

MINUTES

Town of Wappinger Planning Board
March 16, 2015
Time: 7:00 PM

Town Hall
20 Middlebush Road
Wappinger Falls, NY

<u>Members Present:</u>	Ms. Bettina:	Chairman	Ms. Visconti:	Member
	Mr. Ciccarelli:	Member	Ms. Leed:	Member
	Mr. Fenton:	Member	Mr. Malafronte:	Member
<u>Members Absent:</u>	Mr. Robert Valdati:	Member		
<u>Others Present:</u>	Mr. Gray,	Engineer to the Town		
	Mr. Roberts,	Attorney to the Town		
	Mr. Stolman,	Planner to Town		
	Mrs. Roberti	Zoning Administrator		
	Mrs. Ogunti,	Secretary		

PROJECTS DISCUSSED:

<u>11-3224 / NYCDEP Shaft 6</u>	-Resolution approved as written.
<u>15-3324 / Del-Tra Holdings, LLC</u>	-To resubmit.
<u>14-4060/14-3320Stewart's Shop #325</u>	-Circulate for Lead Agency.
<u>HV Hops & Grains, LLC</u>	- Circulate for Lead Agency. To resubmit Site plan application.

Ms. Bettina: **Motion to approve the minutes for March, 2, 2015**
Mr. Visconti: Second the motion
Vote: All present voted Aye
Roll Call: Ms. Bettina Aye
 Ms. Visconti Aye
 Ms. Leed Aye
 Mr. Malafronte Aye
 Mr. Ciccarelli Aye
 Mr. Fenton Aye

11-3224 / NYCDEP Shaft 6 – To vote on amending their site plan approval to work between 11 pm and 6 am for a grouting activity that will reduce the chance of neighboring wells being affected while they construct the shaft. This would only take place Monday through Friday and would be limited to work inside the shaft. Also to review a change in their approved landscaping plan for the site. The property is located at **195-209 River Road** and is identified as **Tax Grid No. 6056-01-288977** in the Town of Wappinger. (Schmitt/Michaud)

Present Chris Villari - NYCDEP
 George Schmitt - NYC DEP

Ms. Bettina: The first item on for discussion is the NYCDEP Shaft 6. You are here seeking approval on site plan and landscaping? Hi, good evening!

Mr. Villari: Yes, and thank you for having me as always. As I recall at the last Planning Board meeting, I did make a request for an extension of work hours. Thank you very much for voting in favor of that. We also presented some conceptual drawings and augmentations to the landscaping plans as was previously approved. I also recall the Board then deferred to the Planner and he was going to put together some documents and/or opinion about the drawings and formally write-up a resolution. We did receive the resolution and I think George actually signed it. Yes? No? Do you want to ask Mr. Stolman to review or give his opinion, but we are fine with it.

Mr. Schmitt: Yes!

Mr. Stolman: Addressing the landscaping plans, I think for the first time in history perhaps, we have no comments on the landscaping plans.

Mr. Villari: Wait, (addressing Bea Ogunti) so you are new, you have to make sure to jot that down. This is really important and we are setting records the first meeting out so don't get used to this.

Mr. Stolman: So on the second page of the resolutions, we have the new plans that would replace or at least augment the old plans that were approved. And on the top of the Page 3, we talked about the permission for the overnight operations. So does someone have a question?

Ms. Visconti: **Motion to approve resolution as written to the Town.**

Mr. Ciccarelli: Second

Roll Call: Ms. Bettina Aye
Ms. Visconti Aye
Ms. Leed Aye
Mr. Malafronte Aye
Mr. Ciccarelli Aye
Mr. Fenton Aye

OUTCOME: APPROVED AS WRITTEN

15-3324 / Del-Tra Holdings, LLC (Formally Bre-Del Enterprises): To amend their site plan that was previously approved for the construction of a 4,128 sf, one/two-story office building in an NB zoning district on .678 acres. The applicant is now proposing to build a 1-story, 2,970 sf building. The property is located at **210 New Hackensack Road** and is identified as **Tax Grid No. 6259-02-508806** in the Town of Wappinger. (Day)

