

## **WEBSTER TOWN PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

PLACE: Webster Town Board Meeting Room 1002 Ridge Road

TIME: 7:00 p.m.

DATE: 6 January 2026

### **PRESENT:**

Anthony Casciani, Chairman

Mark Giardina, Secretary

Dave Malta, Vice Chairman

Peggy Maltman

Drazen Gasic

Katherine Kolich, Recording Secretary

Josh Artuso, Director of Community Development

Erika Corsi, Town Planner

Frank Ciardi, Attorney

### **ABSENT:**

Sven Vetter (will not start until April)

Derek Anderson

Anthony Casciani: Welcome to the first Planning Board meeting of the year, January 6, 2026

### *Pledge of Allegiance/Roll Call*

Anthony Casciani: There are a couple of things we need to do at our first meeting. First of all, we need to pick a Vice Chairman. I want ask for a motion for that position.

*Drazen Gasic made a motion to re-elect Mr. Dave Malta as Vice Chairman(GASIC/MALTMAN)*

### *VOTE:*

|                     |               |
|---------------------|---------------|
| <i>Mr. Casciani</i> | <i>AYE</i>    |
| <i>Mr. Malta</i>    | <i>AYE</i>    |
| <i>Mr. Giardina</i> | <i>AYE</i>    |
| <i>Mr. Anderson</i> | <i>ABSENT</i> |
| <i>Mr. Vetter</i>   | <i>ABSENT</i> |
| <i>Mrs. Maltman</i> | <i>AYE</i>    |
| <i>Mr. Gasic</i>    | <i>AYE</i>    |

*Anthony Casciani made a motion to re-elect Mr. Mark Giardina Secretary(CASCIANI/MALTA)*

### *VOTE:*

|                     |               |
|---------------------|---------------|
| <i>Mr. Casciani</i> | <i>AYE</i>    |
| <i>Mr. Malta</i>    | <i>AYE</i>    |
| <i>Mr. Giardina</i> | <i>AYE</i>    |
| <i>Mr. Anderson</i> | <i>ABSENT</i> |
| <i>Mr. Vetter</i>   | <i>ABSENT</i> |
| <i>Mrs. Maltman</i> | <i>AYE</i>    |
| <i>Mr. Gasic</i>    | <i>AYE</i>    |

***Summary overview of outcome:***  
**SCHEDULED MATTERS:**

**WEBSTER SOLAR GARDEN**

Applicant: Katie Soscia-750 Phillips Road.  
Status: **APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS**

*( Mark Giardina read each application into the record)*

**WEBSTER SOLAR GARDEN:** Located at 750 Phillips Road. Applicant Katie Soscia of Montante Solar Development is requesting FINAL SITE PLAN APPROVAL associated with a 6.63 MW Solar Generation Facility across 20-acres of a 120-acre lot owned by Xerox Corporation having SBL# 065.02-1-40.111 located in the IN Industrial District under Sections 155-5D (4), 269-10 and 350-22 of the Code of the Town of Webster.

Appearing before the board was Katie Soscia of Montante Solar Development (did not sign in) Good evening and Happy New Year and thank you for having me here today. We have a project team here representing the Webster Solar Garden and I know you have met us all before but just a quick reintroduction. I am Katie Soscia and we have along with Kim Nason from Phillips Lidle (did not sign in); Jenna Suz on behalf of Haley and Aldrich and Marcus Lathrop representing Xerox Corporation.

We are here today to review updates to the project in site plan that were implemented as part of the feed back as part of the preliminary site plan approval in November and to request final site plan approval for the project as well as the referral to the Town Board for an Industrial Use Permit for this application. I would like to review the conditions addressed in the updated plans submission if you wouldn't mind going up a slide.

Conditions address in Updated Plans/ Submission:

- Project to comply with 2025 Fire Code
- New asphalt cap to be laid at a minimum of 1.5 inches
- Bedrock trench is protected from ballast footer
- Geo-technical settling report submitted for the C&D Landfill
- Access road & gate reconfiguration
- Limit of disturbance acreage & tree clearing acreage to be shown on plans

Katie Soscia: Then other conditions were listed as well but I would like to go through the ones addressed in our actual submission.

