

Minutes of a Scoping Hearing held by the Town Board of the Town of Riverhead at Town Hall, Howell Avenue, Riverhead, New York on Wednesday, May 17, 2000 at 4:00 p.m.

Present:

Robert Kozakiewicz,	Supervisor
Christopher Kent,	Councilman (arrived at 4:14 p.m.)
Philip Cardinale,	Councilman (arrived at 4:16 p.m.)
Edward Densieski,	Councilman

Also Present:

Barbara Grattan,	Town Clerk
Dawn Thomas,	Town Attorney
Ronald Hill,	Engineer
Charles Voorheis,	Environmental Planner

Absent:

James Lull,	Councilman
-------------	------------

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "It's May 17th, the time is 4:09 and we're here in the Town Board Room for purposes of a scoping hearing on application of Head River or Heidenburg (phonetic), is that right? Okay. We have Mr. Hanley at the podium, I guess to give us some initial information as far as the purpose of this hearing."

Rick Hanley: "Yes. I think the Clerk wants to read the notice of public hearing first- "

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Thank you."

Rick Hanley: "-- and then I will describe it."

Barbara Grattan: "I have affidavits of publishing and posting for a scoping hearing to be held at Riverhead Town Hall, 200 Howell Avenue, Riverhead, New York at 4:00 p.m. on May 17, 2000 to identify those significant environmental impacts to be addressed in a draft environmental impact statement to be prepared in support of a special permit petition of Robert Heidenburg."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "See, I thought there was another name

on the application."

Rick Hanley: "Yes, there was."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Also, I guess for the record so that it can become part of the record, there has been a proposed scope for draft environmental impact statement which was hand delivered by counsel for the applicant, that was provided to the town yesterday and it's a one, two, three, four, five, six page document and that should be made part of the record. Thank you."

Rick Hanley: "Just for the audience sake, there are a number of copies of that draft scope on the table where the stenographer is, if they want to read along while we go through this."

The Clerk has described the petition and the purpose of this hearing. Upon the receipt of the petition by the Town and the review of the environmental assessment form by the Planning Board and the Planning Department, we identified a number of significant environmental issues that we expect to be addressed in the EIS. These include impacts to land resulting from construction period over one year; impacts to ground water resulting from potential contamination in a volume of waste water generation beyond the capacity of the Riverhead Sewer District; impacts to transportation networks resulting from the generation of motor vehicle trip ends which would reduce the level of service of existing roadways, intersections and private driveways; and impact to community character and growth with respect to economic impacts on existing commercially and industrially zoned area and approved projects within those areas.

Further, the Planning Board in recognition of a different and distinct special permit petition from this same applicant on contiguous property owned by the same individual we believe, they have asked that the impacts that are associated with that particular project, also be made part of this EIS. Those are the petitions for the take-out restaurants on the neighboring property.

The scope of issues that have been- or the draft scope that has been submitted by the applicant to a certain extent, I think, went further beyond what we saw, so I think maybe the applicant would like to describe the impacts he has assessed and that should do it. Thank you."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Thank you, Rick."

Allen Smith: "Mr. Supervisor, Councilman Densieski, my name is Allen Smith. I represent Head River LLC which is a limited liability company, the members of which are Mr. Heidenburg and Mr. Lerner.

Mr. Hanley has correctly put before you the matters raised by staff and by the Planning Board and those are incorporated within the draft scope that was presented to you.

As a matter of style, when we first submitted the applications, we showed a hypothetical building of the parcel. Although the only application that is before the Board is for the lumberyard, it appears that a certain amount of confusion was generated by showing the hypothetical building. As a consequence, I have delivered down to Town Hall yesterday a drawing prepared by Mr. Young of the site, last dated May 15th of 2000. It is limited strictly to the lumberyard and shows the areas of the site not subject to the application as vacant land. And we would like the record to reflect that filing yesterday.

That having been said, as part of the analysis here, both including the other parcel mentioned by Mr. Hanley and the potential build out of the site under the existing zoning ordinance, the analysis on traffic will include an additional build out of 52,000 square feet. In doing that analysis, the traffic engineers will assume a 6500 square foot restaurant with 200 seats and 45,500 square feet of other uses. At the moment, the permitted uses within the Industrial A category really don't apply to this site with certain exceptions. You wouldn't build, for instance, a slaughter house on the site which is a permitted use. So for the assumptions of the analysis, they're going to consider 20,000 square feet of automotive repair which is a permitted use and the balance of the 45,500 as being office space.