Present: Mark Day – Engineer
Nick De Luccia – Applicant

Mr. Day: Mark Day representing Mr. DeLuccia and others. This property was approved by the Board a couple of years ago. And as many other properties, this property has been on the market for a long time. Nick asked our office to look into it and downsize. It was proposed originally to be a two-story structure, we are now proposing a single story. We realigned it with Rte. 376, putting the parking more in front – added a little more green, less pavement. The layout is much better than it was before. We have some elevations if you would like to see them.

Ms. Bettina: I believe we have them.

Mr. Day: So as you can see, it is a single-story and office building. Basically, it will be for Nick's office and two other tenants. We were on the agenda earlier and unable to make it, as Nick was away. We were able to get comments from the consultants. We worked with Mr. Gray's office to work through some of the comments. Also got comments from Mr. Stolman's office and we agreed but we have a couple of questions. Can I run through those?

Mr. Malafronte: Sure.

- Mr. Day: The one item you are asking for floor plan, design of improvement – it's generally an open floor plan with Nick's office. You are asking for location. We are not proposing anything other than what's on this plan.
- Mr. Stolman: Any Signs?
- Mr. Day: There will be no signs other than the ones on the building.
- Mr. Stolman: No free-standing signs?
- Mr. Day: None. All the site features and survey was done by Barger & Miller a few years back.
- Mr. Stolman: How is refuse being handled?
- Mr. Day: They are actually going to use the roll-off.
- Mr. De Luccia: The amount of garbage will be put in the recycling container and put in the back for disposal.
- Mr. Stolman: Please indicate.
- Mr. Day: Yes, we will put a note in it. As far as the protection of site, we are going to put erosion control plan together if that's what you are looking for. As far as the limit hours of the office building? Is that what you are asking for?
- Mr. DeLuccia: Yes, use. Are there limit amounts and issues?
- Mr. Stolman: Not really. You can skip that.
- Mr. Day: The setback graphically dimensioned: We did show the setback lines, variances and have been revised. The setback was on the original plan so I'm not sure what you are asking. Are you asking the setback variance?
- Mr. Stolman: Yes, The distance from the edge of the creek to the building was not shown or was not shown on the original plan. There was a distance from the property line but the distance from the creek was not shown.
- Mr. Day: It is listed now as the 65.7 ft. Which I believe is less.
- Mr. Stolman: The second variance has not been shown.
- Mr. Day: That's on there as well, the 43 ft. that was actually on the front of the building.
- Mr. Stolman: You had a note about the first variance and we asked for a second variance to be added.

- Mr. Day: Yes, we did add it. The question we have is about Item 3. Since we were granted the variance for a 100 ft. buffer, do we really need to show function?
- Mr. Stolman: Why don't we skip that.
- Mr. Day: So, that's not required?
- Mr. Stolman: Right. The part about analyzing wetland functions?
- Mr. Day: Yes
- Mr. Stolman: Yes, not required.
- Mr. Day: Landscaping: There is an issue about landscaping, and what property Nick owns. We researched it to the best of our ability. Mr. Hobday mentioned we don't own what we show because of the right-of-way. We do show that Nick pays taxes on the whole parcel.
- Mr. Stolman: Are you talking about the State right-of-way?
- Mr. Day: Yes, and we do have title insurance on that. But we are not sure why you would be taxed.
- Mr. Roberts: Your taxed is based on the value of the property.
- Mr. Day: Even though it's less acreage?
- Mr. Roberts: Pardon? You will have to take that up with the Assessor. It's the value of the property, and if there's a material difference, he has to take it up with the Assessor. I believe your neighbors just settled and resolved the boundary of Rte. 376. I think it was a plank road that was formed in the 1790s. I'm not joking.
- Mr. Day: So that being said, as far as the landscaping, we are not sure since we don't own it, can we still landscape in it?
- Mr. Stolman: Probably not. You will need permission to landscape in it.
- Mr. Roberts: I think you just need a license from the State.
- Mr. Day: Okay
- Mr. Roberts: Is that why no landscaping was never done at the gas station over there?
- Mrs. Roberti: They are landscaping now. They just redid the whole gas station. There's landscaping in the front. I counted them...under the snow.

