

Appendix A DGEIS Public Hearing Materials

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

CHAIN WORKS DISTRICT
REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement
PUBLIC HEARING
March 29, 2016

LEAD AGENCY:

City of Ithaca Planning and Development Board
City of Ithaca, 108 East Green Street
Ithaca, NY 14850-5690

MODERATOR:

Adam S. Walters, ESQ., Special Counsel to City
Planning and Development Board
PHILLIPS LYTLE, LLP
One Canalside, 125 Main Street
Buffalo, New York 14203-2887

BOARD MEMBERS:

Garrick Blalock, Chair
Robert Lewis
MaKenzie Jones-Rounds
Mark Darling
John Schroeder

REPORTED BY:

Delores Hauber, Shorthand Reporter, Notary Public

1 MR. BLALOCK: Welcome, everybody, to
2 the public hearing of the Draft
3 Environmental Impact Statement for the
4 Chain Works District. I'm here as the
5 chair of the planning board and I believe
6 we have a quorum of the board here. If we
7 can have the board members introduce
8 themselves.

9 MR. LEWIS: Rob Lewis, member of the
10 planning board.

11 MR. DARLING: Mark Darling, member of
12 the planning board, liaison with public
13 works.

14 MS. JONES-ROUNDS: MaKenzie
15 Jones-Rounds, member of the planning board.

16 MR. SCHROEDER: John Schroeder member
17 of the planning board.

18 MR. BLALOCK: What would the members
19 of the planning board like to do?

20 MR. DARLING: I would like to move to
21 open the public hearing.

22 MR. BLALOCK: Is there a second?

23 MS. JONES-ROUNDS: Second.

24 MR. BLALOCK: All those in favor.

1 (ALL IN FAVOR.)

2 MR. BLALOCK: The public hearing is
3 now open and Adam Walters is going to
4 explain how the process is going to work.

5 MR. WALTERS: Good afternoon,
6 everyone. My name is Adam Walters. I'm an
7 attorney at Phillips Lytle and I'm special
8 counsel to the City Planning and
9 Development Board for purposes of the Chain
10 Works Project DEIS. My practice focuses on
11 land use and development and in particular
12 the State Environmental Quality Review Act.

13 SEQRA is a complex law. Most people
14 find, if not very difficult to understand,
15 at least challenging and somewhat
16 confusing.

17 In its broadest possible terms SEQRA
18 has two basic purposes. First, it requires
19 governmental agencies to document their
20 decision making and in particular to
21 identify adverse environmental impacts that
22 may result from government actions. In
23 this case we're talking about specifically
24 adverse environmental impacts that will

1 result from the Chain Works Redevelopment
2 Project. Second, it requires governmental
3 agencies to mitigate to the maximum extent
4 practicable their adverse environmental
5 impacts associated with their projects.

6 This information, the adverse
7 impacts, is really all spelled out in a
8 document we like to call the Draft General
9 Environmental Impact Statement or DGEIS.
10 DGEIS contains a very detailed project
11 description, a description of different
12 alternatives to the project, a description
13 of the environmental setting, the potential
14 impacts and mitigation measures proposed
15 for the project. The identification of
16 irreversible and irretrievable commitments
17 of resources and unavoidable adverse
18 effects. It also contains a discussion of
19 future environmental reviews for future
20 project related development.

21 This afternoon and this evening the
22 lead agencies will hold a public hearing on
23 the DGEIS and I've be asked to act as the
24 moderator for tonight. A notice of the

1 adoption of the DGEIS and public notice for
2 the hearing was published in the Ithaca
3 Journal as well as the Environmental Notice
4 Bulletin.

5 And the purpose of tonight's hearing
6 is really to receive comments on the DGEIS.
7 I should stress that the hearing is not
8 intended to be a question and answer
9 session. All of the comments you make
10 tonight will be recorded. We will have an
11 official transcript. Most of the board
12 members are here. They just introduced
13 themselves. They will have a full
14 transcript of everything that is said
15 tonight on the record. And we'll review
16 that very carefully after the hearing.

