

**CONSERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF MEETING
OCTOBER 28, 2008**

The October 28, 2008 regular meeting of the Conservation Board was called to order by Chairman Gary Meixner.

Attendance: Charles Friedberg, Shoshana Hantman, Dr. Frank Lapetina, James Moriarty, Gary Meixner

Absent: Gloria Rosenzweig, Dr. Edward Merker

Guests: None

Announcements:

Board member Gloria Rosenzweig informed the C.B. Secretary that she would not be able to attend the meeting tonight.

Board member Dr. Edward Merker phoned the C.B. Secretary to inform her that he would not be able to attend the meeting tonight.

**Conservation Board
Minutes of Meeting
October 28, 2008**

Page 2

Approval of Minutes:

A motion was made by Charles Friedberg and seconded by Shoshana Hantman to approve the minutes of the October 14, 2008 regular meeting of the Conservation Board. All members present approved.

Old Business:

- A)** Crecco/Wetland Activity/Erosion & Sediment Control/Tree Preservation Permit Applications for 3 Lots, Site Plan/Planning Board, Section 28.17, Block 1, Lot 16, Section 28.18, Block 1, Lot 20 and 21, Create access through wetland buffer for driveway to future residence, Construction of single family residence, septic, well and driveway in R-80 Zone, Constraints Map, Profile and Details, Stormwater Treatment Details dated September 9, 2008, Prepared by Bibbo Associates, LLP, Other – ESC, SEAF and Tree Removal Permits, (Young Road, 1500-ft. north of Elmer Galloway, off Rte. 100): (CF/SH)

The Conservation Board reviewed the above Planning Board application for Crecco site plan, wetland activity, erosion and sediment control, tree preservation permit applications at their meeting.

Board members Charles Friedberg and Shoshana Hantman reviewed the materials submitted, performed a site inspection of the property and gave a verbal report to the Board.

*

Report:

- The application is for a wetland activity permit. The site is located off Rte. 100, (take Elmer Galloway to Young Road).

**Conservation Board
Minutes of Meeting
October 28, 2008**

Page 3

Old Business:

A) Crecco/WAP: (cont'd)

- Board member Friedberg noted that it appeared to be the second phase of a project that was already approved (and he asked Chairman Meixner if that was what he thought. He responded affirmatively).
- Mr. Friedberg explained that towards the end of the cul de sac there are two retention ponds/catch basins, with houses being built next to them. Our first question was were those homes approved?
- We noticed from the site inspection is that the access way in question is already cleared.
- The applicants appear to be asking for the permit to extend a driveway over a water-body (stream) to the proposed house.

Board member Lapetina inquired about the passageway/future road (on the map) going through.

- Mr. Friedberg responded that it is the proposed extension of Young Road, and Phase I of the Bibbo project.
- There are three existing homes already built (I circled them in orange on the plans) said Board member Friedberg. One is finished and has been sold and one is close to being finished.

**Conservation Board
Minutes of Meeting
October 28, 2008**

Page 4

Old Business:

A) Crecco/WAP: (cont'd)

Board member Friedberg explained the plans to the Board and Dr. Lapetina.

Board member Lapetina inquired about a possible violation previously. He noted that frequently the applicant comes back to correct an existing violation on their property.

Board member Friedberg said that he was not aware of a pre-existing violation on the parcel.

- Mr. Friedberg informed the Board members that the garage doors appear to be within 50-ft. of the catch basin.

Dr. Lapetina said that it sounds like a violation and frequently the applicant comes back to correct the activity they did before a permit.

Board member Charles Freidberg went on to explain to the Board that the extension that goes North is already cleared. The west part of the extension has not been cleared yet.

Mr. Friedberg informed the Board that upon site inspection Ms. Hantman and he noticed a stone wall that was very old (that probably represented a property line of some sort at some point) and is along the northern extension of the access way.