- Mr. Day: Alright, we will offer up a plan to the State for their review. We are really limited because of the 10 ft separation from the septic. I really can't do much more from that strip of property that's technically owned by the State. We can also landscape here and we got the note on residuals which we will add. We will bring that back. There was a note here about Graham checking sight distance? Is this a State Road?
- Mr. Stolman: It's just a note saying that we are waiting for Bob and Graham to review the sight distance – we are not getting our hands chopped off again.
- Mr. Day: The elevations were provided, and the signage again was on the building. Other than that all comments we pretty much concur.
- Mr. Stolman: Is the signage dimensioned? Does it show colors? Not only colors - does it show materials? Does it show lighting? We really need it.
- Mr. Day: Is that something that we need now for Planning Board approval?
- Mr. Stolman: Yes, you should. You are showing them what you want to build in terms of signage – you should just detail it more.
- Mr. Day: Yes, they will be back lit. What I'm wondering, is we would just show the areas that are tenant spaces. I guess that would be similar as materials.
- Mr. Stolman: Yes!
- Mr. DeLuccia: Taken as a yes!
- Mr. Day: Okay, we'll do it!
- Mrs. Roberti: Mark, did you get this letter from the DOT?
- Mr. Day: Yes, so we are submitting. We did meet them out there and this was the location it was before. Other than that....
- Mrs. Bettina: I think it will be an improvement. Are there any comments?
- Mr. Day: Thank you!
- Ms. Visconti: It says that the permit has expired.
- Mr. Day: We amended it last Fall.
- Ms. Visconti: Well, we will need something to show. The last thing we have says it's expired.

- Mr. Day: Oh really, we'll get that. We were going to change it because it was on the grass originally in the parking lot but it's not worth it.
- Ms. Leed: Would you consider a lighter color roof, maybe a lighter gray like some of the energy star. The color gray looks better than the black.
- Mr. Day: Like a lighter gray? Okay, we can do that.
- Ms. Bettina: Anybody else?
- Ms. Visconti: No, I'm good.
- Mr. Day: Basically, we got Board of Health approval. Is it possible to schedule a Public Hearing, or do we need one?
- Ms. Visconti: I was going to say that. Do we need one? Is it a material change?
- Mr. Roberts: I think that's a decision the Board makes if you view it as a material change?
- Mr. Stolman: As we said in our memo, the material changed. Although the site plan approval is still valid. The gross project has a different building footprint, a different location, parking area location, and somewhat different building configuration among other things.
- Mr. Ciccarelli: Is it less of an impact?
- Mr. Stolman: Yes, it is less.
- Discussions followed about the impact.
- Ms. Visconti: Vote to waive Public Hearing?
- Ms. Bettina: Are we all set, and do we have any other questions?
- Mr. Stolman: I just have one question. Mark, what outside agency approvals do you need?
- Mr. Day: Just the DOT for the landscaping and Board of Health. We will get a letter from them and that should be it.
- Mr. Stolman: You need anything from the DEC?
- Mr. Day: No, we actually have a prior approval from the DEC saying that nothing was needed. One other issue came up. There was an easement for the building adjacent on the originally drawing. The building required a drainage easement and there was a trench drain pipe that

went to the back. The drainage has been fixed and no longer necessary. So we are asking to remove the original easement. Did I answer your question about outside agency?

Mr. Stolman: We talked about the outside agency approvals. So you don't need anything from the DEC?

Mr. Day: Correct.

Mr. Stolman: So, it would be good for you guys to do one round of complying with my memo and Bob's memo and we go from there.

Mr. Day: Okay.

Mrs. Roberti: We never got a vote to waive the Public Hearing.

