

CHILI TOWN BOARD  
October 5, 2011

A meeting of the Chili Town Board was held on October 5, 2011 at the Chili Town Hall, 3333 Chili Avenue, Rochester, New York 14624 at 7:00 p.m. The meeting was called to order by Supervisor David Dunning.

PRESENT: Councilwoman DiFlorio; Councilwoman Ignatowski, Councilman Slattery, Councilwoman Sperr and Supervisor David Dunning.

ALSO PRESENT: Richard Brongo, Town Clerk; Jordon Brown, Deputy Town Supervisor; Dawn Forte, Supervisor's Secretary; Sandra Hewlett, Stenographer; David Lindsay, Commissioner of Public Works/Highway Superintendent and Building Department Representative; Dianne O'Meara, Director of Finance; Richard Stowe, Counsel for the Town; Eric Vail, Insurance Counselor.

The invocation was given by Richard Brongo.

The Pledge of Allegiance was cited. The fire safety exits were identified for those present.

---

PUBLIC HEARING

A Public Hearing was held by the Chili Town Board on October 5, 2011 at the Chili Town Hall, 3333 Chili Avenue, Rochester, New York 14624 at 7:05 p.m. to discuss Local Law of 2011 amending "Zoning Law of 1981 -- Student Residence."

Attendance as previously noted in the 10/5/11 Chili Town Board meeting minutes.

COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

TIMOTHY SCHULIK, 39 Names Road

MR. SCHULIK: Timothy Schulik, 39 Names Road. I had spoken to you previously about a year and a half ago, Dave (Dunning) out in the parking lot, that was me, briefly about the problems.

I just want to say that I support obviously the Rural Agricultural, you know, the addition, the amending of the zoning. I just want to point out that what I don't understand first of all -- I know I -- the -- across the river in the Town of Henrietta, that it appears that zoning laws were changed to accommodate student housing on an overlay in the first place and without an impact study, without proper notification of all current homeowners in the area both by letters and signs posted so that they could come down there. There would be at least possibly, at the very least, a meeting, a vote or referendum on that issue.

In my opinion, the student housing has decimated and destroyed the fabric of our neighborhood and continues to do so, parking, code violations and a whole list of other things. But, you know, either here nor there.

The garbage, the mowing, the condition of the properties, it is an absolutely nightmare. I have had 38 Names Road, John Hills' property across from me for the past decade. It has been a nightmare. Every couple years a new crew is in. I can't even get out of my driveway. I try to back up. You know, they're parked down the roads.

None of that is being enforced. The Sheriffs have been called by multiple -- myself and Steven Kremer, next to my house. It has been Steve (Kremer) and I before the rest of the neighborhood got involved on our road.

Alfred, we have roads in our neighborhood you can't again get down at night. Parties, frat parties, bonfires, periodically throughout. It is an absolute nightmare.

So with that in mind, and moving forward, I hope that the Town will look at all aspects of what has happened to a residential neighborhood.

Thank you.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Thank you.

I would just like to point out this is an amendment to a Local Law in which we passed legislation a little while ago which is primarily designed to protect single-family homes in single-family neighborhoods. This amendment is being made because of an oversight in the original crafting of the legislation which ignored an area where we knew that there was -- there was an area of single-family homes that were not zoned strictly residential, so this adds to that that allows a property owner to apply for this -- the single -- or student housing overlay. That is still an application process, and I will ask Mr. Stowe to chime in if I mentioned this process incorrectly, but I believe the process for this is that first if a -- if a homeowner who chooses to

rent to more than three unrelated persons, if they choose to do that, they first must come to apply to the Town for this overlay.

They would then be heard by the Planning Board. The Planning Board would then hear this application and then make a recommendation to this Board. This Board would then make a determination whether or not that overlay was appropriate for that particular house, houses or -- or that particular area.

And I would say that just because perhaps one homeowner or one landlord or homeowner that is renting to more people chooses to do that, doesn't mean that because if they got it, that the whole entire neighborhood turns into that. This legislation does not make this neighborhood -- doesn't make this apply to this neighborhood right now. It only gives the ability, and quite frankly, my understanding is that technically and legally we really can't take away the ability for people to use their homes in the way they choose to. In this case they just have to apply to do it.

There is a long process someone would have to go through to make this happen.

RICHARD STOWE: Fairly stated.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Certainly just because you make application does not necessarily mean you will be granted the overlay, as well; am I correct on that?

RICHARD STOWE: Yes.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: You're correct.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: So certainly if there are known problems with a particular household and the landlord being in control of the students that are there, if they come forward through the Planning and Town Board Public Hearings and we hear about that, that could certainly go on the record and we could --

RICHARD STOWE: That's accurate.