**Conservation Board
Minutes of Meeting
October 28, 2008**

Page 5

Old Business:

A) Crecco/WAP: (cont'd)

- According to the application they are not asking about the clearing of the trees required for the property, whether the silt fence is correct, etc. they are asking for a wetland permit said Mr. Friedberg.
- Board member Friedberg explained that the houses are located outside the wetland buffer, but the roads are located within the wetland buffer.
- Mr. Friedberg said that it appears that the applicant has site approval and the lots are defined and they are looking for a wetland permit to finish clearing the access way.

Dr. Lapetina said that they are asking for a tree preservation permit.

- Mr. Friedberg responded that there is no tree plan or survey showing what trees are being removed, preserved, planted, or even a landscape plan, etc.
- Board member Friedberg noted that there is a constraint plan, blueprint, engineering for silt fence, information on the retaining walls, etc., but no tree plan or topographical tree survey.
- On lot #6 there was a ring of trees that were tied off by an orange ribbon, said Mr. Friedberg and we assumed that it meant they were to be removed, but those features did not appear in the plan submitted.

**Conservation Board
Minutes of Meeting
October 28, 2008**

Page 6

Old Business:

A) Crecco/WAP: (cont'd)

- Board member Friedberg noted that on lot #5 and #7 there were no visual markings of what was to be removed or not.

Mr. Friedberg opined that he had no problem with the wetland permit, however, there was no information on trees. Therefore, he said that a tree permit would be out of the question at this time.

Dr. Lapetina said that wherever there is a septic field location all of the trees will be cleared away to facilitate that process and there are three septic systems being proposed.

- Mr. Friedberg explained that since the applicant plans on taking trees down then the C.B. would like to see a landscaping plan as well as a tree survey in order to see what they plan on planting.

Dr. Lapetina noted that the applicant is creating an access for the driveway of a future residence, a single family residence with a septic, well and driveway.

Discussion ensued among the Board members with reference to this application and the missing information.

Chairman Meixner said that he would like to see the comments from the DEP, as the property is located just above the reservoir.

The Board members, after much discussion, decided to send a memo to the Planning Board stating their concerns and recommendations.

**Conservation Board
Minutes of Meeting
October 28, 2008**

Page 7

Old Business:

A) Crecco/WAP: (cont'd)

*

A memo (#08-51) will be sent to the Planning Board stating that the Conservation Board reviewed the above Planning Board application for Crecco, site plan, wetland activity, erosion and sediment control, and tree preservation permit applications at their meeting on October 28, 2008.

The Board members reviewed the materials submitted, performed a site inspection of the property and discussed the application among them.

The C.B. has the following concerns and recommendations:

- 1) The application is incomplete. Submit the necessary information for review.
 - The tree plan and topographical survey have not been submitted.
 - The erosion and sediment plan have not been submitted.
- 2) The C.B. would like to see the comments from the DEP on this project.
 - These comments are important, as the site is located above the reservoir.

The Conservation Board will continue to review this application for Crecco wetland activity permit as revisions are submitted.

**

**Conservation Board
Minutes of Meeting
October 28, 2008**

Page 8

Old Business:

A) Crecco/WAP: (cont'd)

The Conservation Board took no further action at this time.

B) Wright's Court (formerly Barlow Ct./Hallic Place)/Site Plan/Planning Board, Pumping Test Program, Wells 1 & 2/3 & 4; Landscape Plan revised January 31, 2006; Redesign Exterior Façade 8-24-08; Revised Exterior Appearance 8-11-08; Added Mech. Room 7-24-07; Existing Conditions Plan; Neighborhood Plan; Site Layout Plan; Site Layout Plan Alt. A & B; Grading & Utilities Plan; Sediment & Erosion Control Plan; Driveway Profiles and Sediment & Erosion Control Details; Details, Drainage & Roadway Profiles; Construction Details; Contextual Review of Wright's Court proposed by Nordic Custom Builders & prepared by Richard Henry Behr Architect, PC dated October 2008, (#339 & 341 Somerstown Road, Rte. 100 & Scott Place): (CF/JM)

The Conservation Board reviewed the above Planning Board application for Wright's Court site plan, sediment and erosion control plan, site layout plan, details and landscape plan at their meeting.