Ms. Bettina: Motion to waive a Public Hearing.

Mr. Ciccarelli: Second.

Roll Call:

Ms. Bettina	Aye
Ms. Visconti	Aye
Ms. Leed	Aye
Mr. Malafronte	Aye
Mr. Ciccarelli	Aye
Mr. Fenton	Aye

Mr. Day: Can we get on the Agenda?

Mr. Stolman: Next meeting is three weeks from tonight.

Mr. DeLuccia: We might have a little problem with the Board of Health. But, is it possible to get on the Agenda?

Mrs. Roberti: The problems is if you we put you on the Agenda and you don't submit within the next 7 days, there isn't enough time for Bob and Dave to review it. I rather you submit it and we decide when to put you on.

Mr. Day: Okay, thank you very much!

OUTCOME: RESUBMIT

14-4060(SUP)/14-3320(Site) Stewart's Shop #325: Tonight the applicant is requesting that the planning board authorize the Lead Agency Notice to be circulated. The applicant is proposing adding underground gasoline storage tanks, gas pumps and a 1380 square foot canopy. The property is located at **2048/2054 Route 9D** and is in a CC zoning district and is identified by **Tax Grid No. 6056-02-776904/783920** in the Town of Wappinger. (Marshall) (LA 3/23/15)

14-5171/Stewart’s Shops Corp (Subdivision): The applicant is proposing to combine two parcels located at 2048 & 2054 Route 9D. The property is located at **2048 & 2054 Route 9D** and is identified by **Tax Grid No. 6056-02-776904(2048) & 6056-02-776904 (2054)** in the Town of Wappinger. (Marshall)

- Present: Chuck Marshall – Real Estate representative from Stewarts
- Mr. Marshall: I’m actually only here for administrative action requesting Lead Agency status.
- Mr. Stolman: You are before the Zoning Board of Appeals right now and because it is a Type 1 action, the Zoning Board of Appeals can’t act until the Planning Board issues a negative declaration. So the Planning Board tonight could, and we recommend that the Planning Board declares its intent for Lead Agency. We would prepare a Notice that Barbara and/or her staff could send out to that effect, and then 30 days hence the Planning Board can become Lead Agency presumably. So if it’s okay with you, you could declare yourself Lead Agency.
- Ms. Visconti: Do we need that in a form of a motion?
- Mr. Stolman: It couldn’t hurt.
- Ms. Visconti: Motion to declare the Planning Board Lead Agency on this project.**
- Ms. Bettina: Second.
- Roll Call:
- | | |
|----------------|-----|
| Ms. Bettina | Aye |
| Ms. Visconti | Aye |
| Ms. Leed | Aye |
| Mr. Malafronte | Aye |
| Mr. Ciccarelli | Aye |
| Mr. Fenton | Aye |
- Mr. Marshall: So, the only question I have is I think there’s some inquiry by Mr. Cantor. Will there be a response forthcoming before the next meeting?
- Ms. Bettina: No.
- Mr. Marshall: So I just comeback in 30 days?
- Ms. Roberti: We will put you on the Agenda once we have Lead Agency status.
- Mr. Marshall: Oh, thank you very much!
- Mr. Malafronte: Dave, Bob, is this going to be a sub-division? Being that it’s on the same site but you are adding another building on the same site.
- Mr. Stolman: This is similar to Greenbaum & Gilgoohy’s where you approve more than one building on a single lot. There is no prohibition in the zoning law that says you cannot have more than one building on a single lot.