Additional Conditions:

- DEC Approval is required prior to submitted for building permits
- Erosion sediment practices need to be evaluated in no-soil disturbance area

- Deviation from ballasted racking system requires updated Geotech report

Katie Soscia: So, addressing the four points that were conditioned previously implemented by the board. On page G 100, 2025 the Fire Code is listed there, and further detailed implementation of this Fire Code will be submitted with the electrical plan set when we actually go for an electrical permit for this project. On page C 200, limits of disturbance are listed as well as limits of tree clearing. And page C 203 shows ballast field adjustments notes as well as a commitment to repave to add that 1.5 inches of asphalt.

We were also asked to submit a Geotechnical Results for the C & D Landfill. The Geotechnical shows that the project is well under allowable limits and I will go through the actual methodology that was used to get these results. A Geotech investigation was determined to conduct the viability and then installing the weighted system on the C & D Landfill. The methodology was first reviewed and previewed with DEC before we even did the testing. The C & D landfill cap consists of approximately 6 inches of top soil overlaying 18 inches of low permeabilities soil for a total cap of 24 inches or 2 feet. A steel plate was placed on the cover service in three different areas after clearing the vegetation from those areas and special equipment used was a dial indicator incrementally applied pressure or load to a maximum of 1000 pounds per square foot. According to our racking manufacturer, .5 inches is the allowable amount settlement of racking. The racking system that we will design and this show that the limits are far below that as well.

I just want to make a note that even though this was tested that 2000 lbs. per square feet, the actual ballasted and total equipment sitting on the C & D landfill will only be 450 lbs. Per square foot and temporary loads of up to 650 lbs... Square foot will be implemented during actual construction for construction equipment and things like that. So, with 2000lbs. Its approximately 3 times more then the heaviest load predicted on the site. Even with these additional loads the results showed that the weights are still under that allowable differential settlement at 2.2 times and 1.3 times respectively.

In addition, prior to conducting this testing, an assessment of the actual landfill cover cap system itself was also done to insure it's integrity. If you wouldn't mind flipping to the next slide. So, in short, the report showed that the landfill cover is still in tact and there are no concerns with the weighted system that we proposed. Again, there is approximately 24 total inches of cover, and 5 test kits were excavated to that total of 24 inches below surface. They did find that top soil layer of 6 inches at each test pit and they also collected samples at that 6 inch mark and again at that 24 inch mark as well and sent them in for grain size analysis and based on that analysis, the covered soil material is consistent with the targets specification that was DEC...the DEC approved design. So, the report showed that there were no concerns of integrity to the cap.

And then just a reminder of what the system will actually look like and how it's weighted and things like that. We have the Geo-Ballast system up there and then the updated access road. So, there is some discussion about, just fire access and making sure that this was the best

configuration. Based on that feedback we have updated the fire access road to bring the gate a little bit closer so that the turn around is inside the gate for that fire and able to access that major equipment right outside the turn off there. Additional conditions that we the applicant agreed to as part of the conditions that were implemented at the last meeting. DEC approval was required to be submitted before building permits and electrical permits will be achieved. Erosion settlement practices will need to be evaluated and no soil disturbance area and any deviation from the racking system that we have discussed here to date, would require a complete re-do on all of the geotechnical analysis so we are very committed to maintaining that ballasted system that we have reviewed here with you guys all along the way and with that I am happy to answer any questions that I can or perhaps members of my team can if any of the board has any.

Anthony Casciani: (Not speaking loud enough) preliminary approval and that was good. Is that all included in your drawings for your final paperwork.

Katie Soscia: Correct. We will be requesting final site plan approval as well as that recommendation.

Anthony Casciani: All based on this information.

Katie Soscia: Correct, yes.

Drazen Gasic: One of the first questions I have is what you indicated in your presentation of drawing sets, was that submitted to the town for review, the revised drawing set that you were just showing because I only have two pages here.

Katie Soscia: An entire civil plan set was submitted to the town. It was a 10 page full plan set. There were 3 copies submitted and then we had digital copies that were submitted as well.