The other thing, but perhaps the most important thing, is it gives the opportunity for folks to be heard and the Planning Board under a special use permit situation to have the latitude to attach appropriate and reasonable conditions if in the judgment of the Planning Board they are warranted. That is a step that doesn't exist today.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: They can put time -- can they put time limits?

RICHARD STOWE: Appropriate and reasonable. We'll leave the rest to the Planning Board.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Do you want to clarify those for those residents who may be currently renting to students that are not experiencing any problems, do they now have to come into the Building Department and do that process?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Any homeowner within the districts defined in the Local Law, if this Local Law -- if we adopt this particular amendment to it, um, the -- the way the Home Law is currently written, as well as this amendment, should this amendment be adopted at a latter meeting, um, if you live in those areas and you are renting to more than three unrelated people, yes, it applies to your home.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: The question I have been asked is what is the process of alerting the Town to the fact that a residence is being utilized for rental to students?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: It is -- it is the same as any other process, complaint process for anything else in the Town, whether it be a dog or an unkept yard or whatever the complaint might be, is it -- the complaint process. Those complaints can be filed online at our website.

You can download the form and send that in, as well, as coming into the Building Department. It is all managed through the Building Department but a formal complaint -- for us to be able to take -- I say "us," the Town to take action on anything, a formal complaint must be filed. We can't just go in and randomly start -- start going through people's houses and start questioning people. That is not the way that works.

TOM MC MOHR (phonetic), Morrison Avenue

MR. MC MOHR: My name is Tom McMohr (phonetic) more from Morrison Avenue, and I'm glad I received this flyer in the mail last week that something is being done about this issue.

Last Friday night there was a large party on Harold and Theron. There had to be in excess of 100, 150 people, cars on both sides of Harold, which made it essentially a one-way street, which is a safety factor. Theron was the same condition. There is still beer cans and cups on the streets in the surrounding areas that I noticed today.

Also during the wintertime, the cars which have excess residents leave their cars in the street, which make it a safety issue and a plowing issue trying to get around these parked cars, so that road -- so that the streets and roads can't be cleared safely.

Thank you.

PEGGY JUDGE, 49 Names Road

MS. JUDGE: Peggy Judge, 49 Names Road.

I -- yeah. In our little Ballantyne neighborhood, cursory review of that, we have in excess of ten houses that are rented to students. Some of those houses contain three, four, five, six -- up to seven students living in the house. Um, you know, we all have our concerns as far as the parties, the garbage, the noise, the parking, the under-age drinking that I am assuming going on at these things.

Safety issues with the traveling back and forth.

Um, I would like to just say I am in support of adding that to the amendment.

TERRY BONTER, 89 Names Road

MR. BONTER: Thank you. Terry Bonter, 89 Names Road. Just wanted to add my support to what my neighbors have already said. It is a huge problem that is totally out of control in that neighborhood right now, and although enacting this will not totally solve that problem, at least it gives us a chance to get it under control because it is totally out of control right now.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Thank you.

ROY WAGNER, 87 Names Road

MR. WAGNER: Roy Wagner, 87 Names Road. I will be brief. We don't need any more slum lords.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: That was brief.

HANS BORS, 79 Names Road

MR. BORS: My name is Hans Bors, 79 Names Road. Repeating just about everything here, I made a list, too, of everything, too. I mean, the same thing.

The parking on the streets, the garbage, beer bottles. The houses sit vacant in the summer when the students aren't here. It is the same thing, all night long.

The other thing is they're putting student rental signs right on the properties. You know, saying "student housing" right here, right on the houses, and I don't even think that is legal at all as far as federal goes. You should be able to rent to anybody, not just student housing at these houses. So that is another issue there, too. There should not be signs on there just specifically for them.

You know, there are other people that rent out houses that are fine, you know. Single-family people coming in and renting a house, that is fine. They take care of their yard, that is one thing.

But these kids you can't get down the street. The same thing. During the summertime there is garbage, the houses are vacant, broken windows, the curtains hanging there all over the place.

The same thing with the concern with the police, can't get down the roads, anybody.

And another thing that I didn't bring up, there a lot of children in that neighborhood still. There are some that live right next door. 5-, 7-year- old kids peddling in the street. These kids go zipping through the stop sign at Theron and Names. I have seen the cops sit down there, bust a few people and they go away and they just start it up again. They just zip right on through. I -- I don't know how many times I have seen people almost get hit and myself going through that intersection.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: So you would say speeding on Names?