- Mr. Malafronte: So it will still be one site but there's something already there and you are putting another building on the site
- Mrs. Roberti: They are combining the site that Stewart's on, the site to the north has a foundation on it. So when that's completed, at the same time the site planning will be one lot with the gas station pumps and also with the original stores.
- Mr. Malafronte: Do we still need a full blown SEQRA?
- Mr. Stolman: The proposed action is both the consolation, the site plan approval, special permit and variance. It's all under the same proposed action.
- Ms. Visconti: In view of a lack of determination by the zoning administration and lack of additional information. Are we going to move on this or are we going to wait to be advised on the questions that were raised?
- Mrs. Roberti: The questions from Mr. Cantor? We are not answering that because he has not disclosed to his client.
- Ms. Visconti: So why are we moving anything ahead at all until we know from Mr. Cantor that the questions that have been answered.
- Mr. Stolman: If I could, that's a ZBA matter and we are doing planning. The SEQRA process has to be done regardless of Mr. Cantor.
- Ms. Visconti: Okay, just wanted it clear.
- Mr. Marshall: We will receive the full environmental impact and a lot of stuff has not been filled in.
- Mr. Stolman: If you have any other comments, we would certainly like to hear them. They filled out a full environmental assessment form because it's a Type 1 action.
- Mr. Marshall: But some of the items are not filled in.
- Mr. Stolman: Some of the items don't get filled in. They are going to be working outside the wetlands within the buffer.
- Mr. Marshall: But you still have to address it in here if they have to go to the DEC.
- Mr. Stolman: The Planning Board will presumably be the Lead Agency. I don't want to envision the County or the State.
- Mr. Marshall: That means everybody needs to say yes and give feedback from the Lead Agency?

- Mr. Stolman: We are going to send a notice of the Planning Board declaring its intent to be Lead Agency to the outside agencies. They are also going to get a copy of the applications so they are going to see what this is about. They may have some opinions or they may not.
- Mr. Marshall: When we get this, do you review it?
- Mr. Stolman: Yes! All we are looking for right now is for Part 1 to be correct and complete. That has to go out to the other agencies, not Part 2 or Part 3.
- Mrs. Roberti: I just want to clarify something. We are going to send out the Lead Agency. The ZBA cannot act or give a decision until Lead Agency is decided. On that note, before he does any engineering, should he be denied those variances, this project is dead. In a sense, no need for him moving forward until he has those variances.
- Mr. Marshall: So administratively, I went and they couldn't act so I had to come back.
- Mr. Stolman: Given the magnitude of this project, there isn't anything that can possibly be put in it that can circulate for State or County to be Lead Agency.
- Mr. Marshall: But the information.....
- Mr. Stolman: We'll make sure everything is fine.
- Mr. Marshall: Thank you! See you in a month.
- Ms. Visconti:** **Motion to circulate for Lead Agency.**
Mr. Ciccarelli: Second.

OUTCOME: **Awaiting Lead Agency Declaration.**

Ms. Bettina

Conceptual:

15-3328 Hudson Valley Hops Project: To present their proposed project for Carnwath Farms. The property is located at **70-94 Carnwath Farms Lane** in the R-80 zoning district and is identified as **Tax Grid No. 6057-03-487186** in the Town of Wappinger.

Present: Justin Riccobono
Shawn McLearn
Matt Meyer

Mr. Riccobono: I'm Justine Riccobono. My partner, Shawn McLearn, and I are with New York Hops and Grain Exchange and we are working on the Hudson Valley Hops Project. In 2013, we helped developed the first hops farm in LaGrange called Dutchess Hops. Since then, we've had a lot of farmers approach us to develop hop farms in their farms. What we are proposing is putting together a facility that can process and grow hops and become an education institution. We are also working on creating a primary project in the region.

Mr. Stolman: To put this in prospective, Justin and Shawn have met with the Town Board on several occasions. What they are proposing is the use of Carnwath and other agricultural uses, primarily. The Town Board has referred them to the Planning Board. They would require certain uses Site Plan and/or Special Use Permit. That's why there are here.

Mr. Fenton: Have you guys seen the buildings at all?

Mr. Riccobono: Yes, we have.

Mr. Fenton: As long as you have seen it, then we are on the same page.

Mr. Riccobono: Yes, and we are working towards helping redevelop that site with historic preservation in mind.

Mr. Roberts: Have you guys had a meeting with some of the professionals?

Mr. Riccobono: Yes, we did.