Drazen Gasic: One of the concerns I had within the solar array footprint you have vegetation and existing trees, is the intention just to cut the trees to the trunk and leave the trunks in place or were you looking to remove the trunks as well as part of your construction.

Katie Soscia: We want to limit any soil disturbance across the entire site so our goal is to cut flush to the ground as far as we can so it will be like hand felling a lot of trees to be honest with you.

Drazen Gasic: Was that in your drawing said notes that, that was your intention.

Katie Soscia: We have a schedule and the tree removal was, but I don't know if the detail about how it's being done is in there and I'm happy to add that, no problem.

Drazen Gasic: I would like to have it added in to make sure there is no soil disturbance as part of that area. Also, if you could add in the area indicating the clearing the area that you are proposing as part of the project. As what is your tree clearing area; vegetation area part of the project that you need to do.

Katie Soscia: The acreage limit is what you are talking about? That is addressed on several pages of this set and I believe, but limits of total disturbance is 17.5 acres in limits of tree clearing is 15.1 acres. There are some of the areas of the site that don't have any trees on them. So, that is why the numbers are different there.

(are site visits being done by board members?)

Drazen Gasic: Are these mature trees or just....because it is a land fill and I'm wondering....

Katie Soscia: So, this site didn't have any trees on it in the 90's so all the trees there are relatively...some of them are bigger but the majority of them are considered smaller.

Drazen Gasic: Again, I apologize if this is on your notes, it's just that I don't have that set. Are you indicating the monitoring wells to be protected.

Katie Soscia: Yes, we have 20 foot ..... (both parties speaking at the same time)

Drazen Gasic..... Staked out surveys staked out and protected during construction.

Katie Soscia: Yes, we have 20 foot setbacks and then roped off as well during construction.

Drazen Gasic: For those 24 inch cover that tests were performed on site are you indicating the test bit locations on your drawing set.

Katie Soscia: I don't think we did. It is in the Geotech report that was submitted which the Engineer also has but we can overlay that if that is a requirement from the Engineer.

Drazen Gasic: The test pits were within the project footprint.

Katie Soscia: Yes, they were with the C & D landfill footprint itself and that is included in the C & D Geotech cover assessment.

Drazen Gasic: In the actual drawing sets, for any areas where you are doing work that is within a wetland, are you using timber mats?

Katie Soscia: Are you able to speak on that? There is two areas kind of around the area of the asphalt cap that are....wetland created because of that impermeable surface, I honestly can't remember. We had submitted out nation wide or our notification into Army Corp and I believe that was included but I can certainly get you a copy of that.

Drazen Gasic: I'm just asking if you could add a note in your drawing sets that timber mats will be used in wetland areas.

Katie Soscia: Sure.

Drazen Gasic: So, you did have a note in the updated drawings that within in that infiltration area for the testing, the seepage testing locations that you will not be putting any ballast on top of that system.

Katie Soscia: Correct.

Drazen Gasic: For your fences, are your fences ballasted?

Katie Soscia: Fences ballasted around the entirety of the site. The one area that remains in question is the C & D landfill where there is topography. We would like to work with DEC on how they would like us to handle that, specifically in that area. It would just be a very small area.

Drazen Gasic: Is it possible to enter a note on your drawings. Josh, if you can zoom to the left area where the purple...wish I had a pointer...so where it's RW1 for the monitoring well. So, right there you have two collection trenches and then your pink line is your fence. If you can do call out there; no ballasts are to be for the fencing to be placed on that system, there so they can space the fencing.

Katie Soscia: Yep, so there's no weight on it. We can do that.

Drazen Gasic: Has the revised access with the turn around been looked at by the Fire Marshal?

Katie Soscia: It was submitted to the town. I didn't specially call the Fire Marshal to ask if he had any review comments on it, so I'm not sure if he's looked at it individually.

Josh Artuso: I can speak to that. It has been reviewed by the Fire Marshal and is found to be acceptable.

Frank Ciardi: Yes, there's a few things that about the asphalt that I think you touched on, but I just want some clarity with regards to the Geotech report. You're going to put an additional 1.5 inches on the cap. Did the Geotech report get updated with regards to that additional layer that's going to be put on the cap.