MR. BORS: From Theron, from Ballantyne Road, when they turn onto Theron, Names Road is the intersection that they come to first. They just zip right through that stop sign without even hesitating to stop.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I have known of two kids that have got hit on bikes in that neighborhood.

MR. BORS: Yes. One by Ballantyne Road. He was all over the news that one time, too. There is a house right there, too.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: There is a Traffic Safety Committee, and the reason I think Mary (Sperr) is bringing that up, she is a liaison for that. And they will bring up -- if people have concerns regarding that, there is a Traffic Safety Committee that they can voice their concerns at that meeting, as well, and Mary (Sperr) is liaison and she will bring that information back to them.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: If you're interested, the meetings are held in the highway garage, the Highway Department, 7 o'clock on the first Thursday, so tomorrow night at 7 we'll meet again. Feel free to come.

MR. BORS: First Thursday's?

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Yeah. First Thursdays. We'll meet again tomorrow night so if you're interested, feel free to attend. Residents are given an opportunity to address the Committee before the meeting starts so you don't have to stay for the whole thing. It doesn't take long.

MR. BORS: My other question would be, too, I -- I know there is a sign there on Ballantyne Road that is posted like after November 1st, you're not supposed to park on the side of the street.

Is there any other law that concerns that about parking anywhere else in the neighborhood at any specific time?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Actually, I would defer that to Mr. Lindsay, if I could. I know you're more familiar with some of those parking regulations.

Could you please address that?

DAVID LINDSAY: And the sign you're referring to deals with our snowplow operations that restricts parking from November to April. I don't believe there are any other parking restrictions in that particular neighborhood, but we could check the code for you if you would like.

MR. BORS: Right. Very good. Thank you very much.

WISCHMEYER, 53 Names Road

MR. WISCHMEYER: Robert Wischmeyer, 53 Names Road. I -- I would like to have the amendment sent through. I agree with all of the neighbors. There is really not much more that

most everybody else has covered that I can say.

Just it's just been out of control the last couple of years and it seems to get worse and worse every year.

Thank you.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Thank you.

MS. JUDGE: I have one quick question. We have a house in the neighborhood that is being rented to sex offenders. I believe I have been told there are more than four people living in that home.

Does this overlay cover that particular issue or is that completely separate?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I can't answer that right now. I -- I would -- I would come over to Mr. Stowe and --

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: He is like oh, please, don't.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I really.

RICHARD STOWE: Are they related?

MS. JUDGE: No. And the owner of the house is a convicted felon his own self.

Do we need to side bar that?

RICHARD STOWE: No. No, we don't. I -- I followed the procedure that -- well, assuming this passes, I would follow the procedure that the Supervisor outlined, and allow the complaint process to run its course and have the Building Department investigate whatever they need to investigate and make a determination on whether without regard to their criminal status, whether there is a violation of --

MS. JUDGE: Members living in the house.

RICHARD STOWE: -- the provision of the non-related family members. That is the polite way of saying the fact they're convicted felons and sex offenders doesn't really matter.

MS. JUDGE: Thank you.

JOHN KNAPP, 105 Names Road

MR. KNAPP: I agree with all these people. We all have the same problems. I just want to say we're reinforcing their decisions to go ahead with this movement.

But the question I got for you is there something that can be done, Ginny (Ignatowski), about why it takes so damn long to get something rectified in that neighborhood?

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Actually, I will turn that over to Counsel. This process is --

MR. KNAPP: You know the situation I'm talking about.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I know when I was out gathering petitions -- I will say this is what happened -- I was made aware of the situation and then thought that you were covered under what we had just recently passed, because -- because you looked residential.

So then when I made a comment to somebody, they're like, "Well, no, that is not a residential zoned area."

I was like, "They're not?"

That is when I found out the history of what your zoning is and then requested that we make an amendment to this law to take that forward. And then it has to go through the process of -- the various legal processes and setting this Public Hearing, and there has to be a certain amount of time. Everything in government --

MR. KNAPP: That certain amount of time as far as I'm concerned is unacceptable. Six months to have somebody move junk out of the yard that the kids threw out to begin with?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I think what we -- we don't all know the history between you and Ginny (Ignatowski) and what was mentioned before.

MR. KNAPP: Oh, we have no history. (Laughter.)

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: The history referring to when Ginny (Ignatowski) came out to gather petitions when you mentioned something to her, is the history. The other history is your business, we don't need to know about that. Sorry, ma'am. (Laughter.)

