

TOWN OF GREENFIELD

PLANNING BOARD

June 11, 2013

REGULAR MEETING

A regular meeting of the Town of Greenfield Planning Board is called to order by Tonya Yasenchak at 7:01 p.m. On roll call, the following members are present: Tonya Yasenchak, Nathan Duffney, Michael Gyarmathy, Andrew McKnight, Thomas Siragusa, and Stan Weeks. John Streit, and John Bokus, Alternate, are absent. Charlie Baker, Town Engineer, is present.

MINUTES – May 28, 2013

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: A. McKnight

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of and approves the minutes of May 28, 2013.

VOTE: Ayes: Duffney, Gyarmathy, McKnight, Siragusa, Weeks, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Absent: Streit

PLANNING BOARD CASES

MARYANNE TERRY for AT&T – Site Plan Review

New Cingular Wireless, Wilton Road

MaryAnne Terry is present for the application. She states that this is the same installation that they were recently here for on April 30, 2013 for 62 South Greenfield Road. This is a 4G LTE upgrade, antenna upgrade with associated equipment and what that will do, as this is a very compatible technology with older technologies and with future technologies, is give you faster service, greater range and diminish download interruptions, etc. This location is a 200' guyed tower owned by American Tower, they are keeping the equipment at the same platform of 145', they will have the three antennas with remote radio heads and there will be no change in ground space. They have submitted their construction drawings and structural analysis. T. Yasenchak states that a site plan review does not require a public hearing. A. McKnight asks if they are adding a new tower or just antenna. M. Terry states that it is the existing tower and to the exact same platform. C. Baker has no engineering issues. Discussion takes place to waive the public hearing.

RESOLUTION – Maryanne Terry, SEQRA

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: A. McKnight

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board completes Part II of the Short Form SEQRA. All questions are answered “no” and the second box is checked, indicating that this will not result in any significant negative environmental impacts for the Site Plan Review for MaryAnne Terry for AT&T for property located at 422 Wilton Road, TM#126.-1-21.2

VOTE: Ayes: Duffney, Gyarmathy, McKnight, Siragusa, Weeks, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Absent: Streit

June 11, 2013

RESOLUTION – Maryanne Terry, Site Plan Review

MOTION: S. Weeks

SECOND: T. Siragusa

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board grants the request of MaryAnne Terry for Site Plan Review and waives a public hearing for property located at 422 Wilton Road, TM#126.-1-21.2, as per the application submitted.

VOTE: Ayes: Duffney, Gyarmathy, McKnight, Siragusa, Weeks, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Absent: Streit

MARYANNE TERRY for AT&T – Site Plan Review

Crown Castle, Ormsbee Road

MaryAnne Terry is present for the application. They will be putting their equipment on the same exact platform, at 159'. For this application they will be expanding the ground space by 27 square feet for additional cabinets to house the radios and batteries for the LTE equipment. Crown Castle has already approved the amendment for that addition of ground space. The structural passed with no issues. This is again for LTE upgrades and the same equipment will be going in. C. Baker states that he has no engineering issues.

RESOLUTION – Maryanne Terry, SEQRA

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: M. Gyarmathy

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board completes Part II of the Short Form SEQRA. All questions are answered “no” and the second box is checked, indicating that this will not result in any significant negative environmental impacts for the Site Plan Review for MaryAnne Terry for AT&T for property located at 500 Ormsbee Road, TM#110.-1-60.1

VOTE: Ayes: Duffney, Gyarmathy, McKnight, Siragusa, Weeks, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Absent: Streit

RESOLUTION – Maryanne Terry, Site Plan Review

MOTION: S. Weeks

SECOND: T. Siragusa

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board grants the request of MaryAnne Terry for Site Plan Review and waives a public hearing for property located at 500 Ormsbee Road, TM#110.-1-60.1, as per the application submitted.