17 We've kind of taken a little bit of
18 different format. Usually the project
19 sponsor starts off with the presentation,
20 but we wanted to start a little earlier in
21 case there were folks who wanted to make
22 sure they got here a little early to get
23 their comments on the record. So the
24 presentation by the project sponsor is

1 going to be at 5:00, or 5:30, an hour and a
2 half from now. If you would like to make
3 your comments after you see the
4 presentation, that's perfectly fine. You
5 can wait. But if you would like to make
6 your comments earlier, we would welcome
7 that.

8 The kind of rules of order for
9 tonight, pretty straightforward. If you
10 haven't already done so, please make sure
11 you sign in on the sign-in sheet at the
12 table. That is our official record of
13 attendance for the hearing tonight. On the
14 sign-in sheet you will find registration
15 cards for speakers. If you would like to
16 speak, all you need do is fill out a
17 registration card. We'll occasionally
18 collect those. Bring them up here. We
19 will call them in the order that we receive
20 them. If you would like to make a comment,
21 but you don't want to get up in front of
22 anybody or speak into a microphone, simply
23 fill out the registration card. Put your
24 comments on the back of the card and hand

1 it in. That will be part of the official
2 comment record for tonight's hearing.

3 There is a copy of the Draft Generic
4 Environmental Impact Statement right on the
5 back table so feel free to take that. In
6 light of the break we're going to do and
7 looking around I see we are probably not
8 going to have speakers straight through to
9 5:30, I'm sure we will take a break at some
10 point. I will also use my discretion as
11 moderator to say normally we would put time
12 limits on speaking, at least at this stage
13 in the public hearing. It makes sense to
14 let people go for a reasonable amount of
15 time. We'll say somewhere around eight
16 minutes. That sounds reasonable. Any
17 questions before we get started? I do have
18 one question.

19 SPEAKER: Can you just remind people
20 if they are to speak to speak into the
21 microphone so it can be recorded and if I
22 can get you to raise your microphone.

23 MR. WALTERS: You can. Okay. So as
24 we call speakers, you do not have to come

1 up front. You can speak from where you
2 are. We would just ask you to stand up and
3 we will hand out a microphone. We will ask
4 you to speak directly into the microphone
5 so everybody can hear you as I am now
6 doing. Shall we take a moment just to pass
7 out cards if anybody, have any cards come
8 in yet?

9 SPEAKER: Anybody else need a card
10 that wants to speak?

11 MR. WALTER: Again you can feel free
12 to wait until after the project sponsor
13 speaks. That means you'll probably be here
14 a little later. The project sponsor is
15 scheduled to go from 5:30 to 6:30. It will
16 be about an hour. It's pretty detailed
17 presentation on the project. If we have
18 got a large crowd after the project sponsor
19 speaks, we may shorten down the time
20 periods available. So if you will have a
21 little more to say, you might want to
22 exercise your option earlier rather than
23 later. Just a thought. Doesn't look like
24 we have any cards yet. I will not tell my

1 SEQRA joke. Anybody think they would like
2 to speak? If not, we can certainly just
3 table things for a while and pick this up
4 again in a half an hour and see if there
5 are more folks that would like to speak.
6 Wait. There might be a card coming in.

7 MS. JONES-ROUNDS: I have a question
8 about point of order. How long will this
9 public comment period last and how else are
10 people able to make comments? And at which
11 point will the planning board be closing
12 the public hearing?

13 MR. WALTERS: Those are really good
14 housekeeping questions. The question is
15 how long and how else can you make
16 comments. And this is the commencement,
17 this is the formal public hearing, but
18 there is an open public comment period on
19 the Draft Generic Environmental Impact
20 Statement. That comment period goes from
21 60 days from the date of acceptance of the
22 DGEIS by the lead agency. And you can
23 submit written comments directly to the
24 board. Letter format is fine. I believe

1 we take e-mails and we encourage that.
2 Save some paper. And the comment period
3 ends, Lisa, on?

4 For the record the public comment
5 period ends on May 10th, so please get your
6 written comments in before then. Again if
7 you would like to listen to tonight's
8 comments, if you don't want to make a
9 comment tonight here in the presentation,
10 you can review the document at your leisure
11 and write in some comments to the board.
12 This is part of a Generic Environment
13 Impact Statement.