A discussion took place regarding their proposal for the donut hole at Carnwath's Farms. A powerpoint presentation was provided to explain the proposed project.

Mr. Bettina: As Chairman of the Town Board, this property was purchased about 15 years ago. It has been costing us money to the tune of \$50,000 a year. The Board initially made a decision to waive the escrow. It's a nice blue print perspective and from my end, it's a pie in the sky. I'm only 20% on that Board. You are residents and taxpayers so we thought it was important for our professionals to rise to the occasion and see what we can do for them to make this a successful project.

Mr. Fenton: I appreciate the Town making a point like that. Is there a certain threshold that we are going to allow? Is there a timeline?

Mr. Bettina: Mr. Fenton, that is a concern that some of the Board members had. As a matter of fact Mike Kuzmicz and I took the time to visit these guys in NYC and I know they have the ability to renovate these buildings. At this point, we feel that it's important for these guys to come before you as Lead Agency to show good faith and see what your thoughts were.

- Ms. Bettina: Do you have a plan that shows phases of this project? Do you have everything you want for a June deadline?
- Mr. McLearen: No, we are working through the process of assessing what we are going to need. We do have a footprint for that vision and if there's support from the Town to proceed. No, we don't have all the materials put together.
- Mr. Stolman: We've been talking about what exactly needs to be proposed and what the processes would be. We are getting there and we made a lot of progress this afternoon.
- Ms. Bettina: What do you think you need to fixed to move this quicker cause June is around the corner. What information do they need. Does he need a lawyer does he have an idea?
- Mr. Stolman: Are we talking about, the presentation or a breaking ground type of issue? What's the deadline for June?
- Mr. McLearen: Having a lease in place to occupy the site.
- Mr. Stolman: The way it was explained to me today, the farther they get when they get their application submitted by the middle of June, the higher the probability is they may get their funding.
- Mr. Fenton: So if you apply in June, will you find out in September?
- Mr. McLearen: Yes! Typically by the end of the year.
- Ms. Bettina: So we are not even ready for a submission?
- Mr. McLearen: Now, that the team has assembled today and we made some comments and they made suggestions who we would like to propose it to you for action.
- Ms. Bettina: So when do we see that?
- Mr. Stolman: I think that Matt will be working on a site Plan Application and there maybe a use or two that would require Special Permit Use Application. We generally process those together and grant one approval for both things.
- Ms. Bettina: Do we have any idea when this will be? This has been going on for awhile now.
- Mr. McLearen: With all due respect, we are moving as quickly as we can. I know there's a sense of frustration because this has been going on for months. We were here last week and we were asked to present to the Planning Board. I think we've done quit a pretty good job putting it together.

- Ms. Bettina: No, it's great. But like I said, June is not that far.
- Mr. Meyer: The goal is to provide as much complete and intact wheels on the ground plans as part of this funding application. The goal that Hudson Valley Hops has is to have a Lease. That's a meaningful plan to have wheels on the ground for the application.
- Mr. Roberts: We cannot finalize a Lease unless we know what Site Plan you are going to get approved. If you want the Lease in advance of the Site Plan it's going to be hard.
- Mr. Roberts: I need to know how far in the process you need for your application.
- Mr. Meyer: It's not a prescriptive process. It's a touch and feel process with these funding applications. The more you have in hand and complete, the better your position is for competing for the funding.
- Ms. Visconti: If you had a pretty solid Lease to submit to CFA for funding, all the other paperwork and engineer and all that other stuff. If the Lease was there, that would demonstrate to CFA that you have a viable product and you are requesting funding to move it ahead.
- Mr. Roberts: June, that's what I was saying that it's going to be extremely hard to do without your approval of the Site Plan. So, we have to conclude SEQRA before we enter into a Lease Agreement. From what I understand from them, they want a long term Lease.
- Mr. McLearen: What are you saying, formal approval or conceptual approval?
- Mr. Roberts: Formal approval? They are going to tie the Lease into a formal approval.
- Mr. Fenton: What's your biggest impact and what do you need first?
- Mr. Riccobono: You have heard of the term "shovel ready projects", the States out there saying that they are going to give money to shovel ready projects when the land is sitting out there and they say you need a plan or a project. We are actually putting together a plan for that site.
- Mr. Stolman: Looks like the ball is in your court.
- Ms. Bettina: I understand what you guys did in the city. I just want to make sure you guys have it all together so you can move forward and we all be successful.
- Ms. Visconti: How big is your request for the funding? Are most of the funds for the actual growing of hops? All of the classes, food, admission or for agriculture? What is the main function of the funding?
- Mr. McLearen: Agriculture is the primary purpose.

