Town of Schroeppel
Planning Board Meeting Minutes
October 22, 2025

Attendees, Don Clark, Chairman, William MacDonald, Dave Mosher, Regina Drumm, Lee Goodman, Pete Stancampiano, Gordon Walts, Robert Loreman, Leslie Orman, Recording Secretary and, Jeff Eaton, Attorney with CCF (on behalf of Wendy Lougnot).

1. Meeting called to order at 7:00pm.
2. Pledge of Allegiance recited.
3. Review and approval of minutes from September 24, 2025, Planning Board Meeting.
    a. On motion of G. Walts, seconded by P. Stancampiano, the minutes of September 24, 2025 minutes were unanimously approved.
4. Chesbro Road - Subdivision
    a. All fees have been paid.
    b. Tom Vona - Bardon Land Surveying - representing Craig and Frances Chesbro
    c. Application to be sent to Oswego County Planning for 239 review.
    d. Public Hearing to be scheduled for November 19, 2025, Planning Board Meeting.
        i. On the motion of L. Goodman, seconded by R. Loreman the Public Hearing is scheduled for the November 19. 2025 Planning Board meeting.
    e. Review of application and SEQR Review will take place at the November 19, 2025 Planning Board Meeting.
5. Nexamp Solar Farm Application, 71 Hoag Road
    a. 239 review required as presently agriculture lands
    b. Technical Review
        i. Applicant responses received on September 10 and September 22, 2025 (see attached).
    c. Status of overhead vs underground service into the site as required by the town code. Applicant has reviewed this change with National Grid and they are changing the configuration to 2-3 poles to a pad mounted system consisting of two pad mounted units outside of the fence.
    d. Board expressed concerns of the use of Arborvitaes being used as screening trees as they are susceptible to consumption by deer. Applicant to provide a planting list of deer resistant plants that can be used in place of Arborvitae trees.
    e. USACOE Wetland classification – Applicant has indicated that they were given a verbal non-jurisdictional determination by USACOE but a written determination has

not yet been provided – possibly due to delays with the current government shutdown.

f. C&S Engineers expressed some concerns with calculations and assumptions made for SWPPP calculations. Engineers' recommendation is that the assumptions made regarding flows are not conservative enough and should be recalculated. Applicant agreed to re-run the calculations to show what the resulting, more conservative, approach would in turn generate.

g. Impervious Surface Clarification – C&S indicated that the design documents are not clearly depicting that the concrete equipment pads are not clearly shown as impervious surfaces. Applicant agreed to show these pads in clearer reference.

h. C&S recommended that additional signage be located on the entry fence along HOAG road with emergency contact information. Applicant agreed to this recommendation.

i. C&S has requested that the applicants' engineer show the limits of disturbance and limits of clearing, more clearly on the design documents.

j. Noise calculation modeling document (Attachment #11) was submitted but not signed. Applicant indicated that the document was submitted for clarity and as a courtesy to the town. Applicant agreed to resubmit a signed copy of this document.

k. Applicant inquired as to who initiates the public notifications regarding public hearings and SEQRA notifications – the applicant or the town. It was clarified that all of the these notifications would be issued by the town or their legal representatives.

l. SEQRA process to start at the November 19, 2025 Planning Board meeting.

6. Grace Baptist Church

   a. ZBA provided approval of the requested variance for the parking space quantity exception.

   b. 239 review will be sent to Oswego County Planning Board in the next few days following this meeting and should be returned prior to the next Planning Board meeting on November 19, 2025.

   c. On motion of W. MacDonald, seconded by R. Drumm the Public Hearing is scheduled for the November 19. 2025 Planning Board meeting.

7. Motion to adjourn.

   a. On motion of P. Stancampiano, seconded by W. MacDonald, the Planning Board meeting was unanimously adjourned.

October 10, 2025

Town of Schroeppel Planning Board
Town of Schroeppel
69 County Route 57A
Phoenix, NY 13135

Re: Phoenix Oxbow Solar
Site Plan Application Material Review

File: 173.100.099

Dear Members of the Planning Board,

We have completed the second review of the materials submitted by the applicant, Nexamp Solar, LLC, and have prepared this consolidated status report, showing only unresolved and newly identified issues for the Planning Board's consideration.