14 The way SEQRA works we do, the
15 project sponsor has put together a Draft
16 Generic Environmental Impact Statement that
17 the lead agency has accepted as adequate
18 for public review. That opens up basically
19 the 60-day comment period. Every
20 substantive comment received on the DGEIS
21 must be responded to. There must be a
22 written response. That will be contained
23 in a document called the Final Generic
24 Environmental Impact Statement, or FGEIS.

1 So for the record there will be a response
2 to every single comment made. To the
3 extent a comment triggers a modification to
4 the Draft Generic Environmental Impact
5 Statement, that too will be contained in
6 the FGEIS.

7 Any comment cards? Anybody would
8 like to kick things off? All right.
9 Everybody's shy. That's okay. Do we want
10 to just table things for maybe 20 minutes
11 and see then if anybody wants to go? The
12 document is here if anybody would like to
13 review it. I would suggest based on where
14 we are, we will check in again at say 5:45
15 or 4:45 and see if anybody would like to
16 make any comments for the record. If not,
17 we will then adjourn until 5:30 when the
18 project sponsor will do their presentation
19 and I will go through the rules again. But
20 again you're welcome to make comments now.
21 If nobody's interested, I don't think we
22 need a formal motion from the board. We'll
23 simply informally table the hearing so that
24 the transcript reporter can take a break

1 because there's been so much so far. Thank
2 you.

3 (RECESS TAKEN.)

4 MR. WALTERS: It's, good afternoon
5 everyone. It is 4:48. And when we broke
6 at about 4:20 I said I'd check back in and
7 see if anybody would like to speak, make
8 any statements on the record prior to the
9 presentation by the developer at 5:30. So
10 I just want to take a moment to ask anybody
11 if they would like to make a statement
12 before the presentation? Looking around
13 the room and seeing no hands, we will take
14 a break then until 5:30 and the project
15 sponsor will do their presentation. Thank
16 you.

17 (RECESS TAKEN.)

18 MR. WALTERS: Good evening, everyone.
19 We are going to, many of you missed some of
20 the earlier announcements. I, as the
21 moderator for the DGEIS public hearing, I
22 will make a number of housekeeping
23 announcements once the project sponsors
24 have completed their presentation, but

1 without further ado I'll ask the project
2 sponsor to come up and do their
3 presentation of the project.

4 (PROJECT PRESENTATION.)

5 MR. WALTERS: Again for the record my
6 name is Adam Walters. I'm special counsel
7 to the lead agency, the City Planning and
8 Development Board. As I mentioned earlier
9 the lead agency is holding a public hearing
10 tonight right now on the Draft Generic
11 Environmental Impact Statement and I've
12 been asked by the lead agency to serve as
13 the moderator.

14 A notice of the adoption of the DGEIS
15 and public notice for this hearing was
16 published in the Ithaca Journal and
17 Environmental Notice Bulletin. The purpose
18 of today's hearing is to receive public
19 comments on the DGEIS. I should stress
20 that the hearing is not intended to be a
21 question and answer session. All of the
22 comments as Jamie mentioned will be taken
23 down tonight, they will be transcribed and
24 they will be responded to individually in

1 the Final Generic Environmental Impact
2 Statement.

3 In terms of the ground rules for
4 tonight's public hearing; first, if you
5 haven't already done so we'd ask that you
6 sign in, sign the sign-in sheet so we have
7 an official record of everybody that is at
8 the hearing. If you would like to speak we
9 would ask you to fill out a speaker
10 registration form. There's not a lot of
11 information on there, but it helps us keep
12 track and helps the stenographer keep track
13 of who spoke.

14 I will just pull these in order. If
15 anybody would like to speak, you do not
16 need to come up here. We will pass you a
17 microphone. We just ask that you stand for
18 purposes of making your presentation. We
19 would ask you to keep your time frame to no
20 more than ten minutes just so that
21 everybody who would like to speak has an
22 opportunity. Speakers will be allowed to
23 use their time to their best advantage
24 without interruption from the floor.

1 If you are reading from a prepared
2 statement, please keep in mind you can
3 summarize your statement and submit the
4 full text to be entered into the record.

