

III.2 Description of the Proposed Action

Comment No. 2-1

We have reviewed this material and have no substantive comments on this chapter.

(B-1, AKRF)

Response No. 2-1

Comment noted.

Comment No. 2-2

Many people commented that with the proposed project, there would be negative impacts to the quality of life in the Town and would change the character of the community and the beautiful nature of the Town.

*(B-2, PH #1, Ms. Brandon); (B-2, PH #1, Mr. Esposito); (B-2, PH #1, Mr. Feuerman);
(B-2, PH #1, Ms. Fanizzi); (B-3, PH #2, Mr. Catalino); (B-3, PH #2, Mr. Catalino);
(B-3, PH #2, Ms. Yara); (B-7, Patricia Williamson); (B-10, Robert Coyle And Janet Coyle);
(B-15, Helen Evers); (B-32, Valerie Schmidt); (B-35, Christine Capuano); (B-38, Peter & Cathy);
(B-39, Jane Cypher); (B-40, Janine Alberghini); (B-41, Gina Occhigrossi);
(B-41, Gina Occhigrossi); (B-48, Charles DiDonato & Marie DoDonato);
(B-50, James Borkowski); (B-51, Cory Blad); (B-58, Angela Cuomo);
(B-73, MaryAnne Taormina); (B-76, Jackie Kaddatz); (B-77, Jerry Hilpert);
(B-82, Tara Eacobacci); (B-85, Christine Capuano); (B-88, Eugene J. Duffy, Jr.);
(B-103, Donna Shenkman); (B-104, Nathalie Del Vecchio and Roberto Molina);
(B-106, Theresa Brandon); (B-117, Ann Fanizzi); (B-118, Cherie Ingraham);
(B-120, Richard Feuerman); (B-126, Stephen McPartland); (B-136, Lisa Aurello);
(B-138, Michael Catalano); (B-141, James Scomillio); (B-142, Steve & Susan Elias);
(B-142, Steve & Susan Elias); (B-142, Steve & Susan Elias)*

(B-145, Hearing No. 3 (Mr. Hecht)); (B-149, Ann Fanizzi); (B-154, Carlos Passi);
(B-155, Cathy Croft); (B-161, Vikki Rogers); (B-173, Beth Mazzei); (B-173, Beth Mazzei);

Response No. 2-2

The Applicant has listened to local comments on quality of life issues and has adjusted the proposed plan to best address the project's intent to provide the same natural beauty and rural character associated with Southeast while providing for a stronger local economy. As a result, the project has been redesigned to further obscure its visibility from the community and to reduce its other potential impacts, including traffic. The Preferred Alternative Plan presented in this FEIS reduces the number of proposed buildings from the four (4) in the DEIS Plan to two (2) in the Preferred Alternative Plan. This redesign reduced the project by approximately 17%, with the total proposed building square footage in the Preferred Alternative Plan being 933,100 square feet (s.f.) as compared to the 1,124,575 s.f. project presented in the DEIS.

The FEIS Preferred Alternative Plan also does not propose any buildings on the 99.1 acres of the 328.1 acre property that is zoned RC; rather, all buildings will be situated on Lots 2 and 3, which are wholly within the OP-3 District. Building A, which is closest to Route 312, will be approximately 2,150 feet from Route 312, versus 965 feet for Building I in the DEIS Plan. Intervening topography would also make Building A virtually invisible from Route 312. Distance, topography and dense existing vegetation obscures Building A's visibility from Route 312 and preserves the rural character of this area.

The Preferred Alternative Plan also doubles the separation distance to the Twin Brook Manor residences, from 600 feet in the DEIS Plan to approximately 1,210 feet in the Preferred Alternative Plan. In addition, an approximately 12 foot high berm is proposed on the site north of Building B to help further block the visibility of the buildings from Twin Brook Manor. The distance of the nearest building (Building B) to the Hunter's Glen residences remains at approximately 1,415 feet, or just a little over a quarter mile.

Moreover, trucks will no longer be able to circulate around the buildings, with only employee parking situated on the side facing Hunter's Glen.

The property, which is in immediate proximity to I-84, will be developed to comply with the environmental protections built into local and State regulations, including the stringent NYCDEP regulations for development in the Watershed. Sixty-one percent of the OP-3 portion of the Applicant's property (approximately 139.4 acres) will remain completely undisturbed throughout the development process. Following development approximately 80% of the approximately 229 acre OP-3 portion of the Applicant's property will remain open space either in a natural state or landscaped spaces. The Applicant is also willing to commit approximately 92 acres as permanent "no build areas" within the 229 acres of OP-3 zoned portion of its property. No other land use program for the property will protect as much of the property as the proposed project.