I. Pending Comments

The following items are comments from the August 26, 2025 review that require further response, clarification, or documentation based on the applicant's September 10, 2025 submission.

Item 1 - Project Narrative

1b. Equipment Color Samples

- **Original Comment:** The Town Code requires that neutral colors and non-reflective materials be used to achieve visual harmony. Please provide color samples or manufacturer's specifications for all major visible components (e.g., racking, inverters, BESS units, fencing) for the Planning Board's review and approval.
- **Applicant Response:** The Project will comply with the Town's Code. Please see Attachment 2: 6.1-Phoenix Oxbow-Equipment Example Photos-09.09.2025
- Second Review Comment: Planning Board Approval Pending.

Item 4d - Site Plan Drawings (C-100, C-101 and C-102)

4d.i. Utility Lines Undergrounding

- **Original Comment:** The plan proposes new overhead utility poles for interconnection. The Town Code (§ 95-44.9 F.(1)(d)) requires all transmission lines to be buried underground unless demonstrated to be infeasible. The applicant must provide the required engineering data to justify the use of overhead lines so the Planning Board may consider a waiver.
- **Applicant Response:** The National Grid (interconnecting utility) standard interconnection layout is provided in the current site plan documents. The Project has been designed to follow National

Grid Design Standards. The National Grid Standards will be forwarded to the Town for review prior to the upcoming Planning Board Meeting as a seperate attachment.

- **Second Review Comment:** As discussed during the Planning Board meeting, the applicant will reach out to National Grid to install ground-mounted equipment to decrease the amount of overhead utility poles. It was anticipated that a minimum of 2 poles would be required.

4d.ii. Fire Apparatus Access Width

- **Original Comment:** The Project Narrative states that a 20-foot wide gravel access road will be constructed to comply with the Town Code for the passage of emergency vehicles. However, the Site Plan Drawings show the internal access road narrowing to 12-foot wide feet after the main equipment pads. Please clarify this discrepancy and confirm that the entire length of the access road network is designed to meet the minimum width requirements of the Phoenix Fire Department and the NYS Fire Code for fire apparatus access.
- **Applicant Response:** Per section 503.1.1.2, where approved by the fire code official, fire apparautus access roads shall be permitted to be exempted or modified for solar photovoltaic power generation facilities. The Project currently proposes a fire code compliant access road from Hoag Drive to the end of the electrical and battery equipment. The remainder of the road is anticiapted to be exempt from the fire apparautus access road status. A memoranda doumenting this information is provided as Attachment 4: 22.1-Phoenix Oxbow-Fire Code Memoranda-09.09.2025.
- **Second Review Comment:** Please provide the approved document by the fire code official.

4d.vi. Impervious Surface Clarification

- **Original Comment:** The equipment area is shown as a pervious gravel surface, but the detail on Sheet C-602 shows concrete equipment pads. Please clarify and ensure the stormwater calculations accurately reflect the proposed impervious surfaces.
- **Applicant Response:** The concrete equipment pads have been included in the HydroCAD calculations on a separate line item called "unconnected pavement" for clarity. Please see Attachment 5: 7.0-Phoenix Oxbow-SWPPP-V2-9.9.2025
- **Second Review Comment:** The site plan should show where concrete will be placed.

4d.vii. Emergency Contact Signage

- **Original Comment:** Please show the proposed locations for emergency contact signage on the Site Plan. It should be clearly visible and in a location which is convenient and readily noticeable to someone likely to detect a problem.
- **Applicant Response:** The emergency contact signage shall be located at the entrance gate to the facility. Sign symbols and labeling has been added to the site plan drawings. Please see Attachment 3: 4.0- Phoenix Oxbow-Solar Site Plan-V2-9.10.2025
- **Second Review Comment:** It is suggested to add additional signs where the fence starts coming in, along the access road, to avoid unnecessary travel further into the property if the information is needed.

4d.viii. Limits of Clearing

- **Original Comment:** Please revise the limits of clearing so that they do not extend beyond the Limit of Disturbance (LOD) line, as noted in the northern portion of the site.
- **Applicant Response:** The limits of clearing and limits of disturbance have been revised. Please see Attachment 3: 4.0- Phoenix Oxbow-Solar Site Plan-V2-9.10.2025
- **Second Review Comment:** Although the applicant stated that the limits were revised, the Limits of Clearing (LOC) must be entirely reflected inside the Limits of Disturbance (LOD) on the plans. Please review the updated drawings again to ensure this engineering standard is met.