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: That's okay.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: If there are garbage issues, have complaints been called into our Building Department? There is a process. What we're doing here doesn't have anything to do with the garbage issue. These are separate issues. If there are complaints for high grass, garbage in the yard, vehicles that aren't registered and so forth, there is -- our Building Department, our Code Enforcement takes care of that.

So if those problems are coming up, call the Building Department and they can address those.

MR. KNAPP: Okay. That is fine, but what I am saying is, can we shorten that process? This Board has approval process to --

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: What process is that, sir? Of garbage and stuff there to call the Building Department? That -- you pick up the phone, call the Building Department, they're --

MR. KNAPP: I called, but it took six months for somebody to get down there to clean the stuff out of the front yard.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Now you're talking about going on private property. So there -- so legally, Counsel, I will go to you, there -- it's -- we don't have control over that.

RICHARD STOWE: Does that require me to be familiar with the history?

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: No, because I'm not aware of the garbage.

The only thing I'm aware of was the whole rental situation as far as complaints about the --

the condition of the house. That is not within our purview.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I know you have been over to Counsel for an answer, but I know Mr. Lindsay is also very familiar with this because he deals with this as a regular basis and as the head of the Building Department, he can probably answer this process, how this process works and what action we can and can't take and within what time frame.

So have at it, Mr. Lindsay.

DAVID LINDSAY: Can I punt?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: No, you may not.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Just don't ask about the history.

DAVID LINDSAY: I don't know if you filed a formal complaint with the Building Department. Assuming that you have done that, we would log that in and it would be followed up by the Code Enforcement Officer. There is a process we follow with everyone where we provide -- when we receive a complaint, we'll go out and we'll make a visual observation of the site to see if there really is a valid complaint there.

Once we have made that determination, we file or we send an Order of Remedy to the resident. There is an established time frame in which they have to comply. If they don't comply, they get a final order. If they fail to comply, they get issued an appearance ticket to the Court.

MR. KNAPP: That took six months to get done.

DAVID LINDSAY: I don't know if that is the case because I don't know if you actually filed a formal complaint. I'm not familiar with the house you may be speaking about or the property.

Certainly if you would like to come down to the Building Department tomorrow or give me a call, we can look into it.

MR. KNAPP: I would be happy to.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I think that is the important thing, sir. We have the dialogue and the people know about it. If you feel you're not getting the response, then I would -- from the Building Department, I would say he is the Supervisor of that area. Or you have the Town Supervisor. You can give him a call, as well. So if you feel you're not getting the proper response or the response that you would like, then I would say take that course of action. We're here to work with you. We're not here to fight with you. We live in this community, as well. There is a quality of life issue, and you know, we're going to hear about it. This is the last place that we really want to hear about it. We should hear about it being taken care of, and Mr. Lindsay, he does a great job.

So I'm sure, if you want to talk to him after the meeting or tomorrow or something, he will be more than happy to look into it for you.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: And I don't want to drift away from this because Mr. Lindsay will take care of this for you, but I would like to stay with the intent of what this actual Public Hearing is about tonight, if we could.

But Mr. Lindsay will take care of this for you, get your answers for this particular case.

Do you have any other questions as it relates to this student overlay housing?

MR. KNAPP: No. I think I'm pretty much done.

MICHELLE BONTER, 89 Names Road

MS. BONTER: Michelle Bonter, 89 Names Road.

Can you go online to take care of all these complaints for all of the different various departments?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I can't hear.

MS. BONTER: Can you go online for all of the various different departments for the complaints, like the garbage?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: To see what they were?

MS. BONTER: No, to file them.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: To file them, yes.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: It would all be with the Building Department.

MS. BONTER: Okay. And I also support the -- the thing that is up tonight.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: The amendment to the law.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Thank you.

MR. WAGNER: If you people have any pull with the authorities, maybe you could get us a weekend Sheriff patrol. I mean they do come by, but they come by at 9 o'clock in the morning. You know, we need a Friday night and a Saturday night run through the neighborhood. I mean if they're there, they can just drive-thru there. That would help.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I can tell you that when this is discussed at Traffic & Safety, usually it is the Captain of the Sheriff's Department, David Inzanza who attends the meeting. If not, he sends another Sheriff Deputy in his place.

One of the solutions to -- one of the first solutions to speeding issues in an area is to send a Sheriff's Deputy out at some point in time to help monitor that and give out some tickets or assess the situation so there will be some Sheriff's presence just from that complaint to start with.

But I will mention this to him tomorrow night, too.

MR. WAGNER: They usually all have scanners so they know the Sheriff is coming so they run and hide, and they come out again after they're gone.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: It won't be on the scanner if the Sheriff has it on his radar.