While the proposed project will add some traffic to the mix (less than 10% increase), it will double the capacity of Route 312 from Pugsley Road to I-84 by expanding Route 312 to four lanes. This expanded capacity will help the existing congestion. The vast majority of the commercial traffic generated from the proposed project will access the site via I-84 and Route 312 over an "in town" distance of just over a half mile. The vast majority of the proposed project's traffic will not go beyond the Pugsley Road/I-84 portion of Route 312, further helping the community to retain its current rural character. Alternative schemes of development permitted under current zoning like residential, office, medical office and entertainment uses would likely generate far more vehicular traffic that may access other areas of Southeast with far greater frequency than the proposed project.

The Applicant has, through professional experts, evaluated the air quality and noise conditions of the immediate area pre and post development. The air quality is currently good and will remain good following development. Noise levels have been calibrated under current conditions and noise from the project will be less than the maximum permitted by the Town Noise Ordinance, including noise abatement features resulting from the project design.

The Applicant has engaged an expert in warehouse/distribution facilities (Appendix 2-1) to understand the implications of a 24/7 operation. The majority of commercial activity occurs during the traditional business day and is reduced by approximately half during the second (evening) shift. During the third (night) shift the activity is limited to in-building cleaning, maintenance, repair and restocking activity much like a grocery store prepares for the next business day. Based on truck counts at the Gap Distribution Center in Fishkill and at the Matrix Distribution Center in Newburgh, truck traffic is concentrated to the first shift, tapering into the second shift. The vast majority of trucks will not be making deliveries between the hours of 11:00 PM to 7:00 AM in normal operations.

The Preferred Alternative Plan will substantially economically benefit the area, including through significantly increased taxes and employment opportunities. The 328 acre property currently contributes approximately \$143,000 to the local economy in the form of property taxes per year. According to a local tax expert, the proposed project will generate an estimated \$30,900,000 in property taxes over the initial fifteen years of development. The proposed project will generate an estimated \$73,500,000 of annual economic output including 551 new on-site jobs during the anticipated day shift and 115 new indirect jobs. (Although a total of 1,040 jobs are projected over the 24-hour period, the 551 jobs on the anticipated day shift were used in the economic analysis [Appendix 10-1] as a conservative number, but with water/septic demand and the traffic analysis taking into account all three shifts.) This economic output will have a favorable and lasting impact on the local economy.

Schools will be a major beneficiary of the proposed development. Over the initial fifteen years of development, the schools will receive an estimated \$25,945,000 in net new revenue. If the permitted residential units were to be developed, the school system would likely incur a net deficit from the development of the property.

In answering the community's quality of life questions, the Applicant is fully confident that the rural quality and natural beauty of Southeast will be preserved to as near status

quo as possible. The Route 312/I-84 traffic will be benefited with additional lanes. The community will receive a significant economic impact from the proposed development that will be a building block to assuring economic sustainability in the long run.

Comment No. 2-3

Secondly, hours of operation. Is this a 24-hour operation?

(B-2, PH #1, Ms. Fay)

And what's confusing me is the place is going to be open 24 hours a day; is that correct? 24 hours, it's being open?

(B-2, PH #1, Ms. Gallo)

Response No. 2-3

Although the proposed facility will be open 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, within the industry the majority of commercial activity occurs during the traditional business day, and is reduced by approximately half during the second (evening) shift. During the third (night) shift the activity is limited to in-building cleaning, maintenance, repair and restocking activity much like a grocery store prepares for the next business day. Based on truck counts at the Gap Distribution Center in Fishkill and at the Matrix Distribution Center in Newburgh, truck traffic is concentrated to the first shift, tapering into the second shift. The vast majority of trucks will not be making deliveries between the hours of 11:00 PM to 7:00 AM in normal operations.