Item 17 - Visual Analysis

17a. Ground Mounted Interconnection Simulation

- **Original Comment:** Please provide a visual simulation that depicts use of ground mounted electrical interconnection equipment as a mitigation option to reduce the change in visual characteristics associated with the addition of several interconnection poles.
- **Applicant Response:** Please refer to comment and response #4 for Item 4 above for further information on the proposed interconnection for the Project.
- **Second Review Comment:** Please provide new visual simulation after the discussion with National Grid takes place and the final number and type of interconnection equipment (overhead poles vs. ground-mounted) is confirmed.

17c. Viewpoint 14 Consistency

- **Original Comment:** Viewpoint 14 does not appear to reflect the current site plan information. Please update the simulation to be consistent with the proposed layout.
- **Applicant Response:** The Applicant will update their visual analysis and plans to discuss updated materials with the Planning Board meeting on September 24, 2025.
- **Second Review Comment:** The updated visual materials were reviewed during the Planning Board meeting, but digital copies were not available for the official record at the time of this review. The Planning Board raised a specific concern regarding the visibility of panels from Hoag Drive and suggested increasing the vegetation density in that area as mitigation.

Item 20 - Storage Manufacturer Noise Rating

20a. Formal Noise Analysis

- **Original Comment:** Please provide a formal noise analysis, worst-case operational, from all project equipment to demonstrate that sound levels will not exceed the Town's ambient standard at the property lines of residences.
- **Applicant Response:** Noise calculations and modeling are included as Attachment 11.
- **Second Review Comment:** The Noise Calculations and Modeling document (Attachment 11) is unsigned by the preparer. Please provide a formal submittal of the noise analysis, signed by the professional responsible for the analysis.

II. New Comments

This section contains new comments identified during the review of this submission.

1. **Detention Pond in Wetland 33-W004:** The applicant's proposal to locate a detention pond in Wetland 33-W004 anticipates a Non-Jurisdictional Determination (NJD) from the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE). No official documentation from the ACOE supporting this NJD has been provided with this submission. The applicant must provide a final official ACOE jurisdictional determination letter to confirm the status of this wetland. If the ACOE determines the wetland is under federal jurisdiction, additional federal permitting or a new stormwater design will be required.
2. **Time of Concentration (Tc) Calculations (Sheet Flow - SWPPP):** The Time of Concentration (Tc) calculations for both existing and proposed conditions utilize the sheet flow parameter "Woods: Light Underbrush," which corresponds to a Manning's n value of 0.40. Please clarify and justify why the more conservative value of n=0.80 ("Woods: Dense Underbrush" or "Forest with Heavy Litter") was not used for the sheet flow segment of the existing forest areas. Using a lower n value results in a faster Tc and potentially lower, non-conservative peak flows.
3. **Time of Concentration (Tc) Calculations (Shallow Concentrated Flow - SWPPP):** The Time of Concentration (Tc) calculations for the shallow concentrated flow segment utilize the velocity coefficient "Woodland," which results in a flow velocity (Kv) of 5 fps. Please clarify and justify why the more conservative velocity coefficient of 2.5 fps ("Forest w/Heavy Litter" or "Woodland w/Heavy Litter") was not used for this segment of the forest areas. Using a faster Kv results in a faster Tc and potentially lower, non-conservative peak flows.
4. **Hydrology Analysis Intermediate Point (SWPPP):** Please add a new intermediate point of analysis to compare existing and proposed peak flows for 1, 10, and 100-year rainfalls. This point should specifically compare subcatchment E-2 and the discharge from the proposed detention pond to confirm peak flows discharged to the adjacent property are decreased in proposed conditions.
5. **Detention Pond Design (Water Table):** Since the proposed detention pond is located within an existing wetland area, it is critical to consider the seasonal high water table elevation at the pond location. Was a geotechnical/hydrogeological study conducted to determine this elevation? If not, a conservative water table elevation that reduces the initial storage volume available in the pond's HydroCAD model should be used to ensure the design remains effective during high water conditions.

Please let me know if you have any questions or comments on any of the above comments.

Sincerely,
C&S Engineers, INC.

Jesus Urra
Engineer