VOTE: Ayes: Duffney, Gyarmathy, McKnight, Siragusa, Weeks, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Absent: Streit

JOSEPH VAN GELDER – Site Plan Review

Ballou Road

Joseph Van Gelder and Gary Robinson, PE. are present. J. Van Gelder explains that he purchased this old farmhouse, which was built in approximately the 1790's, and they have decided to have a little bigger residence. They are going to keep the old farmhouse and maybe at some point be able to fix it up. It

June 11, 2013

needs a lot of work. He has spoken with someone who takes down old barns, restores them and then puts them back up, and they also make the barns into houses. He states that he would like to farm at some time when he retires, nothing commercial, just for himself. He would also like to build a small barn/workshop, which is actually a frame from a 200-year-old house. Both will look completely historic. He would also like to do some passive solar with panels on the farmhouse roof. They are trying to stay traditional but also be modern. G. Robinson explains the location of the property and the site plan. He states that you cannot see the Kayaderosseras from this location or any of its tributaries. J. Van Gelder explains that the location of the proposed house is a former pasture. T. Yasenchak asks if he intends to build the garage now. J. Van Gelder states that he does, the plans are awaiting a building permit. G. Robinson states that both are post and beam construction and that the applicant is looking at earth tones. J. Van Gelder states that he would like to do a barn red, but if the Board has a concern with that, he can change the color. He states that neither should be visible to anyone. He would like to do standing seam metal roofs. T. Yasenchak states that this property is located in the KROD, therefore it requires a site plan review and she reviews the items that the Board should be looking at. A. McKnight questions that the applicant is going to build the house first and then the barn, and needs to clear for the barn location. J. Van Gelder states that he may build the barn first so that he has storage for supplies and no, he does not need to clear for the barn, there is an existing clearing. M. Gyarmathy asks how long the driveway is. G. Robinson states that it is 300-feet to 350-feet. M. Gyarmathy states that it looks like there is an adequate turn around. He asks if the garage is going to have conventional siding. J. Van Gelder states that he is probably going to do board and batten, although he would like to do cedar siding if he can afford it later. The house will actually look like a barn. T. Siragusa states that he loves this project. He has been spending a lot of time renovating his own barn over the years and wishes he could live in it. He thinks that it is fantastic that the applicant is putting in that amount of effort and dollars to restore an historical piece of Greenfield and live comfortably there. He states that it looks good and we can discuss the amount of windows, etc. J. Van Gelder states that there will be under 50% windows. S. Weeks states that the applicant mentioned that the house was going to have some solar collection, but he does not see anything in the application. J. Van Gelder provides a sketch. S. Weeks states that it is most of the roof, then. J. Van Gelder states that is on the south side. Discussion takes place of where you will be able to see the house from. S. Weeks states that he does not know that he has a problem with it, but the Board didn't know anything about the garage or the solar. G. Robinson states that the misunderstanding may be that J. Van Gelder submitted some information for the building permits but may have thought that that would be coming here. M. Gyarmathy states that he does not feel that we have a complete site plan, the garage is not drawn in correctly where it is going to be, etc. G. Robinson states that they will correct that. S. Weeks states that he would like to see that and since we are requesting the additional information, he feels that a public hearing would be warranted. T. Yasenchak states that the Board would like to see some additional information regarding the solar cells, the color, etc. J. Van Gelder states that the panels are not reflective, they are made to absorb the light. You will not see a mirror, because that would not be what he wanted with his old house. He reiterates that you will not be able to see this from anywhere except if you come up to the house location. T. Yasenchak asks if the applicant can provide the Board at the next meeting some more information regarding the solar panels, labeled and more of a spec sheet. B. Duffney states that he is somewhat familiar with this piece of property. He states that he was up there early this spring and did see the inside of the old farmhouse. It is a beautiful old house, but it needs a lot of work and it would be nice to see it restored. He states that as far as clearing, a lot of it is brushy up there, because 30 – 35 years ago it was still farmed and there were pastures up there. That is where the electric fence comes from. He states that this was probably farmed since the house was built probably in the 1700's. As to the color, B. Duffney states that he would not have a problem as long as it is not something shiny. Regarding the solar panels, he believes that there is a rise on the other side of the farmhouse so that would kind of hide it from view. T. Yasenchak asks what the applicant's thoughts are about exterior lighting. J. Van Gelder states that he likes it dark. The house he lives in now has one lamp under the porch and that is all that he would have at this house – a light at the front entrance, which would only come on if someone came to the door. T. Yasenchak reiterates that this site plan review is because the applicant is in the KROD. The Board has the ability to waive a public hearing but as the applicant has been asked to provide additional information, a public hearing is set for June 25, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. T. Yasenchak asks the applicant to try to get some information, maybe in color, so that