5 Finally, if you are not comfortable
6 making a comment tonight, you may certainly
7 do so in writing. One easy way to do that
8 is simply to fill out the speaker
9 registration card and put your comments on
10 the back. We will collect these. They
11 will become part of the official comment
12 record. But you can also submit written
13 comments again through May 10th, 2016 to
14 the lead agency. Contact information is
15 right there on the screen for you if you
16 would like to write that down. It is also
17 available on the website
18 chainworksdistrict.com. If you go to that
19 website and go to the planning documents,
20 you can down link to the DGEIS. You can
21 also enter DGEIS on the website. You can
22 submit comments directly through the
23 website. Those comments will come to the
24 lead agency. So feel very comfortable

1 doing that if you would prefer that
2 alternative.

3 Those really are the ground rules for
4 tonight. With that, does anybody need a
5 card who doesn't have one? Lisa will be
6 happy to deliver one or two. We will take
7 a minute. If you have your card filled out
8 and would like to speak, feel free to bring
9 it up here or pass it back to Lisa and with
10 that we can call people up.

11 Okay. The first speaker is going to
12 be Bob Stundtner.

13 MR. STUNDTNER: Stundtner.

14 MR. WALTERS: Stundtner. I
15 apologize. For my name butchering, I
16 apologize in advance. Mics are coming
17 around.

Comment ID# 5A

18 MR. STUNDTNER: So first I think it's
19 really important for me as a neighbor, I
20 live at 333 Spencer Road in the City of
21 Ithaca. I share a 410 foot property line
22 with this project. One of the streams that
23 runs through the project passes through our
24 property, so things flow downhill.

1 I think it's really important to say
2 I think this is a great idea to redevelop
3 this former industrial site into a mixed
4 use property.

5 One of the things I'm a little
6 troubled about is the emphasis on new
7 development outside the actual previously
8 developed area and in particular the
9 development to the south of the site that's
10 currently wild. What I would like to know
11 is if the emphasis of approvals is on the
12 new outside the existing footprint of the
13 buildings areas, what guarantee do we have
14 as a community that the former industrial
15 site will ever be developed? Comment ID# 5B

16 Two, I think it's kind of a problem
17 for me thinking about that sewer line that
18 runs through the southern end of the
19 property. Back in the '80s there was a
20 pretty substantial leak in the town portion
21 of that line. So whenever there was a
22 substantial rainstorm sanitary products,
23 feces, urine, obviously you can see the
24 stuff in the stream flow. So it would be a

1 wild assumption on my part to think that
2 NCR, the previous owner of the South Hill
3 Business Campus, was such a good citizen
4 that they never dumped any contaminations
5 into their property and this didn't migrate
6 anywhere beyond that, particularly when the
7 sanitary sewer leaked substantially.

Comment ID# 5C

8 I've lived on that property at 333
9 since 1980. I've seen a lot of change in
10 the ecology of our two and a half acres.
11 Deer have a pretty substantial impact on
12 it. I've had deer shot in my yard in the
13 city limits. I've had deer hit by cars and
14 land in the creek bed. I've had to have
15 city police come over and shoot wounded
16 deer in the yard. Like oh, my God, I've
17 never been this close to a deer before,
18 boom.

19 So the notion that developing that
20 south end is going to have some impact with
21 the deer, the deer moving around. Good
22 Lord the deer have decimated the hillside
23 as it is, the ecology of the hillside.
24 Anything of native species in my yard, the

1 small things, shrubs, small plants, all
2 gone. Deer browse them away. So I think
3 that is an understated impact. Comment ID# 5D

4 But my principle concern is that the
5 new portions would get developed and the
6 existing structures would never get
7 developed because we're talking about a
8 huge sum of money here. And I believe your
9 site plan and proposal emphasizes return on
10 investment, which I don't have a problem
11 with, but I would like to see the emphasis
12 put on the existing structures as first
13 steps and good indication of the ultimate
14 development being responsible.