The Preferred Alternative Plan will pose few if any impacts to the surrounding community, even with 24/7 operations. The nearest building to the Twin Brook Manor residences for the Preferred Alternative Plan is approximately 1,210 feet distant as opposed to approximately 600 feet for the DEIS Plan. In addition, an approximately 12 foot high berm is proposed on the site to further block views of the buildings from Twin Brook Manor. The distance of the nearest building (Building B) to the Hunter's Glen

residences remains at approximately 1,415 feet, or just a little over a quarter mile. Also, trucks will no longer be able to circulate around the buildings, with only employee parking situated on the side facing Hunter's Glen. In addition, trucking activity is concentrated on the side of the buildings facing away from the condo communities, with the buildings acting as a sound barrier to these communities. The buildings will operate 24/7/360, but within the industry, the majority of commercial activity occurs during the traditional business day, and is reduced by approximately half during the second (evening) shift. During the third (night) shift the activity is limited to in-building cleaning, maintenance, repair and restocking activity much like a grocery store prepares for the next business day. Based on truck counts at the Gap Distribution Center in Fishkill and at the Matrix Distribution Center in Newburgh, truck traffic is concentrated to the first shift, tapering into the second shift. The vast majority of trucks will not be making deliveries between the hours of 11:00 PM to 7:00 AM in normal operations. The buildings will also help buffer the noise from the existing approximately 9,000 daily truck trips on nearby I-84. These conditions help to reduce potential noise impacts for Hunter's Glen and the surrounding area to below the levels permitted by the Town Noise Ordinance.

The proposed lighting would be dark sky compliant. No general illumination wall-pack lighting is proposed for any portion of Building B facing nearby residences (unlike the DEIS Plan), and the parking lot light poles will be reduced from 30 to 20 feet high, and fully shielded such that there will be no light spillage off of the property towards Hunter's Glen or Twin Brook Manor.

Comment No. 2-4

Don't know what the best use of this property is and if it's being considered.

(B-2, PH #1, Mr. Catalano)

Why doesn't Putnam consider something useful to the residents - a YMCA, a community pool, a hotel so our guests will come and visit and don't have to drive to Danbury, CT to stay? A shelter from storms when the power goes out and any other times a shelter would be needed?
(B-8, Amanda DeHaan)

Response No. 2-4

In recognition of dramatic changes to the real estate and financing markets in the 21st century, the Applicant rethought its master plan to identify a viable use in demand under current market conditions, reduce the environmental impacts of the prior mixed-use plan, create strong and sustainable economic impacts for the community, and meet the intent of the community's Comprehensive Plan for sensitive economic development in the I-84/Route 312 area. After careful analysis, the Applicant determined that a warehouse/distribution facility use is highly desirable under current market conditions, would pose significantly fewer environmental impacts than other uses, including retaining approximately 80% Town-defined open space on the approximately 229 acre OP-3 portion of the Applicant's property, and requiring approximately a third of the water of the residential project approved for the site, and would have a strong positive economic impact on the community.

The proposed project, which has both current market and financing support, generates significant economic benefits for the community and retains the environmental/rural character of the area.

Comment No. 2-5

We're concerned about whether the operations or the anticipated operations of the facility at the building closest to us can be limited in some way so as to mitigate impacts on the residences [Twin Brook] in the upcoming years.
(B-2, PH #1, Mr. Waldinger)

One of the most important things for me that I'd like to see changed from our discussion on site is de-mapping Barrett Road and moving that building over, even if you have to combine them. I think there's about 550 feet there.

(B-3, PH #2, Mr. Larca)

And I would also support the idea of moving further away from Twin Brook, if we can figure out that roadway.

But building design. I know it's very - - in its early stages, but it seems like maybe we could do a little more studying on the actual shape 4 and maybe where they are.

And I'm wondering why – that orientation, I think, at Lot 4, if you could rotate that building, then maybe you can get further away from the development, and it might make it a little – little easier to accommodate that distance between them.

(B-3, PH #2, Mr. Cyprus)

If you're going to move that warehouse away from Twin Brook and slip it to Barrett Road, is it going to now be closer to Hunters Glen?

(B-3, PH #2, Ms. Fay)

The nearest building will be moved further than the original design of 400 feet from Twin Brook and the truck loading docks will not face Twin Brook or Hunter's Glen.

(B-107, Twin Brooks Homeowners Association, Inc.)

I still don't understand the need for 4 separate buildings, multiple tenants could occupy a single building. As I mentioned in my comments, I would like to see Barrett road de-mapped and buildings 3 & 4 combined to move the corner of building 4 an additional 580 feet away from Twin Brooks. I would also like buildings 1 & 2 combined and shifted further away from Tilly Foster Farm.