June 11, 2013

the Board can see how the panels will look on the roof and the reflective nature of it. C. Baker asks that topography be added to the plans, particularly for the driveway; total area of disturbance; and show some silt fencing along the driveway. G. Robinson states that the driveway is existing. C. Baker questions that this project was before the Board and was approved as a two-lot subdivision back in 2010 and there was some question with the end of the roadway and the highway department. J. Van Gelder states that he had wanted to do a turnaround for the highway department so that he could have more road frontage and a lot line adjustment with the other parcel he owns, but there were issues with the school district line. R. Rowland explains that, in conjunction with the County, many attempts were made to correct this, but because of the school district line there was no way to help the applicant. The subdivision was rescinded and the applicant has also received an area variance for the location of the house.

SKIDMORE COLLEGE – PUD – Referral

Denton Road

Stephanie Ferradino, attorney; Dave Carr, LA Group; Mike Hall, Skidmore College; and Greg Boyer, Dynamic Energy are present for this application. S. Ferradino reviews that this is a 120-acre site on Denton Road and the applicant is here seeking a PUD because the Town does not currently have solar as an allowable use. The College is developing a plan of overall sustainability and sustainable energy is a composite of that plan. The College feels that their responsibility is two-fold – first they want to lead by example so the students are coming up with the current way of thinking about energy and the second, is that this is on the top 10 things that college students are looking for when choosing colleges. Right now 40% of the campus is heated and cooled with geothermal. As part of the NYS initiatives, the Governor's Office is encouraging solar use throughout NYS. She reviews the procedure for approving a PUD, states that the applicant started with the Town Board on May 9th and at that time this was referred to the Planning Board to do the hard work of looking at what is proposed, reviewing the legislation, looking at the environmental review, etc. They also appointed the Planning Board as the lead agency. S. Ferradino states that they have identified two environmental impacts that they think that the Planning Board and the neighbor's will want to hear about – those are visual and sound. When they submitted the original application, the solar array was located on the western side of the property closer to Prestwick Chase. That has been changed quite frankly because they had thoughtful discussions with the neighbors and felt that a shift of that site would have a reduced impact on any of the neighbors in the area. The applicant hopes that the neighbors are pleased with that shifting. The height on the panels is 5' 6" and will be surrounded on Denton Road and parallel with Prestwick Chase's boundary line with a 6' cedar fence which will actually be raised a little bit for stormwater purposes and so that critters don't get caught under there. They think that the overall fence will be about 6' 2" or 6' 3" tall so it will be at least 6 or possibly 8 inches higher than the highest point on the panel arrays. The location from the road is approximately 3 football fields, from Denton Road, and from the nearest neighbor it is approximately 750-feet. The sound source for this site is something called an inverter, which is the machinery that takes the power from the sun, which comes in on a DC current, and converts it to the AC power that you can send through the lines. The inverter is at about 65 decibels. She states that the sound of her voice is roughly 60 decibels so it will be slightly louder than how she is currently speaking, but the closest receptor will be 750'. They do not believe that it will be audible at the corner of the neighbor's property. In addition, to the thought that it will not be able to be heard, they are going to surround it with an enclosure and provide muffling within the enclosure and insulation in order to even further muffle the 65 decibels. She states that the other thing about the inverter is that it is only on when the sun is out. The inverter shuts down automatically when the sun goes down. The other issues from an environmental perspective that normally come up during projects are lighting. There is no lighting as part of this; there is no waste; there are no wetland issues – there are definitely wetlands on the property but they are well within the boundaries of the wetlands and their buffers; there will be no odors associated with this site. The one other impact that they have identified, which is very minimal, is traffic. These panels need to be inspected and maintained on roughly a quarterly basis, so 4 times a year someone is going to go out to the site on the gravel road and do the maintenance work that they need to. Other than that, there will not be significant