MR. WAGNER: I called them and they told me not to do it -- that they would do it, they wouldn't announce over the radio they were going there.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: They won't.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: This would be a special attention. They would have it -- you know, they would get it at the beginning of the shift, they know this special attention. It will not go over the radio. They would just go out there periodically and take a look.

MR. WAGNER: I see it happen a dozen times. All of a sudden, the noise stops, the Sheriff goes by, the noise starts again. They know they're coming. They're not stupid. They're supposed to be college kids.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Doesn't make them smart.

The Public Hearing was closed at 7:25 p.m.

---

#### PUBLIC HEARING

A Public Hearing was held by the Chili Town Board on October 5, 2011 at the Chili Town Hall, 3333 Chili Avenue, Rochester, New York 14624 at 7:25 p.m. to discuss Local Law of 2011 amending "Chapter 500, Special Use Permits."

Attendance as previously noted in the 10/5/11 Chili Town Board meeting minutes.

COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE AUDIENCE: None.

The Public Hearing was closed at 7:26 p.m.

---

#### PUBLIC HEARING

A Public Hearing was held by the Chili Town Board on October 5, 2011 at the Chili Town Hall, 3333 Chili Avenue, Rochester, New York 14624 at 7:26 p.m. to discuss Local Law of 2011 amending "Zoning Law of 1981 - Seasonal Use of Snow Fences."

Attendance as previously noted in the 10/5/11 Chili Town Board meeting minutes.

The Public Hearing was closed at 7:26 p.m.

---

#### PUBLIC HEARING

A Public Hearing was held by the Chili Town Board on October 5, 2011 at the Chili Town Hall, 3333 Chili Avenue, Rochester, New York 14624 at 7:27 p.m. to discuss the 2030 Comprehensive Plan.

Attendance as previously noted in the 10/5/11 Chili Town Board meeting minutes.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I'm going to do this -- ask that we do this Public Hearing a little bit differently. I have attempted or will attempt to put up the elements of this Comprehensive Plan as we go along. But I will actually officially open the Public Hearing for the 2030 Comprehensive Plan.

In doing so, before I ask for public comment, I would like to first note for the record that we did receive comments from the Monroe County Planning and Development. Simply put, the comments back was the Town is recommending under Objective 1-G, Number 6 on page 4-14, "To establish a woodlands protection map to increase and maintain the high quality woodlands. The municipalities may wish to work with the following organizations to educate landowners on the benefits of participation and maintaining woodlands."

Then they mentioned a couple of the agencies that -- that we could potentially work with as we worked through that. So other than that, there were no real comments that affect the overall content of the Comprehensive Plan.

I would guess I would ask for this Comprehensive Plan that we considered going through this chapter by chapter.

I am going to ask -- I know the Town Board has probably got some questions on this, and I guess what I would like to do is have the Town Board voice some of their -- some of their concerns or questions about this. I apologize for the delay here while I get this up and running, but I wanted to get the chapters up there. I know not everybody in the room has a copy of this in front of them. For anybody that might want to see it, we'll try to make it as easy as possible to view. We'll go through this chapter by chapter. I will ask the Town Board, please, for your comments as we go through these chapters.

Upon completion of that, we'll go to additional public comment so the public can comment not only on what they may know about this Comprehensive Plan, but perhaps any of the comments that you, Town Council, may have on this particular plan.

So if everybody is okay with that, we'll -- and moving with that process, I guess I would like to --

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Do you want to recognize the Comprehensive Plan

members in the audience?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Thank you, Mary (Sperr). Probably a good idea.

The Comprehensive Plan Committee, um, was put together by the Town Board almost three years ago now. And it was --

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Excuse me. In case some of the people that -- that wanted to leave and they -- what we're discussing, I'm not sure if they truly understand what we're discussing right now.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: The Comprehensive Plan is -- is basically the plan for the Town for the next 20 years, the development of the document that was developed by this group that is basically the road map for how the Town of Chili or what the Town of Chili prefers to have happen over the next 20 years or so. So certainly if you're welcome to stay if you would like and listen to it. It is a good document. We should know, people should know what is going on in the Town and what the plan is for the development of the Town over the next 20 years. So please feel free to stay and listen. We certainly welcome you, but if you have other business and you would like to move on, feel free to.

But anyway, so this plan -- so the Comprehensive Plan, again this Committee was put together a couple years ago or a few years ago now. This Committee worked diligently over 2 1/2 or better part of 3 years meeting at least monthly, if not more often, to craft this plan. I was -- this Committee was comprised of residents, people who were also on other Boards and Committees, but it was -- and there -- none of us were actually on the Committee. I sat in on the meetings as a liaison to provide Town Board support wherever the Committee needed it, and our Chairman was -- Jordon Brown, my Deputy Supervisor, he was actually Chairman of this Committee.