Board member Charles Friedberg deferred his comments to Board member James Moriarty who also reviewed the materials submitted, performed a site inspection of the property and gave a verbal (and written) report to the Board.

Board member Moriarty said that there was a lot of engineering work done on this application however, there were numerous fundamental mistakes that take away from the plan integrity.

**Conservation Board
Minutes of Meeting
October 28, 2008**

Page 9

Old Business:

B) Wright's Court/SP: (cont'd)

*

Report:

Board member James Moriarty performed a site inspection and prepared a report dated October 26, 2008.

SEDIMENT & EROSION CONTROL PLAN

Soil stockpiling: Page 5/8

- The soil stockpiles (northwest section of property) are inadequate and poorly placed. The areas shown are only 30 feet across. The piling for a site of this magnitude will actually be much bigger until all extra material is trucked away.
- The material separations are inadequate. The stockpiles show only one material in one pile per lot. There are always two or more piles on a site. You need to strip and stock the topsoil first, which will remain on site until grading and planting. The second piling will be of excavated dirt from the foundations. Third is a pile of large rocks, which are separated during excavation. The plan calls for using all excavated rocks for masonry purposes, thus, they will be stored also.
- The plan shows the stockpile on site 'A' right next to the construction entrance. If the silt fence breaks, there will be mud and rocks dragged out onto the main road. Move the pile.

Tree protection

- The tree protection shown is not acceptable. The drip lines of the trees are overlapped by structures. Add four more feet to this for excavation and you would have the true picture of root damage.

**Conservation Board
Minutes of Meeting
October 28, 2008**

Page 10

Old Business:

B) Wright's Court/SP: (cont'd)

- The “drip line” of the tree refers to the area directly under the canopy of the tree. There is a chain link fence detail shown for this area to protect the roots from compaction. The true drip line of an established tree can reach 2 ½ times this. The effort to save these trees will result in dead trees several years later, creating a bigger problem with structural failure followed by costly removals. The saved trees should not be expected to survive.
- The temporary sediment traps are well planned, and they should be used.

MAIN DRAWING SET

Page 3/8

- Paved parking areas should drain to oil separators, not standard catch basins. Public parking will bring in heavy traffic. Oil, anti-freeze, and gasoline are sure to leak from parked vehicles in these large paved areas.
- Automotive fluids can easily find their way down to the aquifer over time, even though it is 600 feet deep.
- Geo-blocks are shown for parking area for ten cars and a dumpster on lot A. This is a very bad idea to have cars, trucks and dumpsters draining their fluids directly into the ground, especially over the aquifer.
- This was approved for Best Plumbing and it is against the entire goal of impervious surface maximums. This plan goes beyond acceptable impervious surfaces. Stop there and work backwards to meet the goal. Geo Blocks are not an acceptable method to compensate for too much lot coverage.

**Conservation Board
Minutes of Meeting
October 28, 2008**

Page 11

Old Business:

B) Wright's Court/SP: (cont'd)

- A variance should be required with public hearings for such activity.
- The Dumpsters should not be located on Geo-block pavers.
- Parking lot spaces 33-42 do not appear to meet Town Code.

Page 6/8; Details

- The silt fence should not be held up with wood posts, as they fail faster than steel posts. Steel posts with a 6x6-wire mesh supporting a heavy gauge filter cloth are the preferred method. Plastic silt fence is prone to failure from exposure to ultraviolet rays. Use non-plastic material, such as woven cloth.
- The 12-gauge wire mesh shown is a good choice if it is galvanized.
- Under the "sodding" section, it says "sold", should say "sod". Failure to proofread can cause major issues on an engineering plan.
- Detail for construction entrance shows an alternate for material. Recycled concrete is not acceptable; use stone only.
- Concrete curb detail is good; NYSDOT detail.

TREE SURVEY LIST

Landscape plan

- Extensive and detailed, but it misses the point.