June 11, 2013

traffic. Someone will mow once or twice a year. D. Carr from the LA Group, provides an aerial photo of the property. He reiterates that this is a 120-acre parcel, which is bordered by Denton Road, Prestwick Chase, residential properties, vacant land and Polo. There are two polo fields in the center of the site with an existing gravel access road and the Skidmore baseball field. He explains that this was originally presented with the array in the NW corner utilizing the existing gravel road. He states that they were not part of the original discussion locating this, but it did make sense at the time as this site was not utilized and it had a low ground cover area, which would require less cutting to locate. When the original presentation was made to the Town, the College was in the process of contacting neighbors and people in the neighborhood to discuss this. Subsequent to that presentation and after talking with some of the neighbors, the decision was made to slide the array over as far to the east as possible, which is the application that was delivered to the Planning Board. There will be a new gravel road constructed, the existing gravel road will remain for Polo, and Polo may also use the new road. The inverter was moved to the opposite side, as far from the neighbors as possible. There will be a cedar fence at the south end and the western end. D. Carr indicates that one of the items they felt was an issue to be looked at was the visual aspect of this array so they picked three points to do a little visual analysis as to what it could possibly look like from those vantage points. The College purchased 6' tall sections of stockade fence, it is still out in the field, and they took pictures from those points and then photo shopped the remainder of the fence. He explains where they took each of the photos from. They are also proposing vegetation in front of the cedar fencing. He is assuming that the fence will be painted a darker color. He states that there may be other points from which people are interested in. D. Carr states that he is not making any illusion to the fact that beyond that fence, at certain elevations, you could see the array. He reiterates that it is 800' from front to back. He states that the College is open to meeting with the neighbors after the meeting, at another time, etc. and mitigating whatever they can. T. Yasnchak asks S. Ferradino to give the Board an overview of the PUD, because a PUD looks at the use of the site overall. S. Ferradino reviews the PUD. The 4th section is the definitional section and with three definitions that are specific to this PUD. The 5th section lists the permitted uses within the PUD. S. Ferradino states that they adopted all the uses that are allowed as it is currently zoned and then added the types of things that they are using currently and for the proposed PUD. She states that they currently do not have sewer or water at the site and do not currently have a need for them, however they included these because at some point maybe the ball field will want to have a bathroom out there. She goes on to review the remainder of the sections. C. Baker questions that the height that has been quoted of 5' 8" on the panels, is that the maximum tilt height of the panel. G. Boyer states that the maximum height is 5' 6" and the tilt is 25-degrees. S. Ferradino states that the tilt will be facing Denton Road. A. McKnight asks what the reason was that they proposed cedar fencing as opposed to something natural like bushes or something like that. G. Boyer states that by code they have to provide a fence all the way around the system, so they felt that a cedar fence would look the nicest. It would be cedar or equal type of fence. If there is another type of fence that the Board would prefer to see, they would certainly take that into consideration. D. Carr states that the opposite two sides are chain link fence. M. Gyarmathy asks what periodic maintenance consists of. G. Boyer states that they will come to the site and clean the filters in the inverter housing, they will check all the connections in the inverter as well as out in the field. If the panels need cleaning, they will clean them. They will mow once, maybe twice a year. M. Gyarmathy asks if there is no adjustment of the panels throughout the year and asks about the code requirement for fencing around as opposed to evergreens. G. Boyer states that there is no requirement for the type of fence, there just has to be a fence around. M. Gyarmathy asks if that is because they are running the cable trays on the ground. G. Boyer states no, it is just because it is an electrical system so it is meant to keep people from going in and destroying and damaging the system. M. Gyarmathy reiterates that it then has nothing to do with the fact that it they are running the cable trays on the ground and supporting the wires in between the panels on the cable trays. He states that if you drive down Denton Road a little farther you can see that homeowners have these panels, and obviously there is no fencing around them. G. Boyer states that the updated NEC Code, section 690, requires a fence around it. T. Siragusa questions that the PUD includes the ball field as well. S. Ferradino states that it does, the PUD needs to encompass the entire lot and the ball field is on the lot. T. Siragusa asks if there are any view shed photos from a neighbor viewing it from their second story. D. Carr states that they do not know. They could take a picture from a second story. He states that it is conjecture but they have done projects, where at the request of a homeowner, gone into people's