Also on that Committee we have a few of the members here. Dorothy Borgus was a part of that Committee. Bill Steimer was part of that Committee and Fred Trott here was -- was also on that Committee.

I just wanted to point out, through this whole process, this 2 1/2 years, I think we had a total of two residents actually show up for any of the meetings at any point in time. And I guess I would like to take the time to recognize our most faithful resident that showed up at nearly every meeting sitting in the back corner hiding, Tom Ryther. Tom (Ryther) was there for almost all of our meetings to hear what was going on and actually had some valuable input when we got to the first Committee Public Hearing.

This is actually the second Public Hearing being held for the Comprehensive Plan.

Did I miss anything?

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: No.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Okay. So I will go then to -- we started out -- the document starts with an Executive Summary.

Is there any questions from the -- from the Town Board on the Executive Summary? No, okay.

Then I will move into Chapter 1. Chapter 1, is there any comments on Chapter 1?

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I did on 13. Um, the second and third to last paragraphs, um, on the bottom of the page.

It indicates "The Monroe County Water Authority also made capital improvements to the water as well as the regional sewer collection."

Actually, the Town also had a part in that. We had to go through several referendum votes for that and the bonding, so I would like to see that reflected in there so we have -- if the wording is changed, "The Monroe County Water Authority and the Town of Chili also made several capital improvements to the water distribution system."

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I think we also wanted to make sure we said "in the southern portion of the Town."

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I was letting him catch up. Also the Monroe County Pure Waters Agency and the Town of Chili. Also extended public sewers.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Okay. I made some highlights in the document so we know.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: So, Supervisor, in regards to us giving you comments that we have, because -- to go and take the time to go and modify the language right now --

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Where it is easy to do, I will highlight it so I know we need to come to the section.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Also have us give the comments to you, to the Board, so we know what we're talking about.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Written comments.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I guess what I would like this Board then to decide as we are going along is this an addition we want to make to it. This is a Public Hearing. If we make these changes tonight and accept these changes tonight during this Public Hearing, it is -- certainly probably works better for the overall flow of the process. Certainly if there is something we can't or -- can't decide on a change tonight, then -- after the Public Hearing I would --

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: So I guess does everybody else concur with that modification?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: That is what I would ask. Does everybody else concur?

The Board concurred with the modification.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Is Sandy (Hewlett) recording this?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Sandy (Hewlett) has the minutes of this.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: I know. Just sometimes --

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I will rely on the minutes to make sure that we -- that we get an accurate --

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I think you do a great job.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: There are certain portions of the meeting sometimes she doesn't transcribe.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: You're digging.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I do know someone else in the audience that may remind me of things that may need changing.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Did we mention Dorothy (Borgus) is here tonight?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: We won't mention any names for that one. We'll just leave that alone.

Anything else on Chapter 1? Anybody have anything?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Yes, Supervisor, on 16. The last paragraph, regarding the -- "In 2006, the Town Board established a Committee to study the Chili Center area and to produce a document that could be considered a Master Plan."

Basically, looking at that statement, um, my thought is being involved with that at that time, that, you know, the wording in there, I think, needs to be modified, changed.

What I have as my comment was, "In 2006, the Town Board established a Committee to study the Chili Center area and to produce a document that could be considered an update Master Plan and was never officially adopted by the Town Board."

Because that was something that we looked at, but it was not adopted for various reasons. So...

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I think it is key, the word "update" -- I would have to agree, is thrown in there. It was not an actual Master Plan. I was supposed to be just an update.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: An update; is that correct?

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I also had the same note.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Everyone concur with that modification?

The Board concurred with the modification.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Anything else in Chapter 1?

Oh, no. Go ahead.

RICHARD STOWE: Would it be fair to call that a "possible update to the Master Plan," because there is -- there is a whole process that we are laboriously going through in order to update the Master Plan.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: No. This is -- this is a new Comprehensive Plan. This is not an update.

RICHARD STOWE: I understand.

Is this the Master Plan or Comprehensive Plan we're talking about?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Comprehensive Plan.

RICHARD STOWE: In this paragraph?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Right, right.

RICHARD STOWE: Which is it?

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Oh, oh, oh. Terminology. Okay.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: So you're saying the word "possible"?

RICHARD STOWE: There was a study that was conducted. It was conducted and my understanding of it was that it was something that could be considered for eventual inclusion in a Master Plan but never was.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Correct.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I like his wording.