**Conservation Board
Minutes of Meeting
October 28, 2008**

Page 12

Old Business:

B) Wright's Court/SP: (cont'd)

- As mentioned in the site plan review, many trees in the “save” category would be damaged, as they are within areas of disturbance. If a tree has 30% of root system damaged, it should be removed.

Tree placement

- Little or no thought was put into tree placement, besides appearance.
- Energy consumption and resulting emissions related to this site were ignored here.
- Deciduous trees should shade the walls, roofs, and windows along the south side of a structure; this will reduce energy consumption for cooling. These trees will lose foliage in the colder months, allowing the sun to warm the roofs, siding, and windows of the structure, thus reducing energy consumption for heating.
- Winter heating emissions can be reduced further by adding dense evergreens along the north side of the structure to act as a windbreak in the colder months.
- NYS Energy Star rating is an option that is recommended to conserve energy and reduce air pollution by emissions. The Town of Greenburgh, for example, requires this rating.

**

Dr. Lapetina mentioned that Rosedale Nursery was responsible for the landscape details on the plan. He commented that the salt sensitive trees should not be planted where there will be plowing, sand and salt.

**Conservation Board
Minutes of Meeting
October 28, 2008**

Page 13

Old Business:

B) Wright's Court/SP: (cont'd)

Board member Charles Friedberg asked about the plantings to the north and was wondering why north?

Mr. Moriarty responded that there should be a 'windbreak' to block the wind that comes from the north, mentioning that it would help the energy efficiency.

Chairman Meixner asked about the dumpsters and said that they were too far away from the buildings; especially with the apartments that will be located over the retail stores. He thought that the tenants would not want to walk back to them in the rear portion of the property. He went on to say that the geo-block area to park cars does not appear to meet Town Code.

Board member Moriarty also discussed the brick pathways and noted that the roots of the trees will be tearing up the paths in no time and then there will be a problem.

Dr. Lapetina informed the Board that he performed an in-depth review of the trees to be planted on the property, etc.

Discussion ensued among the Board members with reference to the C.B. request for additional landscaping in the back area of lot 'A' in order to create a natural barrier between the new construction and the existing residential neighborhood.

Board member Shoshana Hantman asked about his discoveries and the trees planned for the project.

**Conservation Board
Minutes of Meeting
October 28, 2008**

Page 14

Old Business:

B) Wright's Court/SP: (cont'd)

Board member Frank Lapetina explained that there is a list of trees to avoid...

Ms. Davis retrieved Dr. Lapetina's list and provided Ms. Hantman with a copy for her records.

Dr. Lapetina referenced the trees to be planted in the rear portion of Lot 'A' (to the left side when looking at the project). He mentioned that the C.B. had asked that they allow for more coverage, as there is a residential neighborhood right beyond this building and he was wondering if they had shown more plantings in that area than in our previous review.

C.B. Secretary Ms. Davis mentioned that she thought the Board had also asked for a berm in that area in order to enhance the area between the properties and create an evergreen barrier.

The Board members spoke of the addition of trees behind the parking area of building 'A' and examined the plans.

A discussion ensued among the Board members with reference to this application and they decided to write a memo to the Planning Board stating their concerns and recommendations.

*

A memo (#08-50) will be sent to the Planning Board stating that the Conservation Board reviewed the above Planning Board application for Wright Court site plan at their meeting on October 28, 2008, 2008.

**Conservation Board
Minutes of Meeting
October 28, 2008**

Page 15

Old Business:

B) Wright's Court/SP: (cont'd)

The Board members reviewed the materials submitted, performed a site inspection of the property and discussed the application among them.

The C.B. has the following concerns and recommendations:

SEDIMENT & EROSION CONTROL PLAN; Page 5 of 8

Tree Protection:

- 1) The tree protection shown on the plan is not acceptable.
 - The drip-line of the trees are overlapped by structures. Add four more feet to this for excavation (rather than cause root damage).