I have present with me today, Mr. Stephen Lerner who is a principal of the firm, Mr. Charles Voorheis who will address any issues relative to the scope, Mr. Ronald Hill is a professional Engineer with Dunn Engineering who handles traffic. Mr. Young- Howard Young is our land surveyor and site designer with his engineer Mr. Wolpert and Mr. Adams. They are all present today and should the need arise, I'll have them forward.

We have handed out and we have distributed copies of the scope. As Mr. Hanley said, we took the scoping checklist and tried to include therein anything that might be of issue and we are prepared to, in fact, to a draft environmental impact statement in that regard. Thank you."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Thank you. Anybody else who would like to address the Board with respect to scoping issues?"

Charles Cetas: "My name is Charles Cetas. I'm Vice-President of the North Fork Environmental Council. I'd just like to point out that the April 18th notice for this scoping hearing was for a 155--115,000 square foot lumberyard, 225 seat restaurant, 30,000 square feet structure and- no, that's 6,000 square foot structure. So did you- was there another notice for this hearing? Or is this the only notice? Because the project that was notified- noticed in the paper was not the project described by the applicant today.>"

Barbara Grattan: "April 27th. Right, April 27th issue?"

Charles Cetas: "Yes. Right. So I'll say you need to postpone this hearing because you need a notice of hearing again. The property described in the newspaper is not the property he just described."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "It's my understanding we don't even have to have a formal hearing such as this. Would you agree with that?"

Charles Cetas: "Well, the thing is he just submitted that map as of yesterday to the Town. How can the Town have had time to even properly analyze what has been submitted to come up with issues that the town may have with this particular project. It's a different project that what was originally submitted. And- "

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "The applicant's attorney is eager to address your comments so I'm going to give him the opportunity to respond."

Charles Cetas: "And I just got a copy of this draft scope just handed to me a moment ago by Mr. Smith."

Allen Smith: "What is before the Board today is a scoping hearing on the use and, again, where those hypothetical build out is where they (inaudible) up in this particular notice. The notice that's required here is not a jurisdictional notice. The scoping process does not necessarily require a hearing of this particular nature. There is ample notice that we're here today for a project on this particular site involving a lumberyard. That being said, if you want to renotice and redo it, I supposed we can but I'm not sure that that isn't- (a) it's not required; and (b) I'm not sure what that would add."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "I think for purposes of today, I'd like to just keep going further and certainly we can take the issue under advisement and if we see fit, then we can certainly renote if it's determined that's necessary but rather than have everyone come back at a later time, I don't think that would serve the purposes for which scoping or the SEQRA is designed. So let's proceed forward."

Charles Cetas: "As I understand, this project is for a lumberyard, i.e., Lowes- is it Lowes still?"

Allen Smith: "Lowes."

Charles Cetas: "It is Lowes. Okay. And other undetermined uses at this point other than a restaurant."

Allen Smith: "There is no other application pending before this Board whatsoever other than a lumberyard as depicted as a special permitted use. The entire purpose of trying to show a hypothetical build out was to analyze both the site and the potential uses of the property under the current zoning. There is no restaurant proposed; there is no office building proposed. It is simply the lumberyard."

Charles Cetas: "Well, hypothetical use, it says here hypothetical use of a 200 seat 6,500 square foot restaurant. That's in his draft scope. So. Hypothetical use being composed here."

I would say, you know, you still have a problem because, you know, you've got 21.2 acres. You have a proposed use of a lumberyard, Lowes, which is by your own (inaudible) report, a home improvement super store. It's a retail store. Retail is not allowed in Industrial A property. That's my point of view, the NFEC's point of view."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "You're talking about zoning as opposed to scoping, I guess?"

Charles Cetas: "Well, I think zoning is an issue that's covered under SEQRA and environmental impact statements, so zoning should be discussed whether if this project is conflicting with the Town zoning."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "So you'd like to have that as part of the discussion?"

