

# TOW Conservation Commission

## Meeting Notes

Meeting of 01/09/06

### Begin

7:35 pm

### Attending

- Salvatore LaBruna
- Claude Braithwaite – Not attending
- Patricia Owen
- Jon Paul Heurich
- Kevin Sumner
- Mike Leary
- Kate Fox

### Review of Previous Meeting Notes

- Minutes were handed out and read individually. Nominated for approval by Jon Paul. Seconded by Kate.

### Official Business

- PDR Program
  - Two properties were submitted in time to be considered
    - Goldstein and Smiley properties.
    - Two others were submitted too late for this submission but will be considered for future submittals.
  - Completed the evaluation forms with the assistance of Mr. King (he knows the area better than the rest of us).
  - Most of the evaluation categories required objective information (e.g. size of properties, soil type, etc.) and were completed by Sal and Kevin previously.
  - Factor 8, “Discretionary Points” required more subjective analysis and were therefore completed as a group.
    - A. Usable buildings
      - Multiple very useful (and currently be utilized) buildings on the Smiley property. Very few if any on Goldstein.
      - Possible = 10, Smiley = 10, Goldstein = 2.
    - B. Streams and ponds
      - Goldstein is on the Wallkill River. There is a small stream on Smiley that comes from Highland Lakes Park and empties into the Wallkill shortly after leaving the property.
      - Possible = 4, Smiley = 3, Goldstein = 4.
    - C. Water quality.

- The stream on Smiley comes from Highland Lakes Park and is known to contain fish, crabs, and salamanders. The Wallkill River is fairly polluted near the Goldstein property.
    - Possible = 4, Smiley = 3, Goldstein = 2.
  - D. Wood lots, support wildlife.
    - Goldstein is mostly open, but has some regrowth woods. The property border along the Wallkill could be considered a wildlife corridor. Smiley has several large patches of woods but they are isolated and therefore probably not part of a wildlife corridor.
    - Possible = 4, Smiley = 3, Goldstein = 4.
  - E. Scenic view
    - Smiley is visible from the highway and is a very scenic farm. Goldstein is tucked away and slopes down away from the highway so it isn't as visible.
    - Possible = 4, Smiley = 4, Goldstein = 2.
  - F. Scenic road.
    - Both are on scenic roads. Smiley's is one of the last dirt roads left in the area.
    - Possible = 4, Smiley = 4, Goldstein = 4.
  - G. Ownership / future ownership.
    - The Smiley farm is family owned, has a young operator with many family members currently participating. Goldstein being used by others (polo club next door) that should help sustain it into the future. Goldstein also has 10 nieces and nephews at or coming of working age, but we don't know their interest level in sustaining the property as a farm.
    - Possible = 8, Smiley = 8, Goldstein = 6.
  - H. Agriculture economic viability
    - Kevin's analysis of the soils says that they are both excellent, though the Smiley's ranks a little higher. Goldstein does have the Wallkill for irrigation, but the Wallkill is the lowest point on the property so the irrigation water would need to be pumped uphill.
    - Possible = 20, Smiley = 18, Goldstein = 16.
- Totals
  - Part 1 (Soils): Possible = 100, Smiley = 52.3, Goldstein = 36.8.
  - Part II Objective: Possible = 150, Smiley = 125, Goldstein = 104.
  - Part II Subjective: Possible = 58, Smiley = 53, Goldstein = 40.
  - Total: Possible = 308, Smiley = 230.3, Goldstein = 180.8.
- The conclusion is that the commission unanimously supports the Smiley farm for this round of funding (we had previously decided that we only support one for this initial round).
- Reviewed the draft resolution authorizing funding and the town's acquisition of the easement on the property. Recommended no changes.
- We will submit the evaluation and assessment forms and the draft resolution prior to town board working meeting on Wednesday.
- We will also send a correspondence to the Goldstein's saying that only one candidate has been chosen for this round, but that we think that they are a strong

candidate. When we prepare to submit another application they will automatically be included for consideration in the next round (with their permission).

- Mr. King will have a copy of the resolution sent to the other town board members and Mr. Greenwald's office prior to the working meeting on Wednesday.
- Planning Board Materials
  - Globe Contracting.
    - Small changes, but basically this is the same plan that we recommended against approval of several months ago.
    - We will retain our previous recommendation that this development proposal is inappropriate for both the site and the area.
- Future Meetings
  - Next Monday to continue the PDR effort.
  - Possibly to town board working meeting Wednesday (Sal will e-mail).

## **Future Projects**

- Tree cover – Mike will investigate / spearhead.
  - Kevin brought in copies of urban forestry grant from City of Middletown.
  - Mike took the bundle to incorporate into his investigation.
  - Mike brought copies of “Planning for an ordinance” from the Phytosphere website.
- Sidewalks – Sal will investigate / spearhead.
- Reduction of pollutants in storm water runoff
- Pace on-line course for land use.

## **Adjourned**

Motion to adjourn by Pat. Seconded by Mike. 9:15.

## **Copies:**

- Mike – 7 copies of 3 page meeting notes.
- Sal – 7 copies of 13 sheets of Agenda.
- Sal also made several copies of documents for town officials, but didn't have an exact count at this time.