15 MR. WALTERS: Okay. Our next speaker
16 is Rich DePaolo. Comment ID# 6A

17 MR. DEPAOLO: Hi. My name is Rich
18 DePaolo, a resident of Town of Ithaca. I'm
19 also on the Town of Ithaca board. I'm
20 speaking tonight as a citizen and also as a
21 board member, but not on behalf of the Town
22 of Ithaca.

23 I finally got an opportunity to start
24 reading the EIS and supportive documents

1 today. And I foolishly took it upon myself
2 to add up the total number of pages
3 supplied on the flash drive last Thursday.
4 There are over 80,000 pages including the
5 appendices to the Phase 1 and Phase 2
6 Environmental Site Assessment. So first
7 I'll say that I would hope that the
8 developer would be open to the idea of
9 requesting an extension to the comment
10 period because I don't think it's realistic
11 to expect residents and municipalities to
12 provide substantive and comprehensive
13 public comment in a 60-day timeframe when
14 we're talking about literally thousands and
15 thousands of pages of material. I did not
16 get past chapter five today. I will admit
17 I read about 20 pages and I came away with
18 one overarching observation and concern
19 which is that the proposed, the proposed
20 remediation and mitigation is so, there's a
21 laundry list of items that are typically
22 applied in situations where sites are
23 extensively contaminated, but there are
24 virtually no specifics related to this

← Comment ID# 6B

1 site. And the entire, the future is sort
2 of being weighted out as one that is going
3 to be addressed on a site specific basis as
4 issues come up.

Comment ID# 6C

5 And I can tell you that is troubling
6 from a lay perspective and also as a
7 legislature who is being asked to provide
8 permission by zoning for the process to
9 continue. I would like to see more
10 concrete steps. I would like to know based
11 on the fact that the site has been somewhat
12 delineated now and the contamination has
13 been known about for a considerable period
14 of time, I would like to see what the
15 outcome of these discussions between the
16 developer and Emerson and DEC are going to
17 be, how these things are going to take
18 shape over the next however many years it
19 takes to implement them.

20 But I'm hesitant as a legislator to
21 grant what amounts to a blank check to
22 allow for a significant development to take
23 place without knowing whether or not the
24 allowance for the uses that are proposed

1 are going to be, they are going to result
2 in uses that are happening on a severely
3 contaminated site.

Comment ID# 6D

4 So I would say that this has been an
5 issue for decades and the fact that the
6 site hasn't been properly remediated or
7 controlled up to this point does not give
8 me a lot of confidence that granting this
9 sort of carte blanche at this point in time
10 is going to result in the level of
11 remediation I would like to see on the
12 site.

13 MR. WALTERS: Thank you very much.

14 Next speaker is Walter Hang.

Comment ID# 7A

15 MR. HANG: Hi. I only found out
16 about this document yesterday evening and I
17 took a really quick look essentially at
18 some of the appendices in chapter five.
19 One thing I would like to clarify is that
20 class two designation is significant threat
21 to the public health or environment action
22 required, closed quote.

23 So the problem with this site is that
24 for something on the order of 30 years it's

1 never been cleaned up. So the dual phase
2 vapor recovery groundwater pump treatment
3 of the fire reservoir is ineffective.

4 By going through the documentation
5 the areas of the incredible high level of
6 pollution are just mind boggling. And
7 cutting out the little fire reservoir isn't
8 going to accomplish anything. It's
9 regulatory exceedances for petroleum
10 products, corrugated solvents, heavy
11 metals. It's just absolutely mind
12 boggling. And so this obviously poses a
13 threat as was noted through some vapor
14 intrusion into the possible structures that
15 are proposed to the site. There's going to
16 be fugitive dust problems. There's massive
17 groundwater contamination that's never been
18 cleaned up.

Comment ID# 7B

Comment ID# 7C

Comment ID# 7D

19 So with every investigation the areas
20 of concern, the recognized environmental
21 conditions just become more numerous. So
22 before I get around to reviewing this
23 massive document that is as Mr. DePaolo
24 noted is 80,000 pages, I will offer written

1 comments. But I think that the bottom line
2 is that after so many decades of
3 contamination associated with this site, I
4 have no faith whatsoever that the
5 Department of Environmental Conservation is
6 going to require this site to be thoroughly
7 investigated or remediated. The original
8 record of decision was never implemented.
9 Revised record of decision was not
10 implemented. Basically there hasn't been
11 any remedial efforts past the dual phase
12 recovery groundwater treatment system
13 adopted circa '86 or something despite more
14 free flowing product that's not an aqueous
15 safe liquid. There's more contamination
16 leaking out of the site you can shake a
17 stick at.