June 11, 2013

houses and taken pictures to do a visual analysis. He states that they can do that, but there has to be a request. They could do it if homeowners had a concern. T. Siragusa questions that they had a meeting with some of the neighbors and that ended with a relocation. He asks if the applicant can share what some of the sentiments were at that time from the neighbors, what their concerns were. Mike Hall, states that he met with several of the neighbors and one on more than one occasion, there were concerns about the visual impacts; potential glare; and potential sound. He states that their write-up to the Town Board stated that it produced sound, a hum, at 65 decibels at 15-feet so there was a concern as to how much sound that meant. Other concerns had to do with destroying the vegetation for animals, animals being able to traverse the area; destroying the vegetation on the ground – they will have to take vegetation off the ground in order to put the panels up; potential for an electro magnetic field being generated by this solar array that might be harmful to the health of people who are close to it. Those were the general concerns that were expressed and in discussion with the neighbors, they suggested to the applicant that the biggest thing that Skidmore could do to mitigate those concerns was to move the site to the NE corner of the property because it would put it further away from the residential property. M. Hall states that there is quite a bit of additional cost to Skidmore to do it that way but they felt that it was in the best interest to do so. T. Siragusa states that a maintenance facility was mentioned and asks if construction of a building is in the plans. S. Ferradino states that there will be some housing that encloses the inverter to help with the sound issues. The inverter is 8-feet tall and they are proposing to dig into the ground 2-feet so that it is at the same level or just slightly higher than the solar arrays. T. Siragusa asks if there might be another building that might store spare parts or maintenance equipment, mowing equipment, etc. S. Ferradino states that the maintenance facility that she was referencing was something that may come in the future, likely related to either the Polo use or the ball field use. She states that that is something that they are leaving open for conjecture and it is something that would have to come back to the Board for a site plan review. T. Siragusa asks if there are any additional security measures besides the fence that would be in place including lighting, alarm system. G. Boyer states that there is no lighting or alarm system. The fence is locked; all the electrical equipment is locked, so everything is locked. T. Siragusa states that the fence is only 6-feet tall; there is a ball field and students. He is just wondering if there are concerns or what the measures are for security. G. Boyer states having everything locked. T. Siragusa asks what the expected lifetime is on the panels. G. Boyer states that they have a 25-year warranty and they degrade .05% every year, so after 25 years they are still producing over 80%. T. Siragusa asks if this project were successful, would they consider expanding the footprint of the array. S. Ferradino states not on this site and that is a commitment that the College made to the neighbors because they did ask that question. She states that the PUD language will state such. T. Siragusa asks where the power goes, any connect to the grid, any construction to get to the grid. G. Boyer indicates on the plans where the inverter and transformer will be located, they will trench down to the switch gear which will feed directly into the grid. They will also re-feed back to an existing sub-meter for the College's lights and whatever they have on this site. T. Siragusa states that there will be direct power to the ball field and asks if that will also go to the College or just back to the grid. G. Boyer states that it goes to the grid and then gets virtually net metered back to the College. A. McKnight asks what is meant by switchgear. G. Boyer states that it is about 6-feet tall and it is a completely enclosed piece of electrical equipment. T. Siragusa asks if the panels are fixed, there is no rotation, no tracking of the sun, no motors. G. Boyer states that is correct. S. Weeks asks how they deal with animals that can go under the fencing, is there wire screening under it or how much of an issue are animals. G. Boyer states that animals are not an issue. They can go freely in and out of the enclosure. S. Weeks asks where we can see a similar installation. G. Boyer states that he can get back to the Board with a location. S. Weeks states that he would like to know that, he would like to be able to see one. T. Yasenchak states that she knows that they have a website and there are several pictures of different installations. She states that if the Board can be told if any of those that are similar to this project so if it is not something that we can physically go to, maybe there is something that we can see a picture of. G. Boyer states that the Fairhaven landfill is very similar to this and is on the website. S. Weeks questions that in case of heavy snow is there any attempt to clear it or does it just pile up and they get less output. G. Boyer states that it will pile up, it will eventually melt off of the panels but they don't actively go out and clear the panels. B. Duffney states that, as M. Hall indicated, the neighbors' concerns were visual, glare, sound, vegetation, and the magnetic field. Some of these things have been addressed tonight. B. Duffney asks if there is any