- 2) The “drip-line” of the tree refers to the area directly under the canopy of the tree.
 - There is a chain-lined fence detail shown for this area to protect the roots from compaction.
 - The true drip-line of an established tree can reach 2.5 times this area.
 - The effort to save these trees will result in dead trees several years later.
 - This will create another problem with structural failure followed by costly removals.
 - The saved trees will not survive with this configuration.

**Conservation Board
Minutes of Meeting
October 28, 2008**

Page 16

Old Business:

B) Wright's Court/SP: (cont'd)

Soil Stockpiling:

- 1) The soil stockpiles on the northwest section of the property are inadequate and poorly placed.
 - The areas shown are only 30-ft. across.
 - The piling for a site of this magnitude would be larger (at least until all material is trucked away).

- 2) The material separations are inadequate. The stockpiles show one material in one pile per lot.
 - There are always two or more piles on a site.
 - The first pile is topsoil.
 - The second piling will be of excavated dirt from the foundations.
 - Third is a pile of large rocks, which will be separated during excavation.
 - The plan calls for using all excavated rocks for masonry purposes therefore, they too will be stored.

- 3) The plan shows that the stockpile on site "A" is next to the construction entrance.
 - The pile should be moved.

**Conservation Board
Minutes of Meeting
October 28, 2008**

Page 17

Old Business:

B) Wright's Court/SP: (cont'd)

- If the silt fence breaks there will be mud and rocks dragged out onto the main road.
- 4) The temporary sediment traps are well planned; they should be used.

MAIN DRAWING SET

Page 3 of 8:

- 1) Paved parking areas should drain to oil separators, not to the standard catch basins.
- Public parking will bring heavy traffic.
 - Oil, antifreeze and gasoline are sure to leak from parked vehicles in these large paved areas.
 - Automotive fluids can easily find their way down to the aquifer over time, although it is 600-ft. deep.
- 2) Parking lot spaces #33 through #42 do not appear to meet Town Code.
- 3) Geo-blocks are shown for a parking area for ten cars and a dumpster on Lot "A".
- Cars, trucks and dumpsters should not be draining their fluids directly into the ground, (especially over the aquifer).
 - The dumpster should not be located on Geo-block pavers.

**Conservation Board
Minutes of Meeting
October 28, 2008**

Page 18

Old Business:

B) Wright's Court/SP: (cont'd)

- Geo-blocks are not an acceptable method to compensate for too much lot coverage.
- This plan goes against the entire goal of impervious surface maximums.
- A variance should be required for such activity; with public hearings.

Page 6 of 8; Details:

- 1) The silt fence should not be held up with wood posts as shown on the plan, as they fail faster than steel posts.
 - The preferred method is steel posts with a 6x6-wire mesh supporting a heavy gauge filter cloth.
 - Plastic silt fence is prone to failure from exposure to ultraviolet rays. The applicant should use non-plastic material, such as woven cloth.
- 2) The 12-gauge wire mesh shown is a good choice, if it is galvanized.
- 3) Under the section that says "sodding"; it says "sold" and should say "sod".
- 4) The detail for the construction entrance shows an alternate for material.
 - Recycled concrete is not acceptable; the applicant should use stone.
- 5) The concrete curb detail appears to be good; NYSDOT detail.

**Conservation Board
Minutes of Meeting
October 28, 2008**

Page 19

Old Business:

B) Wright's Court/SP: (cont'd)

TREE SURVEY LIST

Landscape Plan:

- 1) This plan seems both extensive and detailed, but seems to miss the point.
 - As mentioned in the site plan review, many trees in the “save” category will be damaged, as they are within areas of disturbance.
 - There are structures and pathways all around the trees to be “saved”; within 3 years they will be dead.
 - If a tree has 30% of its root system damaged or compacted then it should be removed.

