

## **CAC Meeting, April 4, 2022**

**Attending in person:** CAC members Jamie, Choral, David, Amy, Colleen, Jane. J. Hoffman, Planning Board Clerk, attended. Jay Lorenz attended the meeting as a prospective member. Meeting commenced at 6:30pm

We approved the March 7, 2022 meeting minutes.

**This meeting was devoted to a review of Part I of the Iron Star Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF).** Because the CAC has been asked by the Planning Board (PB) to provide additional review of the latest Iron Star proposal/revisions, we decided to do a step-by-step review of Part 1. After this detailed review, we decided that Jamie and Colleen will use the 18 questions and format of the Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) Part 2 as a way to present our concerns and review of the revised Iron Star proposal to the PB. CAC members will then add their comments and any revisions. All the points and questions listed below could indicate moderate to severe impacts from this project in terms of the EAF.

### **Here are points of concern we discussed.**

**Driveway or Road and Parking:** A road will trigger additional zoning regulations. What about emergency vehicles and drivers going to the public restaurant? Are there sufficient parking spaces for staff and public guests? Also, there is an unclear use of term “access roads” and questions re. dimensions which need to be reviewed by an engineer. Their estimate of 2.1 acres of impervious surface added is likely to increase given a change from a driveway to a road and more parking.

**Landscape Plan:** Proposed cottonwoods are short-lived and prone to storm damage. We need a mix of native trees and shrubs for natural look and durability.

**Septic Field:** Twenty people allotted for each septic field may be inadequate. The sizing is not clearly determined.

**Retreat Center:** Is this term consistent with the definition in the zoning rules?

**Impact of project and Land Use Types and Changes:** An engineer needs to review Iron Star’s numbers on the project’s impact as well as the numbers indicating land use change and cover types. Polygon areas appear to add to a number greater than total acreage of the development parcel.

**Stream buffers:** Part of their driveway/road is within the 100' buffer. Additionally, they have a 100' buffer from the stream but it does not look like the line was ground-truthed, nor have they included any wetlands along the stream. Does the newly enacted 150' buffer apply? Should they delineate, map, and provide buffers for any wetlands along the course of the stream? The plans do not show accurate setbacks.

**Storm water and point source runoff:** They have not shown how storm water runoff may impact adjacent properties or jurisdictional waters. Further, they have identified "pipe outfalls" as a new point source (D.2.e.ii) and then state that the runoff will be directed toward an onsite and offsite stream and federal jurisdictional wetlands (D.2.e.iii). Is there sufficient separation from the point source(s) that they will not require a State Pollution Discharge Elimination System Permit (SPEDES) or Army Corps review and approval?

**New Demands for Water:** An estimate of 4200 gallons of water daily and one existing and three new wells are likely to have an impact on the aquifer and neighboring wells. Property owners across the road need to be listed and notified. Also, they have not provided the depth to the water table, well depths, nor the pumping capacity of the private wells and potential impacts to the aquifer.

**Water recycling of gray water** for landscaping is not included in their plans.

**Bedrock and Existing Conditions:** They have not answered the question regarding bedrock depth. This could significantly impact what excavation needs to occur, septic design and layout, and well depths.

**Waste Management:** They have not identified the locations of the roll-off carts, which could impact sensitive environmental areas and could be an issue with the size of the existing access roads (and parking).

**Air Emissions** during project and road construction should be evaluated.

**Lighting** choices for Dark Sky compliance need scrutiny.

**Hazardous Waste** from construction vehicles and attendant gasoline, oil, and lubricants need to be addressed. Storage and use of such fluids and any

pesticides/herbicides used during operation should also be evaluated. Also, we need to investigate the impacts of an old adjoining waste dump that may contain hazardous waste.

## **Amphibian Crossings in Ancram**

Jamie led a successful amphibian crossing night. There will be a few more of these crossings/counts in April as weather and conditions permit.

## **Joint CAC Brochure**

We also distributed the new CAC brochure on recommendations to build houses sensitively in Columbia County. It's important to get these to area realtors (Jane knows some to reach) architects and planners.

Next CAC meeting is Monday, May 2, 2022 at the Town Hall.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 pm.