Charles Cetas: "Yes."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Okay."

Charles Cetas: "You know, I believe there's a conflict here with the Town's zoning on the property. And Lowes is a retail outfit. It's not a lumberyard. I think you have a problem with segmentation because SEQRA requires that you, you know, that the applicant should disclose what his plans are, you know. What are the plans that the property has? And if it's going to be built in phases, all the phases that are contemplated for this project need to be fully analyzed. And if you don't know what those phases are, how can you analyze them? You know everything is hypothetical and conjecture. It's in the air somewhere. You know. How can you analyze it?"

So, you know, you're basically he's not going to tell you what the uses are going to be. You've got to basically analyze every single use in the Industrial A Use District in this impact statement. Every single one of them. Not just what he says office space. I don't even see office space as an allowed use in Industrial A. So how many restaurants are we proposing? He's got one, maybe it's four, five different restaurants. So that's, you know, what are we talking about other than a lumberyard or a super retail store?"

This project is, of course, going to need to be hooked up to the Riverhead sewage treatment plant and I just spoke to Kevin McAllister, the Baykeeper yesterday, and his investigation of the problems with Riverhead sewage treatment plant is that the plant has not met its discharge permit standards for nitrogen discharge basically since the new restriction went into effect in 1996. So you've got a big problem here with adding more flow, more nitrogen into the sewage system and I understand you just got another application for a big condominium project on Riverside Drive last week. I think it's a couple hundred-it's- what is it, 200 and some plus condominiums that's going to have be hooked up to the sewage treatment plant.

So I'd say you need to have a cumulative- what are the cumulative impacts to the sewage treatment system given the problem that the sewage treatment is having now with meeting the standards and the problems we're having in Flanders Bay with having to close shellfish beds and whatnot. The DEC closed all the shellfish beds in Flanders Bay from a while back.

I don't know, have they been reopened now, do you know?"

Councilman Densieski: "No, I don't know. When you see Mr. McAllister, maybe we can find out when Southampton is going to pay

their half of- what they haven't paid us in the last three or four years."

Charles Cetas: "Well, you can call him. He's got a business card, you can call him and ask him yourself."

Councilman Kent: "The new plant should be opened by October so I think it would be much in advance of any- of this construction being completed."

Charles Cetas: "Well, I think you have to take into account the fact that, you know, there are problems and so we hope, you know, that the improvements will address, you know, the problems that the plant has had over the years and but I think your staff report did say that there may be a problem that this project will exceed the capacity that was contemplated for this site, you know, at the time they did the study, as to how much flow is going to be allowed from each property along Route 58.

So if you have office space, if you have restaurants, I mean each different type of use has a different kind of flow and I think all those things have to be taken into account, so. I don't know if the Riverside Drive property- was that contemplated in the previous study or not, the H2M study? You know, it is right there next to the sewer plant, but was the flow from that property as a condominium project accounted for? And other projects. Don't you have a whole lot of other projects on Middle Road, senior citizen projects and whatnot. They're going to be using the sewage treatment plant. So I think all those things have to be considered in this impact statement."

Councilman Densieski: "I think the plant on Middle Road is- I may be wrong, but I believe they have their own sewage treatment plant. Is that correct or incorrect?"

Howard Young: "I think the (inaudible) is on site."

Councilman Densieski: "They have their own sewage treatment- "

Charles Cetas: "Yeah, some are not, so, anyway. That's a big issue with us is, you know, the impacts to the bay from the sewage treatment plant and the fact that you've got all these new projects eventually will be hooked up along Route 58. You know, you've got Riverhead Centre is going to be hooked up. I guess the Serota project if that ever gets built would be hooked up. This project would be hooked up. I don't know how many other existing businesses have not

been hooked up but will be hooked up eventually. So, and any other vacant properties, I guess, along Route 58 that may be built on eventually would be hooked up and so. Anyway, that's an issue.

Traffic, of course, is- we already believe that Riverhead- that Route 58 is over developed. We're having all kinds of problems with traffic on Route 58 now so this project will add to that, of course. Lowes is a high traffic, high volume type of store and so that area is naturally going to have a lot more traffic problems when it gets built, if it gets built.