June 11, 2013

kind of magnetic field. G. Boyer states that there is a magnetic field in everyone's house from appliances. That is all that this will produce. He states that it is the equivalent of what is in your home everyday. At the transformer and inverter area, it will be higher, but it is the same electro magnetic field that you would find in a transformer that is sitting in your front yard or any other placed in a residential zone. S. Ferradino asks if the structure that is around it will help to block some of that. G. Boyer states that it will definitely help to block some of that electro magnetic field. B. Duffney questions the size of the actual inverter. G. Boyer states that it is 8 to 9 feet wide and about 8 feet tall, and about 3 feet deep. B. Duffney states that the inverter is going to create quite a bit of heat and asks if there will be cooling fans. G. Boyer states that the structure is vented and there will be no mechanical fans installed. The inverters themselves have fans on them to keep them cooled. B. Duffney questions exactly how much property is going to be encompassed in this. S. Ferradino states it is an 8-acre site out of the 120 acres. B. Duffney asks what the distance is between the panels. G. Boyer states that from panel to panel, side-to-side in the row, they run continuous. Front to back there is a 7-foot row between the rows. B. Duffney asks what the panels are actually made of. G. Boyer states that it is a thin tempered glass. B. Duffney asks if someone were to jump the fence and hit one with a baseball bat, is there a chance of electrocution? G. Boyer states that the panels are actually extremely difficult to break. He states that you could hit it with a baseball bat and all it will do is spider. It takes a lot to put a hole into a panel. If you do put a hole in it, you will not get electrocuted from it. T. Yasenchak states that we do have the long form SEQRA in front of us, however, we have not read the PUD yet. She suggests that we take the time to read that and consider the information that is in there. We do not have the PUD language so we cannot deem the application complete at this time. A public hearing is not required for SEQRA, but it is within the Board's purview to request. There is an item within SEQRA that does ask if there is or is not likely to be public controversy related to potential environmental impacts. That is something for the Board to think about, but if the Board believes that that would be a yes, then it would be in the applicant's best interest to have that public hearing to hear what they have to say. B. Duffney states that this is becoming a pretty high-density area, there is a lot going on, and it would probably be in our best interest to have a public hearing on it. The Board agrees. C. Baker states that this is a bigger planning issue than engineering issue at this point. Obviously there is significant engineering behind the solar use, but as far as the Town's point of view, he feels it is more of a planning issue. S. Weeks states that we talked about a lot of the engineering issues, but not the PUD approach. He states that he knows that there is some concern as to whether that is appropriate and whether this is the right location. S. Ferradino states that she did speak to Mark Schachner who did question whether a PUD was appropriate here. When she explained that this was going to be a mixed-use site, he stated that a PUD was entirely appropriate here. B. Duffney asks if there is currently a PUD. S. Ferradino states that there is not, it is just MDR2. A. McKnight states that we have recently talked with Skidmore about their composting proposal. He asks why this would not work on the same site as the composting facility. M. Hall states that in order to make this work, they need an existing electric meter and there is none on the composting site. There is one on the ball field site that they are able to tap into and they have discussed it with National Grid who has approved the use of that meter for this kind of facility. A. McKnight asks if that is a National Grid requirement. M. Hall states that they cannot put a meter in a field specifically to attach a solar array to it. He states that the PSC defines specifically the kind of meter that you can use, they do not have to have much use on them, but they have to be there. You cannot put a new one in; it has to be an existing meter. S. Ferradino states that it is a Public Service Commission requirement. A. McKnight states that it seems to him, from a planning point of view, that completely hidden from view, like the composting facility would be, would be ideal. B. Duffney states that he believes that the issue was brought up about clearing the 8 acres and behind the composting facility is all wooded. T. Yasenchak asks if there is additional information that the Board would like to ask of the applicant for the public hearing. S. Weeks states that he would very much like to see a similar facility so he would like to know where one might be located that the Board could see. B. Duffney asks if there are any in this area. G. Boyer states that he does not believe of this size. M. Hall states that solar in upstate New York is relatively new for anything of a larger magnitude. He states that there are some in the approval process. B. Duffney states that then Skidmore and the Town of Greenfield are going to be setting the standard for this. A. McKnight asks how many KVA it is. G. Boyer states that it is a 2-megawatt system. C. Baker asks if the applicant has an actual number for solar gain in the wintertime in the North East. G. Boyer states that he

