietness of my backyard with the crickets and the frogs chirping.

Adding a ridiculously sized distribution center in my backyard changes my life forever and my kids's lives forever. My husband's family have lived here for well over 80 years. I'm sure they never dreamed to have to deal with this or the stress that it's caused every one of us to the north and south of the cornfield that has always been a cornfield.

Certainly, none of us have ever had to worry about our water quantity or quality. Who should we be going after after our wells fail? The Town of Schodack, Scannell, or the mystery company? The residents need some assurance that we will be safe. Can you truly offer this, let alone put these assurances in writing?

What about the traffic? Again, who will be

liable for the accidents or even the deaths when people are going anywhere from 55 to 75 miles per hour down Route 9 only to come face to face with a slow moving tractor trailer pulling out of an entrance/exit without a traffic signal, especially taking a left to head to the Exit 11s for I-90.

We have had a hard enough time to get out of North Hillcrest Road. What about the residents residing off Richwood? They have a split second to make a decision to exit the road. Now, with the added traffic, they are taking their lives into their own hands every time they leave their homes.

Please think long and hard about the decisions you're making. We all understand people want to sell their land and that Schodack is getting pressure from Rensselaer County higher-ups, but at what cost?

Aren't there better options for a business this size to go down Route 9 where there aren't residents next door? Schodack needs smart business growth done appropriately. Schodack should grow but not at the cost of negatively impacting its residents. Please cross the T's and

dot the I's and really think of all the negative impact before signing your paperwork, because your decisions today will affect tomorrow's Schodack. Thank you.

MR. SPINK: Hi. David Spink, S-P-I-N-K, 2 Star Terrace. I think you're looking at the largest project here in the history of Schodack. And so the question is: Why are we trying to rush it?

We saw tonight that the plans for the project aren't even complete, they're still fluid and here we are having a public hearing on something that's not well designed as yet.

As far as the potential Negative Declaration on the SEQRA and the Full Environmental Impact Study, that would be a gross dereliction of your duty really to the town. If it's environmentally sound, why would anyone be afraid of a Full Environmental Impact Study? It may help the project.

But we're trying to -- that's one of the big problems with this is trying to rush it and throw it down the throats of the people of this town. And that's a lot of the ill feelings you have

here. A lot of these studies and a lot of the documents -- Mr. Laberge has written a very detailed and thoughtful letter here and I'm not sure that this is really -- any of these things been addressed and they're not going to be things that are going to be addressed by a sentence or two. These are serious concerns.

Obviously, the aquifer and the special permit, are you really comfortable doing a special permit on the Water Quality Act? I would be very, very careful about that, something that size, something as precious as the aquifer. You can't un-pollute the aquifer, you can't -- once you muck it up, you've done it for all-time, most likely.

And some of these studies are very strange. And in fact, we've seen it in the neighborhood, we see -- you know, some people say, "Oh, there are people traipsing around out in the cornfield in a foot and a half of snow." And they apparently did this for an afternoon or two, and they come back and say, "Ahh, no cultural artifacts here," you know. And then some of the trees we see in these projections -- we should note that those pictures were probably taken by people trespassing on

private property and those trees that they're going to leave are on property owned by residents of Birchwood. So a lot of this is kind of hard to swallow.

A 20-foot berm. Well, it's 20 feet from the bottom of the cesspool. So it's maybe five feet above where the level of the building or ten feet. So as Mr. Laberge has shown, there are a lot of problems with this 700-page document. The traffic study doesn't work out. And have you ever considered -- sometimes when the snowbanks are high and snow's flying and you see the trucks lined up and down into peoples' neighborhoods and then multiply that by two or three, because these trucks aren't all going down Exit 11. They're going to go fuel up at Pilot, then they're going to go to 12 or they're going to be all over the place. So there are a lot of problems. The

traffic doesn't add up. So you know, you really need a Full Environmental Impact Study here.

And just on kind of a personal note here, Ms. Mayrer and Mr. Johnson, you were on the board when the PD-3 was developed, and we know that. We've read the minutes. PD-3 was developed for small

businesses and trying to protect Birchwood/Hillcrest neighborhoods. That doesn't do it. That isn't strong enough. Just think about that.