- Mr. Roberts: June, you are going beyond the Planning Board. Once they submit the applications, then you will have something to discuss.
- Mr. Stolman: The area that's available for growing hops in the donut hole is roughly an acre.
- Mr. McLearen: The way that we can all contemplate the definition of farm operations has a lot of guidance at the State level and elsewhere. The way your own zoning contemplates farm use, has guidance and we have complied with both. The legislation that has been passed guiding other entities as farm breweries has similar guidance. Based on that existing guidance to ensure that these types of activities, and a farm operation can be understood as such. A lot of what we've been trying to do is dealing with an extremely complicated site that you guys own and we are trying to understand. We can't do that in a vacuum. So what we are trying to do is what can we give you that best complies.
- Mr. Fenton: Do we have CO's for the buildings?
- Mr. Roberts: I don't know about the Museum but I think it has Certificate of Compliance. The Mansion is boarded up and I'm not sure the Chapel has been authorized for use.
- Additional discussions took place regarding their proposal for the donut hole at Carnwath's Farms.
- Ms. Leed: Is this 100% contingent on you getting the State grant? Do you have any other backup plans? Or you'll just keep trying?
- Mr. Riccobono: We have other investments sources as well. There's State grants, loans and private money is all included.
- Ms. Bettina: So, if you don't get this grant, you still want to go forward. Is that what you are saying?
- Mr. Riccobono: Of course, it's a nice piece of it and as a priority project, it does bring a lot of recognition to the region as well has bring in a great deal of money.
- Mr. Roberts: This conversation could go on and I know you have a lot of things that you want to address. One of the things we want to express tonight is how the Planning Board expressed their intent to be Lead Agency. As soon as they submit the required information, we can then circulate to all the involved agencies. At least let's get this going so that we have a fighting chance by June.
- Ms. Visconti** **Motion to declare our intent to be Lead Agency.**
Ms. Ciccarelli: Second
Vote: All present voted Aye
Roll Call: Ms. Bettina Aye
Ms. Visconti Aye

Ms. Leed Aye
Mr. Malafronte Aye
Mr. Ciccarelli Aye
Mr. Fenton Aye

New and Old Business:

Mrs. Roberti: We are up to New and Old Businesses. Osborne Square was on and now is off the Agenda. Last meeting, we approved the Resolutions. Since then DOT met at the site so I think the Resolution should be amended and get something in writing from the DOT before it's signed. To that extent, I would like you to authorize an Amended Resolution to be prepared by David.

Ms. Visconti Motion for authorization of an Amended Resolution by Mr. Stolman.

Mr. Malafronte: Second
Roll Call: Ms. Bettina Aye
 Ms. Visconti Aye
 Ms. Leed Aye
 Mr. Malafronte Aye
 Mr. Ciccarelli Aye
 Mr. Fenton Aye

Mr. Malafronte: Motion to go into Executive Session for legal advice at 8:45pm

Mr. Ciccarelli: Second
Vote: All present voted Aye

Ms. Visconti: Motion to come out of Executive Session at 9:30pm

Ms. Bettina: Second
Vote: All present voted Aye

Ms. Visconti: Motion to close at 9:31pm

Ms. Bettina: Second
Vote: All present voted Aye

The meeting ended at 9:31p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bea Ogunti, Secretary
Town of Wappinger Planning Board