Comment ID# 7E

18 I urge all city and town officials
19 not to approve any rezoning or any project
20 approvals whatsoever until there is an
21 absolutely comprehensive, viable,
22 meaningful cleanup plan that is negotiated
23 openly and transparently so that the public
24 can have confidence that this incredible

1 wide range of toxic hazards is going to be
2 resolved once and for all. They just
3 continue to ignore these hazards year after
4 year while the responsible party does
5 everything they can to try to reduce its
6 obligation to monitor the contamination, to
7 deal with the contamination problems that
8 are already known about. I think it's just
9 not a good way to go.

10 And again I think the key thing is
11 everyone wants jobs. Everyone wants low
12 income housing, a good place to live,
13 commerce. I'm all for that generally
14 speaking, but the bottom line is this class
15 two site, it's polluted, massively polluted
16 and hasn't been cleaned up. That's the
17 first priority. And I don't think that
18 engineering, institutional controls, caps
19 and all that leaving the contamination in
20 place is acceptable.

21 I think the bottom line is, and I've
22 advocated this from the very beginning, the
23 high level sources of contaminate has to
24 get dug out. It's source removal and got

1 to go and then ultimately I think this site
2 perhaps could be remediated to the point
3 where it doesn't pose a threat to the
4 people living around it. Many homes have
5 had sub pressurization systems installed,
6 but it's not all clear that they are
7 actually that effective because of the
8 reason that the aerated zone to allow
9 vaporization with the depressurization
10 system since many of the homes are built on
11 bedrock.

12 So I think that this has not been a
13 good situation since I identified the
14 problems at the site maybe 12 years ago
15 when your risk rider said there was no
16 clear declining trend in the groundwater
17 contamination. I think at that time the
18 Trexler was like 28,000. The potable
19 standard is five parts per million. So
20 this is just a continuing problem.

21 And it's just I think irresponsible
22 that it hasn't been resolved and I don't
23 think that these concerns should be ignored
24 any longer. And again I would reiterate

1 this project should not receive any of the
2 requested approvals in any way, shape or
3 form until the site is actually remediated
4 on a comprehensive basis in full compliance
5 with all applicable requirements; and I'll
6 put that in writing. Thank you.

7 MR. WALTERS: Thank you. Next
8 speaker is Cynthia Brock. Comment ID# 8A

9 MS. BROCK: Wow, kind of hard to go
10 after Walter. I've been looking at this,
11 I'm Cynthia Brock. I'm a resident of the
12 city and I also serve on the city council.
13 And I like many of us have been watching
14 this project over time before Chain Works
15 came forward and even the possibilities.

16 And like many of us here I see this
17 as an opportunity to try to achieve the
18 types of clean ups that so far we have had
19 no leverage to facilitate. So I'm excited
20 because of that. We have a tool in our
21 hands we didn't have before and that's a
22 good thing.

23 If we all want to see more housing,
24 safe housing we want to see a vibrant

1 community and we want to see every aspect
2 of the city being fully utilized and
3 contributing to the city. So I come at
4 that from this perspective. Comment ID# 8B

5 When I first started thinking about
6 looking at the DGEIS, I wanted to look at
7 the little tiny details that we typically
8 look at when we talk about planning. We
9 think about population and traffic and
10 zoning and so forth. In terms of that I do
11 believe that the DGEIS does not go far
12 enough in analyzing the population impacts
13 for the residents there. It uses an
14 analysis of two people per dwelling unit.
15 But it does no -- it does provide no
16 breakdown at all in terms of what the age
17 of that population might be. And if you
18 don't know the age of that population,
19 therefore it doesn't project what kind of
20 impact on the community it might have. Comment ID# 8C

21 Rutgers University put out a report
22 based on New York census data that says in
23 housing complexes of more than five units
24 for rent, a two bedroom generally houses