RICHARD STOWE: Comprehensive --

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Please -- please somebody rephrase this the way you would like this paragraph.

RICHARD STOWE: "Establish a Committee to study the Chili Center area and to produce a document that could be considered as a possible update to the Master Plan."

How is that?

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Okay.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Do we want to keep in there "although this was not adopted"?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Correct. "Never officially adopted by the Town Board."

RICHARD STOWE: "Possible" turned out to not be actual.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Okay.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I'm okay with that.

Anybody else?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: He didn't go to RIT, but he is educated. (Laughter.)

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Hey, my son graduated from RIT. He was not one of those problems.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Anyway, anything else in Chapter 1?

We'll move on to Chapter 2.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: 2-8. Anybody have anything before 2-8?



The very last paragraph, on 2-8, kind of contradicts itself. Um, because it is saying it both helps and hinders. I was wondering if we could change that wording to instead say, "The Court Street Dam located in Downtown Rochester contributes to the drainage problems in this area only when the flows in the Genesee River is high is the damn lowered. Lowering the dam increases the flow rate through Rochester and helps or keeps flood elevations as low as possible for both the Black Creek and Little Black Creek Watersheds."

The way this is written, contradicts itself. So if we could just maybe...

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Anybody have any concerns with that? Okay.

Next? Chapter 2, anybody else have anything in Chapter 2?

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I had something on Figure 2-6.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Figure 2-6. The Community Facilities and Recreation Map.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: On the map or on the text?

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: On the map itself, the Figure 2-6. Streeters Inn is not on there. And that, to me, is a historic site that should be placed on there. Certainly it is open to the public. The Streeters Inn. It is not listed underneath the historic sites.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Is it possible because it is a County-owned facility? Just a thought.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: With the Committee was there any thought about that?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I was just going to ask.

Dorothy (Borgus), I know you originally had said something.

Or, Jordon (Brown), if you want to chime in.

JORDON BROWN: The discussion we had, and it appears in the minutes, I think, of our final meeting was that, um, we didn't mean for this to be a comprehensive list and that there other -- other buildings that are not listed on here, and we suggested that the Town Board consider having the Historical Committee perhaps look at it to have -- to come up with a comprehensive list if that is what you want.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I don't know that we necessarily have to get into every last house that -- that has been recognized in the Town of Chili, but certainly Streeters Inn is something that is within even our budget, we're paying for the utilities. I mean, that to me is -- is on -- is on like along with the Cobblestone Schoolhouse. To me, that that is a pretty important entity. I don't know if we need to get into beyond that, but something that we're expending public -- you know, taxpayers' money on, I would think should be on this map.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: It is connected with the Cobblestone Schoolhouse because the Preservation Board and our Historian holds open houses at both facilities on Sunday afternoons during the summer, so.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Makes sense.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Does make sense.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Anybody have any issues with doing that? I mean, adding something to the legend shouldn't be a big deal, I think.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I guess my concerns is, Jordon (Brown), are there others? What are the others?

JORDON BROWN: If you don't mind, I would like to defer to Dorothy (Borgus) because at our meetings, she named a couple of other structures.

DOROTHY BORGUS: I believe we talked about the Inn, the former Inn at the corner of Union and Buffalo Road.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I had that on there, as well. The only reason I decided against it because it wasn't really something we put taxpayer monies into.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Well --

DOROTHY BORGUS: Probably if you went back to the minutes of that meeting, they're all there. But we just felt that we -- as Jordon (Brown) said, we -- we had to -- with these maps you have to begin and end somewhere, and pretty soon you're into areas that are gray. And then you don't please anybody.

So we just decided to call it -- call it what we saw, and as Jordon (Brown) said, have the Historical Preservation group go over -- if we wanted to expand it, it -- it could be quite a busy map depending where you draw the line.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I'm not interested in it being very busy, but it is just that one particular one I thought should be added because of its prominence.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Makes sense if Cobblestone is on there, it should be on there, as well. They both either should be on or off.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Was it your intent, Dorothy (Borgus), during your discussion to have the Preservation Board include the homes that have been the -- the Town Board has authorized to be in a Preservation District? There aren't that many. Only nine now.

DOROTHY BORGUS: I don't remember that we got into it to that point.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Because I can have the Preservation Board address it at their upcoming meeting in a couple weeks.

DOROTHY BORGUS: I don't think we intended to go that far with that.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: That was my recollection looking, listening to the Committee. Et me ask, because we have a couple members of the Committee as well as the Chairman here.

Is there any reason, do you have any objection as a Committee for -- for the members that are here?