(B-158, Eric Larca)

Response No. 2-5

The Preferred Alternative Plan reduces the number of proposed buildings from four of the DEIS Plan to two. The distance of the nearest building to the Twin Brook Manor residences has been doubled, from approximately 1,210 feet in the Preferred Alternative Plan as compared to approximately 600 feet for the DEIS Plan. In addition, an approximately 12 foot high berm is proposed on the site to help block views of the buildings from Twin Brook Manor. The distance of the nearest building (Building B) to the Hunter's Glen residences remains at approximately 1,415 feet, or just a little over a quarter mile. Also, trucks will no longer be able to circulate around the buildings, with only employee parking situated on the side facing Hunter's Glen. In addition, trucking activity is concentrated on the side of the buildings facing away from the condo communities with the buildings acting as a sound barrier to these communities.

The buildings will operate 24/7/360, but within the industry, the majority of commercial activity occurs during the traditional business day, and is reduced by approximately half during the second (evening) shift. During the third (night) shift the activity is limited to in-building cleaning, maintenance, repair and restocking activity much like a grocery store prepares for the next business day. Based on truck counts at the Gap Distribution Center in Fishkill and at the Matrix Distribution Center in Newburgh, truck traffic is concentrated to the first shift, tapering into the second shift. The vast majority of trucks will not be making deliveries between the hours of 11:00 PM to 7:00 AM in normal operations. The buildings will also help buffer the noise from the existing approximately 9,000 daily truck trips on nearby I-84.

These conditions help to reduce potential noise and other impacts for Hunter's Glen and Twin Brook Manor.

Comment No. 2-6

This project is no good for ... the safety of their children.

(B-2, PH #1, Mr. Feuerman)

Response No. 2-6

See Response 4-7, Response 4-47B, Response 4-48, Response 4-61, and Response 4-65. The four lane section will mitigate the site traffic along Route 312 and will improve emergency responses along the roadway by providing a second lane for vehicles to pull over into and by effectively reducing queuing of eastbound traffic. The intersection and roadway improvements have been designed in accordance with NYSDOT standards to provide proper roadway geometrics, thereby minimizing the potential of accidents.

Comment No. 2-7

There's so much warehouse space where people have moved out, commercial space that's unused that's just rotting away at this point, and we're trying to tear down more trees and rural space to build more logistics centers that - - who knows if this is going to be a success or not.

(B-2, PH #1, Ms. Yara)

There are many other industrial areas that are already available for this purpose.

(B-107, Twin Brooks Homeowners Association, Inc.)

Response No. 2-7

The industrial vacancy rate is currently 5% in the area and the office vacancy is closer to 18% overall and 25% in the sub-region, according to the CBRE Group, Inc., a commercial real estate services and investment firm. Any empty warehouses in Southeast are likely due to location and physical deficiencies, not the least would be the inability to convert an old warehouse building to meet the needs of modern e-

commerce users. Warehouse/distribution facilities have specific requirements in order to operate, which typical warehouses do not. For instance, typical warehouses are often defined by low ceilings, poor loading dock access, and environmental concerns. The vacant warehouses may also potentially be obsolete due to the current requirements of tenants.

In any event, SEQRA jurisprudence establishes private applicants, who lack the power of eminent domain, cannot be required to consider properties that they do not own, including because “[i]t would be unrealistic, and, indeed, onerous to impose upon private developers the obligation to acquire alternative sites or options to purchase them and then submit all the sites to the lead agency for review and selection.” Horn v. International Business Machines Corp., 110 A.D.2d 87, 97, 493 N.Y.S.2d 184, 191 (2d Dept. 1985), leave to appeal denied, 67 N.Y.2d 602, 499 N.Y.S.2d 1027 (1986).

Comment No. 2-8

Now, I belong to the fire department. Okay. I don't want to see more residential homes go in here. You know, we don't have enough EMTs as it is. I don't see anybody in here that's a volunteer there. So this is a good use for the property.

(B-3, PH #2, Ms. Miller)

Response No. 2-8

Comment noted.

Comment No. 2-9

So one of the things you might just consider is that e-commerce is here to stay, and it would be nice to look at this as a project that might - - might benefit your town.

(B-3, PH #2, Mr. Gates)

Response No. 2-9

Comment noted.