Look at me. Is that what you really had in mind for PD-3? Is it? Thank you very much.

MR. DOLAN: I'm Jim Dolan. I live on Reno Road. I've lived in Schodack for 44 years. I think the town needs sensible development. I think it needs commercial development, but this is a major essentially warehouse in between two residential areas. It's not appropriately located at this location.

I question whether it's legally allowed under our zoning law in that under the planned development section, it says that it's designed to produce a development pattern in harmony with the goals and objectives of the town.

Putting a project like this in between two residential neighborhoods doesn't do that. Warehouses are allowed in -- I think it's PD-5 or something. It's one type of development zone. This is PD-3. Warehouses are not allowed. So they call it a sales distribution center. Sales

distribution center when the law was written

intended to be something other than huge
warehouses.

This is supposed to -- intended to be small
facilities. It wasn't intended to be this huge,
huge, huge warehouse. And a sales distribution
center, so this is not intended to be allowed by
the town in PD-3. So I don't think it legally can
be allowed in this particular area.

And what is the difference between a sales
distribution center and a warehouse? This is a
huge warehouse and, yet, that's not allowed in
PD-3, and small distribution centers like Dunkin
Donuts, small little facilities.

So I object to the fact that the Board would
even consider this project in this area. I don't
think it's legally allowed in this area.

Secondly, no one can properly evaluate this
project; the residents and the Board can't
evaluate this project without knowing who the
tenant is and what's stored there. So until that
is known, I think the process should be suspended.

A lot of people said an Environmental Impact
Statement is necessary. I would like to amplify

that as one -- also a PE, and I know there's a lot of expertise here on the Board. As I'm sure the Board knows, the requirement of an Environmental Impact Statement doesn't depend on the expertise of the reviewers, such as the Planning Board. It depends on the law.

The law requires that any project that may have a significant impact on the environment must be pos dec and an Environmental Impact Statement prepared. And it's clear, as the lawyer that led off the comments today said, that this project exceeds the threshold for requiring an Environmental Impact Statement.

So I imagine that the Board will be making a pos dec and requiring an Environmental Impact Statement to be prepared.

Also, documents are not easy to review unless you take time to come down to town hall. For those that want to evaluate the project in more detail, I'd like additional time for that so they can submit comments.

So I think you should be extending the comment period for, say, 90 days to allow time for the public to generate its own comments on the

project. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MAYRER: Going? Going? Gone.

Okay. Here, we go. We are not closing the public hearing. We will keep it open, yes. As you are aware, we do not know who the tenant is and I did ask that question at 3:30 this afternoon again for the benefit of this hearing and I was informed because of some administrative issues, I could not be informed who the tenant was.

So I did try to get that information for you and I was not able to do that, but we will know, I believe I've been told within the next two weeks we will no know. So we will keep the public hearing open.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: How long?

CHAIRMAN MAYRER: Til the next meeting, because we're going to find out. The other thing is I also confirmed that this property will be managed by Scannell. It is not a sale. This is a tenant. So they will be keeping the property and the tenant will be under a 15-year lease.

So these are the things I do know, but I don't know anything else.

So with that, if no one else has any

additional comments, I will look to get a motion to adjourn.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER: Motion.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Could I ask a question?

Why can't they tell us what's going there? Why can't they?

CHAIRMAN MAYRER: I just said I asked the question this afternoon --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes, but they're right here.

CHAIRMAN MAYRER: -- and they have some administrative things to do and then they will be telling us.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: All this time?

CHAIRMAN MAYRER: Yes. I'm sorry.

I have a motion to adjourn. Do I have a second?

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER: Second.

CHAIRMAN MAYRER: All in favor?

(Affirmative responses.)

CHAIRMAN MAYRER: Opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MAYRER: Thank you, everyone. And thank you for being gracious to each other.

(Whereupon, at 10:04 p.m., the hearing was
concluded.)

* * * * *

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, **THERESA L. ARDIA**, Shorthand Reporter and Notary
Public within and for the State of New York, do hereby CERTIFY
that the foregoing 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.

Theresa L. Ardia

THERESA L. ARDIA, CSR, RPR, RMR

Dated: June 12, 2018.