Tree Placement:

- 1) It appears that no thought was generated towards tree placement, besides appearance.
- 2) Energy consumption and resulting emissions related to this site have been ignored on this site plan (see below).
 - Deciduous trees should shade the walls, roofs, and windows along the south side of a structure; this will reduce energy consumption for cooling.
 - These trees will lose foliage in the colder months, allowing the sun to warm the roofs, siding, and windows of the structure, thus reducing energy consumption for heating.

**Conservation Board
Minutes of Meeting
October 28, 2008**

Page 20

Old Business:

B) Wright's Court/SP: (cont'd)

- Winter heating emissions can be reduced further by adding dense evergreens along the north side of the structure to act as a windbreak during the cold months.
- 3) NYS Energy Star rating is an option that is recommended to conserve energy and reduce air pollution by emissions. (For example the Town of Greenberg requires this rating).

The Conservation Board will continue to review this application as revisions are submitted.

**

The Conservation Board took no further action at this time.

C) Planning Board/Site Walk October 14, 2008 at 9 AM (Weather Permitting) for the following/Tabled by Board member Merker: (EM)

9:45 AM Mitchell Prel. Sub. (TM-16.09-1-9)
& Steep Slopes Permit Application of Gary Mitchell for property located on the west side of Tomahawk Street for a proposed 4-lot subdivision, three of which are new building lots and one existing lot.

**Conservation Board
Minutes of Meeting
October 28, 2008**

Page 21

Old Business:

C) Mitchell Preliminary Subdvsn/SSAP: (cont'd)

Board member Dr. Edward Merker was not present at the meeting to discuss the above application that he asked to be tabled until the next Conservation Board meeting.

Therefore, the Board members agreed to table this discussion until the next Conservation Board meeting.

A report will be forthcoming at that time.

New Business:

A) Conservation Board/Budget Hearing with the Town Board is scheduled for Tuesday night, November 18 at 8:30 PM in the Library/Discuss with C.B.:

The Conservation Board members discussed the Budget hearing that is scheduled for November 18 at 8:30 PM in the Library.

Ms. Davis explained that their scheduled time is for 8:30 PM Tuesday night. She informed the members that their regularly scheduled meeting night is November 11 and 25. The Budget hearing is on the third week of the month, which happens to fall on the 18th.

The Board members thought that since the budget was the same as last year there was not too much to discuss, as the funds available are very limited.

**Conservation Board
Minutes of Meeting
October 28, 2008**

Page 22

New Business:

A) C.B. Budget Hearing:

Ms. Davis asked if anyone was planning on attending the meeting and if the Board had any ideas on what they would like to tell the Town Board members.

Chairman Meixner went on to explain that if the Board members needed money to pay for educational needs then they could request whatever is necessary from the Town Board (and according to what we have been told in the past they would in all likelihood grant the request).

Board member Lapetina advised the Board that he would like to attend the hearing, but with such a little budget there is very little to talk about with the Town Board. He also mentioned that he did not know if he was free of commitments on that night.

Ms. Davis commented that it seemed ridiculous to have a hearing on a budget that was asked for and approved last year, with absolutely no changes to the document whatsoever. She explained that she emailed Barbara Sherry and asked her about attendance at the meeting and was told that the C.B. is advisory and it was not mandatory that they attend the Budget hearings at all.

Chairman Meixner said that he thought that he should attend the hearing as he did last year.

Ms. Davis explained that he attended the year before, but for some reason he was not able to attend last year, she did not remember why.

Chairman Meixner advised that he thought he attended the hearing, but maybe it was the year before he did not recall.

**Conservation Board
Minutes of Meeting
October 28, 2008**

Page 23

New Business:

A) C.B. Budget Hearing:

Ms. Davis explained to the Board members that over the past 28 years she had asked the Town Board for many things, but they never entertained any of them, so what was the point of going this year?

Dr. Lapetina questioned if there would be more strength in asking for something if several of the Board members were to attend the hearing.

Ms. Davis responded that maybe in a different year it might work, but this is a very lean year monetarily. She commented that maybe if you have something to say or share with them about anything then it would be a good idea, but in general they will have a conversation with us, but it never goes anywhere; like speaking to a wall.