1 2.5 people and then it breaks down the
2 distribution, how many are preschool age,
3 how many are primary school age, how many
4 18 to 25, 25 to 45 and so on so you can
5 come up with an idea of what your community
6 will be and their needs. Based on that and
7 the projected 1,830 bedrooms. Instead of a
8 population of 18,030 -- actually no, I
9 guess you would put one, instead of a
10 population of 18,030, it would create a
11 population of 2,300 individuals just about
12 of which about 460 would be in primary
13 school, 230 would be 18 to 24, 970 25 to
14 44, 311 between 45 and 64. 72 in the ages
15 of 65 to 74. And 109 individuals age 75 or
16 older. That helps us inform when we think
17 about recreational resources. The DGEIS
18 talks about SW1 as being an open green
19 space, but makes no mention of recreational
20 resources that would support 480 primary
21 school individuals that would be living on
22 the site or 230, 18 to 24 year olds. What
23 kind of playground, green space, soccer
24 fields. A population of 2,030 individuals

Comment ID# 8D

1 is probably the entire population of the
2 flats of which we have several parks,
3 several playgrounds and several community
4 areas and supports and we have replicated
5 that here and the DGEIS has not described
6 how it would mitigate the need for
7 recreational space for the population it
8 will have.

Comment ID# 8E

9 The DGEIS also does not include King
10 Street and Stone Quarry in terms of its
11 parking, traffic impacts and for the volume
12 of individuals who are coming down from out
13 of town, I do believe that it will impact
14 those individuals who will just bypass
15 Aurora and go down Stone Quarry to get into
16 town and that should be included in the
17 traffic analysis. I requested it in the
18 scoping document. I was told that it would
19 be included in the scope so I was surprised
20 that it indeed was not included.

Comment ID# 8AL

21 So once you get away from the sort of
22 nitty gritty, fun things we like to think
23 about when we envision the future and as I
24 started delving into what some people have

1 said not only 80,000, over a 100,000 pages
2 of this document I am reminded that first
3 and foremost, even though we like to look
4 at the pictures and envision all of this,
5 first and foremost we are dealing with a
6 class two superfund hazardous waste
7 setting. And that in and of itself makes
8 me think, when I'm thinking about traffic
9 and playground feels like I'm putting the
10 cart before the horse because in my
11 understanding the sources of the
12 contamination that they are drawing out of
13 the fire water reservoir has never clearly
14 been identified. They don't know where
15 that source is coming from. They do know
16 that when they go through that pump and
17 treat system year after year after year
18 after year, the level of contamination that
19 they are pulling out is not going down.
20 It's staying pretty much the same. So
21 there is a tremendous source of
22 contamination likely under those buildings
23 that will continue to be a concern. Comment ID# 8AM

24 And I do know that when we talk about

1 systems and homes, whether or not we're
2 talking about heating systems or air
3 conditioning, water, sewer and so on, they
4 don't work all the time. And we put a
5 tremendous amount of faith in mitigation
6 systems. And when we know that there is an
7 danger underground, I don't have the
8 reliance or the confidence that leaving it
9 there and putting in a soil vapor intrusion
10 system or other system or capping it is
11 actually going to ensure an environment
12 that is going to be protected and safe for
13 the residents who will live there, many of
14 which as I've indicated will be primary
15 school and our youth.

Comment ID# 8AN

16 So it brings me back to what Rich has
17 said. Until we know what the cleanup plan
18 will be, the comprehensive cleanup plan of
19 the area will be, it is very hard from a
20 zoning standpoint, from a planning
21 standpoint, from a legislator who
22 ultimately will represent a significant
23 portion of these residents, it's hard to
24 put forward a plan that says we want

1 residential housing here. And I feel stuck
2 in this chicken and egg scenario Comment ID# 8AO

3 The underlying fact is is that like
4 others have mentioned I have not seen the
5 DEC compel clean up of the area. And I
6 don't have faith that even though we are
7 given the opportunity when the record of
8 decisions come forward to comment on that.
9 I don't have faith that the DEC will compel
10 remediation of the area so that we can be
11 insured that for generations and the future
12 of our children will be safe. Comment ID# 8F

