

APPROVED

Community Preservation Fund Advisory Board Meeting Minutes January 7, 2010

Members present: Chair Susan Ezrati, Rich Biezynski, Pete Hubbell, Brent Kovalchik, Robin Logan
Phil Seymour

Absent: Miriam Latzer

The meeting was called to order at 7:40 p.m. A quorum was determined to be present for the conduct of business. The Board reviewed the December 3, 2009 minutes. Brent noted that in paragraph 5, page 1, Red Hook should be substituted wherever Tivoli is mentioned. Also a wording change was made in paragraph two, page two. As there were no further changes, Phil moved to accept the Minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Rich and all were in favor.

Susan handed out copies of three spreadsheets which she had developed. She explained that the first spreadsheet lists the properties in geographic order, the second by category (A, B, etc.) and the third by total score. The Board reviewed the map relative to the first spreadsheet. Susan felt that it would have been helpful to have listed the parcel numbers. She noted that when she developed this spreadsheet, she found that not all the properties had complete data. Some seem to have been skipped, leaving the information incomplete. In response to questioning, she noted that not very many are incomplete. There are also some categories on which the Board has no information, e.g. ecological features. She suggested that as none of the properties have an ecological feature, perhaps this category should be eliminated. After discussion, the Board agreed to eliminate this category.

It was determined that "protected farmland" referred to property which already has an easement on it. Brent noted that the Open Space Plan has explanations of all the categories. Susan asked whether there should be categories for drinking water and well heads. This would identify future water sources. However she also said that protection can be accomplished through zoning and other means so that these funds need not necessarily be expended for that purpose. There was discussion as to whether points should be given for drinking water protection. Rich responded that water is not in the A group. He said that "drinking water" is a broad, vague term and questioned how the Board could evaluate that.

Brent noted that the Open Space Plan mentions the various local streams as resources. Pete questioned whether the Board needs to adhere to what the book states. He felt that the simpler the Board makes it, the easier it is for everyone to understand. He suggested using one broad category which would include all water resources, viz. the above ground streams, aquifers, etc. and giving that category a ranking. Brent said that water is especially important for the villages. Water would be needed for any future development. He suggested one set of categories for the town and another for the villages as the importance of various categories could be different for the villages as opposed to the town. In this vein, Pete said that water for irrigation is important to the farmers. Susan asked if the aquifer protection and the drinking water could be combined into one category.

Pete suggested that the Board obtain input from the town Water Board. Robin supported that idea. Brent said that there is a water resources map to which the Board could refer. Susan said she could create a new column/adjacent columns for aquifer, drinking water and well head protection. Brent said that a study had been done by the Chazen Group and many maps are available. Dutchess

County Soil and Water Conservation has also done recent work on ground water. Pete reiterated his suggestion that all water resources be lumped together. Susan said that there are many nuances, e.g. federal versus state wetlands. Brent said that federal wetlands are less restrictive. The DEC controls the tributaries and is more restrictive. Pete said that the wetlands issue is different from that of water resources and should be separate from above ground streams. Brent said that the two are linked together as in some cases the streams are a source of drinking water.

Susan suggesting combining the categories of ag district, operating farms, prime soils and priority ag, into one heading, but keeping the details. Then one rating could be made for the entire category. Another category could include aquifer protection, drinking water and well head protection. Rich suggested that surface water, i.e. lakes, streams, ponds and wetlands could be another category.

The meaning of the category of priority forests was discussed. Brent said that these properties are areas which are not interrupted by main roads, where agriculture is not the predominant land use and where there is a significant forested area and wildlife. It was determined that this referred to properties along River Road. Phil said that he felt that the categories should be left as is and not lumped together. Susan said that priority ag should be an A category, not B. Aquifer protection, drinking water, well heads and wetlands could be different columns. Phil asked whether the category of drinking water is necessary if you separate out aquifers and well heads. Susan said she would add columns for drinking water and well heads. Pete said that there are multiple uses for the wetlands, including recharging the aquifer, and they should be separate.

Susan said that since questions keep coming up, e.g. on the agricultural properties, perhaps the Board should get input from the appropriate committees. Rich said that the work of the Board is following the work of the Ag Committee. In response to questioning, Susan clarified that in showing the work of the Board to other committees she simply wanted to be assured that the most up to date data had been used. She went on to discuss the spreadsheet with the rankings of the various categories. She noted that some parcels have several parts, each of which was ranked separately. Rich said that if the parts were considered together, such parcels would rank higher. It was decided to lump together properties with the same owner.

Susan said she will go back to the spreadsheets, distinguish between aquifers and drinking water and reposition priority ag next to the ag designation. She and Brent will meet and work on the village categories. Pete offered to use his mapping programs to obtain the missing information for those parcels with incomplete data. He will then run this information by Rich. The Board reached consensus that input should be sought from the Ag Committee and the Water Board; however the final approval will be the purview of the Board.

A motion to adjourn was made by Phil and seconded by Brent. The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 P.M. The next meeting will be held on February 4, 2010 at 7:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheila Franklin