Comment No. 2-10

I was talking to this gentleman earlier, and he suggested I submit to the board I have petitions with several signatures of residents - - concerned residents of Putnam County, Westchester County, Connecticut, opposing this project.

(B-3, PH #2, Ms. DiDonato)

Response No. 2-10

So noted.

Comment No. 2-11

Okay. So you're basically removing open space in a residential development for the use of this, and you're telling us that we're going to have all these tax benefits.

(B-2, PH #1, Ms. Armstrong)

Response No. 2-11

The Phase I portion of the previously approved project was to use a 185.2 acre portion of the property for the development of 143 single-family homes and 237,000 square feet of the property for office/commercial space. The percentage of Town-defined open space for Phase I was approximately 83%. The open space for the proposed warehouse/distribution facility is approximately 80% of the approximately 229 acre OP-3 portion of the Applicant's property that will contain all the proposed buildings. The open space for the warehouse/distribution facility is more continuous compared with the typical open space associated with single-family homes and office/commercial space.

Please refer to Response 10-3 for a discussion of tax benefits.

Comment No. 2-12

What is the environmental impact of this project?

(B-8, Amanda Dettaan)

In fact, Northeast Logistics is the very antithesis of these goals: harming and degrading the environment.

(B-117, Ann Fanizzi)

Response No. 2-12

See Response 2-2. The environmental impact of the project was discussed in depth in the DEIS. Since that time and based on comments from the public and various governmental agencies, the Preferred Alternative Plan makes a number of changes to further avoid and mitigate environmental impacts.

These changes are discussed in Section 2, Potential Impacts, of the FEIS.

Comment No. 2-13

However, another new reality, namely acts of terrorism were never mentioned. New York City has been a prime target for terrorists and this center would make an ideal "soft target".

(B-91, Alan Wendolski)

What if massive amounts of hazardous chemicals (such as chlorine, ammonia, pest control products, etc.) were ordered and tracked on-line to the center in time for the attack?

(B-91, Alan Wendolski)

Response No. 2-13

As described in Response 3-8, the Applicant would be willing to accept a condition to its requested Special Permit that would establish that the Preferred Alternative shall not handle or store hazardous substances that are subject to regulation by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) pursuant to 6 N.Y.C.R.R. Part 596. The NYSDEC is the State agency primarily responsible for the handling and storage of hazardous substances. NYSDEC has declared its intention to preempt the field in regulating the handling and storage of hazardous substances, declaring that its regulations preempt unauthorized and inconsistent local laws or ordinances. See 6 N.Y.C.R.R. § 598.2.

Accordingly, as a condition to any Special Permit for the Preferred Alternative, the Town Board can establish that “hazardous substances,” as that term is defined in the NYSDEC’s regulations and which are subject to regulation by NYSDEC pursuant to 6 N.Y.C.R.R. Part 596, shall not be handled or stored at the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative is not intended to handle or store hazardous materials in the magnitude or means subject to regulation by the NYSDEC. Rather, it will be handling and storing ordinary consumer goods that may contain trace elements of substances that are considered hazardous, such as nail polish, televisions, and computers.

Comment No. 2-14

Hi lot of discrepancies between these two statements/articles. One stating over 500 tractor trailers a day, other saying 6 to 8? One is an attachment.

Please can we have the truth.

(B-33, Gary Hamburg)

Response No. 2-14

This comment references two separate proposals, the \$100 million dollar distillery project is slated for the Town of Carmel, and the warehouse/distribution facility is slated for the Town of Southeast.

Comment No. 2-15

Hudson Valley Economic Development Corporation supports Interstate Logistics plan to build a 1MM + square foot Logistics Center in the Town of Southeast. We believe logistics centers are in high demand based on current market conditions, and this project will have a far less environmental impact on the site than the previous mixed use plan. The project, which poses relatively few demands on governmental services, provides a substantial net fiscal gain to the community. It would generate an annual average of approximately ten times the current property taxes of \$140,000. There are also significant job numbers associated with this project: Direct, indirect and induced jobs to be created during the construction phase of the logistics center are anticipated to reach 818 jobs. In addition, the operation of the proposed project is anticipated to generate 919 direct, indirect, and induced jobs at the local level, including 665 direct jobs from the operation of the proposed facility across a wide level of skills. Many of the Southeast residents, as well as the surrounding communities will be able to take advantage of this opportunity, increasing family income and retail spending.