Chairman Meixner specified that he tried to speak to them about the fact that the steep slope, wetland and tree preservation fees would ordinarily go to the Conservation Board, under usual circumstances. However, the way they have it set up all of the fees go to the Planning Department and the Town Board will not discuss the possibility of the Conservation Board making any money for the town, so we are not funded and have virtually no money/income. They merely say that it goes to the general fund.

Board member Charles Friedberg suggested that the C.B. ask how much money is generated to the General Fund as a result of the efforts of the Conservation Board.

Dr. Lapetina commented that they probably have that figure someplace in their records.

**Conservation Board
Minutes of Meeting
October 28, 2008**

Page 24

New Business:

A) C.B. Budget Hearing:

Ms. Davis reiterated that any revenue created by the C.B. goes to the Planning/Engineering office to report as income and for their possible use. She explained that what happened was that when the C.B. became a Board the people who were on the Board decided that they did not want to be liable for the final approval of any application. Therefore, they gave up their right to be liable by law (on decisions for wetlands, etc.) to a super-majority of the Planning Board. They also gave up their right to have the C.B. write up the wetland, steep slope and tree preservation permits. The Planning office does all of that work; including collecting the fees for the applications, and they might end up in the general fund eventually, but all of our projected revenue goes to the Planning and Engineering offices. So basically they circumvented the C.B. being a full time Board and the secretary being a 'full-time' employee and they gave that work to the Planning office. So we generate no money as far as they are concerned.

Chairman Meixner reiterated that the Town Board offered money to help the members attend school, etc.

Ms. Davis explained that the C.B. could petition the Town Board if the members would like to attend class, however, it is a request, not a guarantee of funds. She mentioned that there is some money in the budget for schooling, but not as much as they asked for in the past and it is dwindling every year.

Board member Friedberg asked if anyone from the group was planning on going to the hearing.

Dr. Lapetina said that he would like to think about it and get back to the Board.

**Conservation Board
Minutes of Meeting
October 28, 2008**

Page 25

New Business:

A) C.B. Budget Hearing:

Ms. Davis stated that the Town Board does not really want the Conservation Board to be full time, so they have arranged everything so that we are not; and its been working that way since 1988.

Dr. Lapetina questioned if the Planning Board was more full time than the Conservation Board.

Ms. Davis said that the Planning office has three people in the office that does their work. The secretary works full time, but cannot get paid for full time (she gets paid for 17 hours a week), as the Town Board wants the C.B. Secretary job to be a part time job.

A good question though is what makes them full time versus our Board not being full time said Board member Friedberg.

Dr. Lapetina specified that when the C.B. has numerous applications going on, I'm sure that we process as much information as they do.

Ms. Davis added we do and even more sometimes.

Mr. Friedberg noted that probably since we do not officially process and grant applications then that is the defining line.

They do not come out and say that, but it is a good reason to use for the most part in order to keep the C.B. Secretary's job part-time, said Ms. Davis.

**Conservation Board
Minutes of Meeting
October 28, 2008**

Page 26

New Business:

A) C.B. Budget Hearing:

Dr. Lapetina advised that from an insurance point of view, he is sure that the Board is covered in the errors and omissions clause, and we actually have to be, otherwise we all better go home now. It does not make any difference whether you are on this Board or the Planning Board if someone wants to sue you they can do so with regards to your comments, decision making, practices whatever. They can sue you so you have to be covered, otherwise you better not say anything.

Ms. Davis commented that the Board is definitely covered by law.

Dr. Lapetina said that then we did not give up anything.

Ms. Davis informed the Board that she would keep this item on the agenda for the next meeting in case they had any ideas or wanted to discuss anything, and also as a reminder of the C.B. Budget hearing date.

Dr. Lapetina explained that it may not be the year for it, but he thinks that there is a different feature so to speak on the landscape now. Conservation has become much more of a critical issue, much more of a popular issue and much more of a participatory concept among the general public. I think it is harder to push it off onto the side now. It may not be the year for it now, but I think at another time, perhaps its time to make a good case for it. I have not been on the Board that long, but I can tell you for as long as I have been on that the character of this Board has changed dramatically in the last six months and for the better.