Katie Soscia: We didn't update it with those results.

Frank Ciardi: Do you know if that's going to change anything with regards to the bail, the you know, the actual solar panels that are on the cap with the additional 1.5 inches.

Katie Soscia: In terms of settlement between on and off the cap.

Frank Ciardi: Yes

Katie Sosica: So, the racking system that we have is really nice in that we can take breaks quite often in it. It's not like a continuous arm where there are no brakes. So, we can put brakes in between if there is a deviation in topography there. So, that'll be an infield adjustment as we haven't added that 1.5 asphalt cap yet and we still need to clear the area, but we can certainly account for that easily.

Frank Ciardi: Can you update the Geotech report with that 1.5 included?

Drazen Gasic: The concern, the question Katie is the 1.5 inches overlay contribute to any impact on the cap because of that weight added onto the cover.

Jenna Suz: We'll just have to review that with our engineer, and we can address that and get back to you.

Frank Ciardi: And then the 1.5 cap, that is going to be added, that's not ... your not going to mill and then put it. It's just going to be right over the top. You don't think putting that 1.5 will compromise on the ground at all? Or can we have that as part of the Geotech report if there's going to be any compromise with regards to putting that asphalt right over the top?

Katie Soscia: Yeah, I'm not a Geotech analysis, so I can't answer that question then in the moment here. So, we need to take that question back to the experts. And there's a lot of like calculations and math run behind the scenes. So, I think it would take a couple days to get that answer anyways.

Frank Ciardi: But you're not opposed to us putting that in the final as a condition of the final site.

Katie Soscia: I guess my only question would be, when we did the Geotech analysis as is, we actually used ... it's the asphalt cap is there, and we used a system to push down and basically do calculations. If it's not there then it's difficult obviously to redo. I don't know if it's easy enough to say, hey, it's going to be X amount of weight added on, can you add that into your math? I just don't know the answer to that. If it's possible, we're happy to do that. I just don't know if that's, you know, chicken egg situation. I don't know to be honest with you.

Frank Ciardi: That's fair.

Marcus Lathrop: Reading the Geotech report that one and half inches wasn't needed. It met specifications the way it is right now. That was a request that was made at the last planning meeting to add that to try and address some concerns about issues moving forward. So, that's really that one half isn't needed per the Geotech report.

Frank Ciardi: Does anybody else have any questions? Because I just have some questions about the bond. Just regards to the bond, so we had some questions early on at the preliminary when we gave preliminary approval with regards to the decommission bond. I went through your decommission plan. Your bond doesn't....it's not listing a certain company.

Are you guys going to....what company do you use or are you picking a company after?

Katie Soscia: Yeah, we need to I guess get approval on the amounts and stuff for us to actually have the bonds issue, but we usually work with Hoffman and Associates. That's who we've done our bonds with in the past but there isn't a, I guess a bond to show for yet until it's approved. But I did put in the bond paperwork of like basically what we've used in the form paperwork that we would insert information to if it were to get approved.

Frank Ciardi: Okay and obviously I saw the bond it's going to be a bond of the value of the project. Hoffman and Associates is that...do you know what grade of a company.

Katie Soscia: Like an A or A + . I don't know off the top of my head.

Frank Ciardi: So, if you put in... A rating or better or higher, you'd be okay with that.

Katie Soscia: Yep.

Anthony Casciani: We have gone pretty deep into his thing. Drazen thanks for your help on that. We did give it a preliminary approval and we did address copy....(not speaking loud enough) You did address them all. So, we're good with that. So, you've got that stuff showing on your final drawings and all that stuff. That's good. Okay, the intent would be to move forward for final approval. Alright, as we did with the preliminary, I'll start one off. We need some help as we go along because we entered some different things here.

#### **RESOLUTION 26-000**

Anthony Casciani made a motion for **FINAL SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR THE WEBSTER SOLAR GARDEN** Located at 750 Phillips Road. Applicant Katie Soscia of Montante Solar Development is requesting FINAL SITE PLAN APPROVAL associated with a 6.63 MW Solar Generation Facility across 20-acres of a 120-acre lot owned by Xerox Corporation having SBL# 065.02-1-40.111 located in the IN Industrial District under Sections 155-5D (4), 269-10 and 350-22 of the Code of the Town of Webster which was seconded by Mark Giardina.