Community character. What impact is this going to have on our existing economy that we have here, local businesses that may be affected by this. You know, we have at least a couple of smaller hardware stores, you know, downtown, one longtime family owned hardware store downtown. It's going to affect those kinds of businesses.

I know competition may not be the sort of taboo but the is fact I think it does affect our community character when you, affect locally owned family businesses. So, this property will be clear cut. It's 21.2 acres; it's going to be clear cut. My view, I think the Town of Riverhead ought to pass a law against clear cutting. Only 2.7 acres of the property according to the materials I have are going to be into lawns and landscaping, you know, artificial landscaping. They'll be using chemicals to maintain it, pesticides, herbicides, that kind of stuff.

It's in a ground water- you know, Zone III deep recharge protection zone. So when you're adding development of, you know, a major development of this nature on top of a deep water recharge, I think that's a major issue. You have, you know, a large parking field with oils and stuff being- I'm sure they'll have drainage recharge from the parking lot into the ground water, I assume, Allen. That's what's planned?"

Allen Smith: "Most parking lots have drainage, yes."

Charles Cetas: "Down into the ground water. Well, it completes the water cycle, having to go back in the air and come back down as polluted rain. So, anyway, that's a big issue. I think deep water recharge Area Zone III impacts to the ground water from the parking field, from chemical use from the landscaping. Any toxic chemicals that may be stored at the Home Depot. They have- I'm sure they'll have a garden center. Automobile products will be sold there. All

kinds of things."

Councilman Kent: "I think this is Lowes."

Charles Cetas: "Lowes. Yes. Well, Lowes, I've been to Lowes. They're just like Home Depot, you know, a Home Depot. You know. They're twins."

Councilman Kent: "He said Home Depot."

Charles Cetas: "They're similar to Home Depot."

Councilman Kent: "Okay."

Charles Cetas: "Okay. I've shopped at both."

Councilman Kent: "You're admitting that on the record?"

Charles Cetas: "Yes. I am. Not in Riverhead, not on Long Island. Other areas that I've been to."

Councilman Kent: "Oh, okay."

Charles Cetas: "So I do know what these facilities are like and they're an all purpose type of store. So, you know, like I say, it's a retail store. Retail stores aren't allowed in Industrial A and I think the original application said it was going to be a shopping center. And if it's going to be a shopping center, I think you need to consider the Business B restrictions as far as lot coverage and whatnot and the calculations I did, the original was 150,000- 157,500 square foot, that was the original application. Now I think it's even more-- let me add it up here."

Councilman Kent: "187,200 it looks like."

Charles Cetas: "187,200, well, I said the original was 17% coverage. I figured it out. I was using an acre of 43,560 square feet acre. So at 157,500 you're at 17% coverage so I think if you're going out there with almost 190,000 square feet now, it's probably close to 20% coverage, lot coverage. So, you know, if it looks like a shopping center, they said it was a shopping center to begin with. Walks like a duck, talks like a duck, acts like a duck, it's a duck. It's a shopping center. So I think you have to consider it as a shopping center in the impact statement as one of the alternative uses and getting to alternative uses, I think the Town ought to start

considering less intense uses along Route 58, i.e., recreational uses. I know there's a proposal for a mini golf- miniature golf facility, that kind of thing. Maybe that would generate less traffic, less pollution, less, less, less. So I would urge the Town to, you know, we do have a master plan going and urge the Town to even consider what's going on with the master plan in this impact statement. I think a lot of comments have been made during the focus groups that I've been to that, you know, they want less intense uses in Riverhead and less density, less, less, less, to preserve our character, to preserve our open spaces, to preserve our farmland, to preserve our natural resources, preserve our critical areas.