June 11, 2013

does have production numbers, but not with him and he can get them. C. Baker states the question was just more of a curiosity. T. Siragusa states that he does not get the PSC and existing meter. Why would they have that and what does it have to do with the State Administration incentives, what is the reason here? Michael West, Skidmore College, states that the reasons are unknown. T. Siragusa asks why the State has an opinion. M. Hall states that the PSC is regulating all of the energy production in the State and this ruling is associated with a law that was passed last year. S. Weeks states that he would like to see that on paper somehow. He states that he is having a tough time with that, because the Public Service Commission is not the utility, they are interested in things like alternative energy, etc. We are all having difficulty trying to figure this out. S. Ferradino states that she will get that information for the Board. T. Yasenchak states that she would like to have some photos on file so that the public can come look at them. She states that the specs were provided and they are black and white. She went on-line to see what they really look like in three dimensional, with the color. That would be something that she would like to see as we go forward with the SEQRA and looking at the visual impact. She would also like to see something, even if it is just a cross section of what you would see if you were higher. Even a cross section of the height of a second story of a house interpolated over the 800' or so, how high is the fence and how high is the array inside that. She states that this is the MDR area where there may be people building homes in the vicinity and she would like to see what the visual impact might be. D. Carr asks if there is a location she would like it from. T. Yasenchak states maybe the road because if there are houses on the other side at some point, maybe the western lot where there is already a neighbor or the northern vacant lot. T. Yasenchak reviews that there is a requirement for what the existing land uses are within 500' of the property lines. S. Ferradino asks if the Board can set a public hearing for the next meeting, as they would be eager to hear the public comments earlier rather than later. T. Yasenchak states we can set the public hearing, but as we are asking for additional information and the public comments may require additional information, we may not close it that night. A public hearing is set for June 25, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. T. Mina states that it was his understanding that the PUD would cover only the 8 acres and if the PUD covers the entire parcel he feels he was misled. M. Hall apologizes if there was a misunderstanding. T. Yasenchak states that part of the review of this project is how it fits in with the Comprehensive Plan, the existing neighborhood, etc. The site has to be looked at as a whole, not just the 8 acres. T. Mina states that the applicant is welcome to come to his home to take a picture from a second story window. T. Yasenchak recommends the Board review the requirements for what is required for this application and the Comprehensive Plan. They should also review the long form SEQRA as we may be reviewing that at the next meeting.

The meeting is adjourned at 8:54 p.m., all members in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosamaria Rowland
Secretary