Ms. Davis noted that the Conservation Board has had a very good run of excellent members, once trained. However, when the members become very good then the Planning Board recruits them and we have to start all over again.

**Conservation Board
Minutes of Meeting
October 28, 2008**

Page 27

New Business:

A) C.B. Budget Hearing:

Board member Shoshana Hantman commented that then those appointments are good for the town.

Ms. Davis responded of course, but then the Conservation Board has to start all over again recruiting new members and training them, which takes time, so it is not beneficial to our Board.

The Board members took no further action at this time.

B) Tentative Informal Meeting/to be arranged between C.B. members and Planning Board members regarding JFK High School/St. Patrick's Church and the Trailway/need possible dates and times:

The Conservation Board members discussed the tentative informal meeting that they are attempting to arrange between the Planning Board and the Conservation Board.

Board member Charles Friedberg advised the Board that they need to make sure that the Trailway goes through the JFK property and that the Town is able to take advantage of the one million dollars that the County has earmarked for the cause. We need to push that through and get the bike path operational as soon as possible.

**Conservation Board
Minutes of Meeting
October 28, 2008**

Page 28

New Business:

B) Tentative Informal Meeting/PB-CB:

Ms. Davis explained to the Board members that she contacted the Chairperson, Ms. DeLucia and she was not able to make the tentative meeting on Monday, so she did not pursue it any further at that time. She noted that Board member Merker wanted to have that meeting, but it was inconvenient for the Planning Board.

Chairman Meixner said that it wasn't because he could not be present at the meeting?

Ms. Davis said that it was a majority of people who could not make it, as it turns out not very many people of the principles involved could make the proposed meeting. She explained that Dr. Merker sent her an email on the 16th and she missed it at first and then when she saw it and checked it out, several people could not participate. It was not the short notice; it was the timing that did not allow for the meeting. She reiterated that Chairperson Ms. DeLucia apologized and said that they were too busy doing what they are doing and everyone is out of town, so she is operating with a minority of her Board.

However, said Ms. Davis (reference item B on New Business), that Ms. DeLucia is in favor of the Trailway going through the JFK property and that she thinks that the majority of her Board members are in favor of the Trailway going through there. Ms. DeLucia asked for some tentative dates from the Conservation Board and she said that she would get back to us.

Dr. Lapetina asked why the C.B. could give her a date that is the same as our date for our meeting.

**Conservation Board
Minutes of Meeting
October 28, 2008**

Page 29

New Business:

B) Tentative Informal Meeting/PB-CB:

Ms. Davis responded that it would be good for her, but being it is the day before Ms. DeLucia's meeting she does not know that it would be a good time (after speaking with Fedora) for the Planning Board Chair.

Board member Charles Friedberg agreed and said the second and fourth Tuesday of the month is perfect for us.

Ms. Davis explained that it would not necessarily be an informal meeting at that point (not that it matters) but they had requested it be informal. So, then we would just be inviting them to our meeting.

Chairman Meixner agreed and said to invite them on those dates at 8 o'clock.

The Board members took no further action at this time.

There being no further business to discuss, a motion to adjourn was made at 9:30 PM by Board member Charles Friedberg and seconded by Board member James Moriarty. All members present approved.

**Conservation Board
Minutes of Meeting
October 28, 2008**

Page 30

The next regular meeting of the Conservation Board will be held at the Town House on November 25, 2008 at 7:30 PM.

Subsequent Conservation Board meetings are tentatively scheduled to be held at the Town House on December 9, 2008 and December 23, 2008 respectively.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosetta Davis
Secretary
Conservation Board

Cc: Town Board
Town Clerk
Town Engineer
Town Planner
Planning Board
Zoning Board
Open Space Committee
Architectural Review Advisory Board
Landmark Committee