So I would say, you know, the Town ought to consider holding off on this project until the master plan is done and maybe even a moratorium on commercial site plans. So that's my comments for now and I assume there'll be opportunity for written comments. You know, what's the deadline for that? If you're going to have to renotice, I guess there'll be a different deadline- "

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "As I said, I think we've got to look at that issue and take it under- I don't think there is any need for this type of a hearing and- but I'll speak to counsel and make sure I feel comfortable with it. As a Town Board, I think we've got to- "

Charles Cetas: "Scoping, you know, we've always- "

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "-- we've addressed the issues. You've been up for about 15 or 17 minutes addressing all the issues that you feel need to be addressed in a DEIS, so I think the purpose for which we're here which is to identify all possible issues of environmental significance is being done. Whether we're getting into semantics or nuances or picayune little type of issues is something that I'll have to take up with counsel and make sure we feel comfortable as a Board with the notice and the implication of the map that's been submitted to us as a conceptual site plan and take it under advisement. And we'll discuss how long we wish to keep the public hearing- I mean this comment period open for purposes of this hearing which is the scoping for the draft."

Charles Cetas: "Right. Well, I want to just tell you, I haven't had a chance to put, you know, written comments and I would like to be able to do that and, you know, may be able to add more than what I said today, so- "

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Yeah, maybe 10 days from this hearing

or something like that."

Charles Cetas: "Ten days, a couple weeks?"

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Yes. All right."

Charles Cetas: "Okay."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Thank you."

Karen Leo: "Which mike is the working mike?"

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "I think the one to your left. Our right."

Karen Leo: "Okay. I'm Karen Leo from Rosenman & Colin, counsel to Riverhead Centre, LLC. Riverhead Centre owns property at the intersection of County Road 58 and Mill Road which is approximately a half mile from the site. I'd like to reiterate the request to keep the hearing open for the submission of public comments. The draft scope was submitted yesterday; we barely had time to review it let alone submit written comments. And today we have a new site plan which I haven't looked at yet but I assume is different from what's in the Town Clerk's file on the project. So we would like at least two weeks to submit written comments. We expect to include a report of an environmental scientist and although scoping is required under the SEQRA regulations, if you do do scoping you have to have meaningful participation and one day notice on a scope, I don't think can be considered meaningful. So we would like time to submit written comment.

Turning to the draft scope, Riverhead Centre's first and most general concern is that it's not at all clear what's planned for the property and therefore it's very difficult to evaluate the sufficiency of the draft scope. So far this property has been described in several different ways since the special permit application was submitted in November, 1999.

First it was a retail shopping center with a 115,000 square foot lumberyard, a 6,500 square foot restaurant, and two other buildings of unknown use of 6,500 square foot (inaudible), 30,000 square foot with associated water supplies, sewage disposal, parking, draining, landscaping, lighting. There was a traffic study submitted on April 4th which describes the property as having a 174,000 square foot Lowes, a 6,500 square foot restaurant, and 36,000 square feet of

retail which is not permitted on Industrial A. And the draft scope that we saw Monday describes the project in a third way, which is a 135,000 square foot lumberyard with parking in covered areas, and then references to an adjoining 2.71 acre parcel and a hypothetical build out of a 6,500 square foot restaurant and 45,500 square feet of permitted or specially permitted uses.

Now, it's not clear when the stuff became hypothetical. It's been planned all along. So, again, it's difficult to determine- again, I don't know- what's the square footage now on the site plan?"

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Total square footage? Of the conceptual plan that's before us?"

Karen Leo: "Yes."

Councilman Kent: "I think it's 187,200- we've got the total of the numbers you just gave me."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "It's the same square footage as described in the proposed scoping document. I don't know if you have a copy but that's- "

Karen Leo: "Okay. And Lowes- "

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "-- it's the same square footage as the conceptual plan and that document which was referenced earlier on show from what I've been able to determine to be best of my ability if I'm reading the map right, the same square footages."

Karen Leo: "So, then Lowes is still 135,000 square feet."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "135,200 square feet."

Karen Leo: "Okay. So obviously there's been some changes, you know. We hear today now that the uses are going to be, I guess we're still sticking to the 45,500 square feet of other and 6,500 square feet of restaurant. But, again, in order for the Board to adequately address the scope, it really needs to know the nature and size of the project and that's the only way to determine whether- what the potential impacts are going to be.

Again, we have these other uses now. Today we're told that they're going to be office and automotive repair but as Mr. Cetas pointed out under Industrial A the permitted and specially permitted

uses range widely. So in order for the EIS to be meaningful, the applicant has got to either identify what they're planning on building or consider the worse case build out under the applicable zoning.