#### **FINAL APPROVAL CHECKLIST**

1. Subject to PRC comments.
2. Subject to Parks and Recreation fees (if applicable)
3. Subject to Preliminary Approval Conditions.
4. Subject to all applicable governmental fees.
5. Subject to Department of Public Works approval

6. Significant construction shall occur within one year, as deemed by the Planning Board, to expire on 1.6.27.
7. The conditions of Preliminary and Final approval are depicted on the cover page of the final designed plans.
8. The Engineer for the proposed project shall provide a Letter of Certification that all proposed work was completed, as per Planning Board resolution of final approval before a Certificate of Occupancy will be issued.
9. A Letter of Credit to the Town for the project shall include the fee for the Engineer's final certification inspection of the site.
10. Subject to resolution of the final approved minutes.
11. Must comply with all preliminary approval conditions

Anthony Casciani: Few things we wanted to add on was:

12. Vegetation and tree cutting limits shall be added to the plans; removal shall be limited to surface level only (no soil disturbance).
13. Timbermats to be used in wetland delineated areas during construction
14. Drawing notes to call out and note to protect the bedrock trench system, fencing and ballast array installation.
15. The applicant shall enter into a Host Community Agreement (HCA) with the Town of Webster to the Town Board's satisfaction. This is something you guys have been working on. It's out of our area. We don't even know what took place with it all, but that's up to the Town Board to work with.
16. The site plan should clearly show both the landfill covers and include the associated landfill, hazardous waste site and RCRA site numbers on the final drawing.
17. Decommissioning Bond must be Grade 'A' or higher.
18. DEC approval is required prior to submitting for building permits.
19. Preliminary and Final approval conditions to be added to the cover sheet of the final plan set.

Recommendation for issuance of an Industrial Use Permit provided to Town Board

Anthony Casciani: Okay, I think we also...we need to make a motion to send this application to the Town Board for an Industrial Use permit also.

Kim Mason: Can I just clarify that real quick. Sorry to interrupt. So, actually, it's been referred to this board by the Town Board. So, what we'll be looking for tonight, this is in our letter as well is a recommendation on the IUP to the Town Board. So, ultimately the Town Board issues the IUP, but they have the ability to ask you all as part of the site plan process to issue a recommendation on the industrial use permit.

Anthony Casciani: Okay, so a motion recommending the Town Board to grant you your Industrial Use permit.

**RECOMMENDATION TO TOWN BOARD: FOR INDUSTRIAL USE PERMIT**

|                  | <b>MOTION</b> | <b>Second</b> | <b>AYE</b> | <b>NAY</b> | <b>Abstained</b> | <b>Absent</b> |
|------------------|---------------|---------------|------------|------------|------------------|---------------|
| Anthony Casciani | X             |               |            |            |                  |               |
| Dave Malta       |               | X             |            |            |                  |               |
| Mark Giardina    |               |               | X          |            |                  |               |
| Derek Anderson   |               |               |            |            |                  | X             |
| Sven Vetter      |               |               |            |            |                  | X             |
| Drazen Gasic     |               |               | X          |            |                  |               |
| Peggy Maltman    |               |               | X          |            |                  |               |

Anthony Casciani: I think one of the big concerns with the board back when we were originally was what the.....and this again, this is out of our line but just satisfaction for a program for financing with the town. Whether it's a pilot program or however they want to work it that's...this is all based on that. You know, you working with them for that approval. Alright, I guess that's it. You are all set.

**ADMINISTRATIVE MATTER:** Approval of minutes for:

September 2, 2025 (GIARDINA/MALTA); November 18, 2025 (GIARDINA/MALTA); December 2, 2025 (GIARDINA/MALTA)

With no other applications before the Board this evening Anthony Casciani concluded tonight's meeting at 7:30 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Signed



Dated

2/3/26

Mark Giardina, Secretary  
Katherine Kolich, Recording Secretary

FEB 4 '26 AM11:32  
FILED WEBSTER TWN CLK