13 And so I'm stuck because I know we
14 have 60 days. There's a lot to look at.
15 There's a lot to analyze. There is a lot I
16 do want to talk about, but I'm not quite
17 sure where to go from there. I will echo
18 Rich's request to extend that 60-day
19 comment period. Not only in looking at the
20 regular planning, traffic, population, all
21 of these other impacts, environmental
22 impacts as it was mentioned here earlier
23 today there were at least, if I can tell,
24 15 new areas of concern that are delineated

1 and outlined in the DGEIS which will, which
2 will need and can benefit from a closer
3 look and we will need additional time just
4 to look at those things. 60 days might
5 have worked for a regular development, but
6 this is a whole different kettle of fish
7 and it deserves a longer period of comment
8 and input.

9 MR. WALTERS: Thank you. Our next
10 speaker is George McGonigal. Anybody else
11 has cards to pass up, now would be the
12 time. This is my last card. Comment ID# 9A

13 MR. MCGONIGAL: Thank you. Like
14 Cynthia, I represent the first ward in the
15 City of Ithaca which includes South Hill.
16 And I won't repeat what has already been
17 said, but I will say I agree with extending
18 the comment period past 60 days. And I → Comment ID #9B
19 agree that this place has to be cleaned up
20 before it can be redeveloped.

21 I've been extremely excited about
22 this project and reusing these buildings
23 and opening up this part of the city and
24 the town is full of possibilities. These

1 particular drawings, when it comes to the
2 part of the city that I represent, I have
3 to say I'm shocked at how dense and tall
4 these apartment buildings are. This is a
5 neighborhood of single family homes and
6 you're proposing putting six story
7 apartment buildings in people's backyards.
8 I think that is out of line and I think
9 they will too. Thank you.

10 MR. WALTERS: All right. Would
11 anybody else like to make any comments for
12 the public record on the Draft Generic
13 Environmental Impact Statement? Yes,
14 please. Can you just fill out

15 MR. DESCHERE: I did fill out a card.
16 My name is Ken Deschere. I lived in one of
17 the houses that were shown on your map in
18 South Hill Terrace for the last 35 years.
19 Raised a family there. I worked in the
20 late '70s in the Morse Chain building 21.
21 I'm familiar with the area and some of the
22 problems that are faced by anyone trying to
23 clean up effectively the remediation.

24 And I just want, my biggest thing to

1 say is thank you to Mr. Lubin and his staff
2 and the people he is willing to spend money
3 on to develop the project. I worked with
4 environmental investigations and developed
5 the website looking at all the pollution
6 and took courses at Cornell and answered
7 all kinds of questions trying to better
8 understand all the pollution and the things
9 left behind by a century of industrial
10 operations. And the more we looked, the
11 more we found, the uglier it was and also
12 the clearer it was that the DEC and
13 Department of Health don't have the time,
14 resources and even inclination to try to
15 really work on solving these problems.
16 What it takes is an investment in time and
17 effort and expertise to try to bring some
18 meaningful project that hopefully will pay
19 good economic rewards to all of us to bring
20 that to fruition.

21 Just looking at the 80,000 documents
22 and the list of acronyms that extends for
23 six pages, it's pretty easy to see this is
24 complicating material and a lot of details

1 and a lot of bases that have to be touched
2 and I'm very grateful that someone, an
3 organization is willing to do that to try
4 to improve what's a very big part of the
5 city and has been for a very long time.

6 MR. WALTERS: Thank you. Okay. Did
7 anybody else fill out a card that might not
8 have made its way forward. Okay. We'll do
9 a final call. Would anybody else like to
10 speak tonight and comment on the Draft
11 Generic Environmental Impact Statement?
12 Okay.

13 With that this hearing will remain
14 open. It will be continued to the next
15 planning board meeting and at that point
16 the board will decide whether to close the
17 hearing. But we thank you for your time
18 and attention tonight and for your comments
19 and everyone drive home safe.

20
21 * *

22
23
24

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately in the notes taken by me on the above cause and that this is a correct transcript of the same to the best of my ability.

DELORES HAUBER