Now going through the categories of the draft scope, Riverhead Centre has several specific concerns. The draft scope indicates that the EIS is going to examine impacts to groundwater and terrestrial ecology but it doesn't specifically state that the EIS is going to analyze a project's impacts on the tiger salamander preserve which is located directly across County Road 58 from the site.

This Board knows that preserve was created in connection with the Tanger development.

The groundwater in the area of this project flows south from the site to the preserve and there's a direct underground hydrogeological connection between this property and the preserve. So the final scope must provide for an analysis of the impact of this project on that preserve.

With respect to community services impacted by the project, we agree with Mr. Cetas that the impacts on the Riverhead sewage treatment plant have to be considered. We know that because counsel has advised the Planning Board that the site has been allocated a flow of 17,214 gallons per day and it's estimated the flow from this project will be 15,688 gallons per day. But the estimate flow includes only Applebee's, a second restaurant of unspecified square footage, and Lowes also with unspecified square footage. And this estimated flow does not include any of the other square footages that's being proposed, the 45,500 unknown uses- square feet of unknown uses.

Obviously this additional development is going to result in increased flow and given that the treatment plant is near capacity, the exact flow likely to result from this project must be known before the Town can properly evaluate the impacts on the sewage treatment system.

Regarding the proposed analysis of socio-economic conditions in the draft scope, the final scope should define the study area. We don't know the range of that study and also the methodologies that are going to be used to determine whether the project is going to have adverse socio-economic impacts.

With respect to traffic, the applicants propose a traffic impact

study that is going to consider the development of Phase I of the site with Lowes and then Phase II separately. This separation violates SEQRA's requirement that cumulative impacts be considered. And in order to avoid improper segmentation, the traffic study has got to address a future build condition that includes both Phase I and Phase II and, again, the exact size and nature of both Phases have to be defined. If Phase II remains undefined, the applicant must be required to consider the worse case build scenario under existing zoning.

It's also not clear from the draft scope what the study area for the proposed traffic study is going to be or what the major development in the proposed study area will be considered as part of the analysis for future no build condition. These should be defined in the final scope. In addition, the draft scope appears to be too limited with respect to the intersections that are going to be analyzed. In addition to those listed in the draft scope, the EIS should study the intersections of County Road 58 and Osborne; County Road 58 and Harrison Avenue; Mill Road and Route 25; and Kroemer Avenue and Route 25.

Finally there are two areas in the- that are not included in the draft scope that should be included in the final scope. We know the site is situated on a parcel of property that's formerly owned by AdChem which is a manufacturer, but despite this prior manufacturing history and the continued manufacturing that's going on there on the remaining AdChem parcel, the draft scope doesn't include any proposed analysis of hazardous materials on the site. In order to determine whether there's going to be any hazardous material impact, the final scope should require Head River to perform a preliminary site assessment and follow up sampling to determine whether the site contains any contaminants from past uses. If there are hazardous materials on the property, the applicants should be required to analyze whether there's any potential for these contaminants to impact people or the environment.

The draft scope also doesn't include an analysis of the more than one year construction impacts resulting from the project despite the Planning Board's April 25th resolution that required them to do so. So the final scope should provide for an analysis of such impacts.

So those are my comments today. So I thank you on behalf of Riverhead Center. And I would like to know is there going to be a- has the Board agreed to extend the hearing or are we going to get a decision on that?"

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "As far as written comment period?"

Karen Leo: "Yes."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Yes. I think we'll briefly discuss that and we'll make a statement today as far as that time period."

Karen Leo: "Okay. Well, we request two weeks for adequate- I think that would be adequate."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Two weeks is okay?"

Karen Leo: "Okay, thank you."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "That was easy. Anybody else who would like to address the Board with reference to the scoping on the Head River LLC? Anybody else? Once, twice, no further comment. We'll keep the public comment period open for written comment for two weeks from today's date, close of business. The time of what is that- 4- May 31 would be date. Chris has been kind enough to provide me with the date. So May 31, 2000, 4:30 close of business, written comment on the scoping. Thank you."

Allen Smith: "Thank you."

(Hearing left open to 4:30 May 31, 2000 for written comment)

Barbara Gutton
Town Clerk