The project owners plan to maintain the rural character of the area and will offer several acres at the Route 312/Pugsley intersection to Putnam County for inclusion in the Tilly Foster Farms project, further enhancing the rural character along Route 312 and assuring the protection of the Town's aesthetics. Traffic is always a concern however extensive mitigation is proposed to accommodate the project and the associated site generated traffic volumes.

We support Northeast's efforts to invest in the Town of Southeast and Putnam County and to bring jobs and economic vitality to the Hudson Valley Region.

(B-45, Hudson Valley Economic Development Corp.)

Putnam County Economic Corporation supports the Northeast Interstate Logistics Plan, comprised of 332.64 acres, located at the Route 312 and Pugsley Road (Exit 19, Off Route 84). Of the proposed five lots, 3 will be the site for 4 buildings totaling 1,234,575 S.F of warehouse space. Lot 4 will remain vacant and Lot 5 will contain the wells to service the proposed buildings. This change from "Campus at Fields Corner" of 143 unit residential development, to warehouse will now have a far less environmental impact on that area. Without residential housing and no students to educate, there will be no impact on area schools. We believe this project will yield a net fiscal gain to this community; would generate an annual average of approximately ten times current property taxes of \$140,000.

Significant workforce and job creation is anticipated. From our labor force research, the direct, indirect and induced jobs to be created during the construction phase, is anticipated to be 919. This includes 665 direct jobs from the operation of the proposed facilities across a wide level of skills. We believe that due to its central location, many Town of Southeast residents, as well as surrounding communities, will want to take advantage of these job opportunities that in turn, positively impact family income as well as support their retail spending.

Of special note and with an eye on 'thoughtful economic growth', the owners are sensitive to maintaining the beauty and rural character of their acreage. They have offered acreage at this intersection for inclusion in the county owned Tilly Foster Farm project, further insuring its character and Town aesthetics.

Additionally, traffic volume associated with warehouses is remarkable. Extensive mitigating proposals are in place to target this matter. Specifically, the intersection, the time of each traffic pattern, the signalization of the intersection, offering dual left turns with shared right turns along Pugsley road as well as widening NY 312 to receive the dual left turn. Traffic signal timing improvements are also proposed at the intersection of NY 312 and Independent Way.

We support this proposal and believe it is within keeping with thoughtful economic development while bringing rate-ables and jobs to Putnam County's Town of Southeast.

(B-46, Putnam County Economic Development Corp.)

Response No. 2-15

Comments noted.

Comment No. 2-16

We respectfully request copies of all future submissions as an Interested Party and we reserve our right to comment further on the project as it moves through the review process.

(B-98, Snyder & Snyder)

DEIS, page 1-53, add the Office of the NYS Attorney General, Watershed Inspector General, Environmental Protection Bureau as an interested party.

(B-108, Watershed Inspector General)

Response No. 2-16

The Office of the Watershed Inspector General has been added to the list of Interested Agencies. A law firm is not typically considered an Interested Party, and can obtain information on the progress of the SEQRA process via the Town's website.

Comment No. 2-17

I do not see any attributes that this project could possibility bring to our community.

(B-118, Cherie Ingraham)

Response No. 2-17

See Response 2-2 and Response 10-3.

Comment No. 2-18

Quality of life – a 24x7 trucking / warehouse operation is not the type of high paying jobs that makes sense to bring into Putnam county. Why is the board even considering an option for 24x7?

(B-135, Alison Yara)

24 hour operation

(B-139, Tonia Olsoe-Rubeo)

And may allow for over 500 truck trips per day, with needed 24 hour access.

(B-142, Steve & Susan Elias)

I am concerned about things with the 24/7 operation.

(B-145, Hearing No. 3 (Mr. Gress))

Has any of them addressed not being 24/7 at this point? In terms of running overnight, is there any thought to having set hours where you're not actually – (Indiscernible) – 10:00 at night? I'm not sure if that's been run into the modeling or if you're, kind of, just assuming a 24/7 operation.

(B-145, Hearing No. 3 (Mr. Hecht))

I am also in favor of restrictions. I've done a lot of research. There's plenty of logistics centers, warehouses, whatever you want to call them, that do not run overnight, that shut down on a certain time frame, so you don't have trucks coming in and out during the overnight hours.

(B-145, Hearing No. 3 (Mr. Hecht))

Response No. 2-18

See Response 2-3.

Comment No. 2-19

In terms of the layout of the buildings, you know, we talked when we were on site. I don't – I still don't understand why there's four buildings in this proposal for a logistics center. I mean, even some of the examples that you shared with us in the prior slide, the smaller building, much smaller than Gap, was half a million square feet. So I'm not sure why you have four separate buildings here split up.

(B-145, Hearing No. 3 (Mr. Larca))

What I'd like to see, as you discussed and we discussed, is Buildings 3 and 4 combined and pushed away from Twin Brooks. And again, I don't know why Buildings 1 and 2 are separate. I know the lot line is in between Buildings 1 and 2.

(B-145, Hearing No. 3 (Mr. Larca))

And I think some of this is probably similar to what Eric said, but if – you know, if we can get rid of Barrett Road -- or I think you discussed privatizing it. I'm even saying get rid of it. Is there a way to shift both buildings away or even combine Buildings 3 and 4 into one building, something like that? Just, you know, anything we can do to get away from those communities, I think, would be great.

(B-145, Hearing No. 3 (Mr. Cyprus))

And I'd also -- you know, the buildings have always been a little bit odd for me, the number of them or the way they are -- I don't know how the site fully functions from a, you know, mile above view. So maybe you can drill into that and show us, and maybe you'll discover something that might unlock a solution that might be more beneficial. I don't know. That's it.

(B-145, Hearing No. 3 (Mr. Rush))

Response No. 2-19

See Response 2-2, Response 2-3, and Response 2-5.

Comment No. 2-20

And I don't know if you have to answer this in the FEIS, but I'm curious to know if you get the – the use approved but not the zoning change, will you abandon Building 1 and move forward with this project on a smaller scale?

(B-145, Hearing No. 3 (Mr. Larca))

Response No. 2-20

Unlike the DEIS Plan, the Preferred Alternative Plan proposes no zoning text or zoning map amendments, including no rezoning proposed of any portion of the Applicant's property that is in the Town's RC "Rural Commercial District". All of the Applicant's property located in the RC District will remain zoned RC District. The stormwater retention and septic facilities sized specifically for Building A are located in the RC District portion of the property and are permitted under the Town's zoning ordinance. No buildings will be situated in the RC District; rather, all buildings will be situated on Lots 2 and 3, which are wholly within the OP-3 District (Figure I-3).

Comment No. 2-21

And I think one of the biggest issues with this project is that you don't have a tenant; so everything is hypothetical. So I'm curious to know if you've been talking to any potential tenants and what that would look like.

(B-145, Hearing No. 3 (Mr. Larca))

Response No. 2-21

The Applicant with its marketing team is actively engaged with the marketplace and is generating user interest in the project. The property needs to have approvals to attract serious interest and commitment from users, as users generally do not consider sites until they understand whether or not the property can be developed for their intended use.

Comment No. 2-22

Can you include the full marketing pitch/statements being presented by CBRE to prospective clients?

(B-154, Carlos Passi)

Can you share the list of potential tenants?

(B-154, Carlos Passi)

Response No. 2-22

See Response 2-21. As stated in that response, the property needs to have approvals to attract serious interest and commitment from users, as they generally do not consider sites until they understand whether or not the property can be developed for their intended use.

However, CBRE marketing materials can be found online at:

http://images1.loopnet.com/d2/TIZZqxp2fj8PqmhALj7OBdK2r_ziqLbYZH-aRoTKjjw/document.pdf.

These materials are clear that the proposed project is a “planned development” that “is currently going through a coordinated approval process.”

Comment No. 2-23

The environmental impacts on quality of water, flora and fauna are all very clearly defined and must be followed by both the applicant and the Town.

(B-159, Daniel Armstrong)

Response No. 2-23

Comment noted. The purpose of this environmental impact statement process is to assess the means for avoiding or mitigating the project's potentially significant adverse impacts to the maximum extent practicable, consistent with social, economic, and other considerations.

Comment No. 2-24

Is this project already approved and will the building (construction) be going forward? If not yet approved will there be a public vote?

(B-164, Dalia Valdajevaite)

Response No. 2-24

The project is not yet approved. The process is to complete the State Environmental Review Act (SEQRA) review of the entire project before the project may proceed to the Town Board for Special Permit approval, demapping of Barrett Road, and to the Planning Board for Site Plan Approval, Subdivision Approval, and a local wetland permit

Public hearings will be conducted during each phase of the process to obtain public input, but there will be no public vote, which is true for any land use application.