You, Jordon (Brown)?

JORDON BROWN: I was looking at the minutes trying to find the others.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: That is all right.

Would you see there be any objection to adding Streeters into that map?

BILL STEIMER: No.

DOROTHY BORGUS: No.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: And not going any further with it than other than that at this point?

Jordon (Brown)?

JORDON BROWN: I wouldn't have any objection to it.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Other members of the Committee here, do you think there -- based on your feeling for the Committee and what -- would there be an objection?

BILL STEIMER: No.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I certainly have no objection to that, to adding that there.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: The designation, I guess, would be it is called "community facilities." That is a designated community facility. The Preservation District includes private homes. So that would be the -- the difference to not include them. As I look further on this, I can't remember. It has been a while since I read this, but I would agree just to put Streeters on and leave it at that.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Just that delineation.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: All right.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Sound good?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Sounds fine.

Next. Chapter 2. Anything else on Chapter 2?

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I did on Figure 2-8. I'm sorry.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: We have another one on 2-8?

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Yes. One on 2-6.

This is now 2-8. This is the -- water distribution lines and --

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Map 2-8?

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Map 2-8.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Okay. Thank you.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I'm questioning the -- on Brook Road there, we got a little piece of red. I don't recall that being proposed at all, and there is no homes right there. The blue pieces on either end captures the homes. I don't think that that has any proposed -- and then we are lacking the proposed that we had for going down Wickens Road. I don't know why -- it shows there on the other side. We have it -- the whole plan and everything for Wickens Road and finishing that up through there. And then on the other side, going down Milewood.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Down Milewood.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: We do have engineering reports and everything on that. We're just waiting for some additional research. Before we go forward with that, I would think that that would be reflected on the -- the maps.

DOROTHY BORGUS: I believe, and maybe Jordon (Brown) can back me up on this, and Bill Steimer is here, and Fred (Trott). Um, I think those things were happening as we were doing this map. And -- as we went through this a chapter at a time, we realized that things had happened that affected Chapter 2 and we were already on Chapter 4 or 5, and we knew there would be some things that we were going to have to catch at -- later, and I think this is 1 or 2.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: All right. That is fine. This is obviously what you said, a 2 1/2 year process, and I can certainly understand that there was things that were happening at the Town at the same time.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Progress. I call that progress.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: This question did come up at one of our later, later meetings with the Comprehensive Plan, and I did, um, ask David Lindsay to -- to address that. Um, the response that -- that the -- the red section is accurate as there is no water on that stretch of Brook Road.

With that said, the red section indicates proposed, but I'm not sure why as -- there has -- does not appear to be any properties serviced by this extension. In fact, there are only two commercial and one residential in the 4250 foot stretch of Ballantyne, and this probably does not make sense from a cost standpoint to do at this time.

But I think we already know that it is certainly accurate that this map should probably be modified to indicate the Wickens Road and the Milewood area which there was a proposal out there to do.

Are we okay with making those modifications?

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I had the same note.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Then we'll ask for that modification.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Our waterline experience in the past.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: We'll ask for that modification to be made on the map.

Anything else on Chapter 2? Any other maps?

Chapter 3? Anything on Chapter 3? Anybody have anything on Chapter 3 at all? No?

Chapter 4?

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Yes. Um, very first page. If you look at the very first page, um, it lists sections A, B, C, et cetera. And Section A, on page 4-1, letter B says, "Advanced communication infrastructure network."

If you then turn to page 4-6, which is where B starts, B is referred to as, "Managing the built environment," and the text that follows seems to support the heading of "Managing the built

environment," not "Advanced communication infrastructure network."

So I'm assuming something got glitched somewhere along the way.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I have to agree. We should change the B so that it reflects --

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: 4-1 needs to state what it actually is.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Should match what 4-6 has.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Got you.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Managing the built environment.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Anybody have any issues with that?

The Board concurred with the modification.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Anything else with Chapter 4 or Chapter 3 -- 4?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Yes. On 4, 4-8.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: I have something on 4-4.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I have something on 4-7.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: I'm first.

Um, I have a question regarding Objective 2. It is on -- page 4-4, Objective 2, letter G, and this may be is a question for Mr. Lindsay, but this reads, "Amend the Town design criteria for all development to include trees and landscaping around all onsite drainage facilities." Then for instance, "detention ponds."

And at least from my understanding being on the Drainage Committee, that the -- the -- the purpose of detention ponds isn't to have pretty landscaping and et cetera to make a view out of them. They're supposed to get filled and do their job, not to be visually attractive.

So I just wondered -- do you concur with this statement or do you think we need to change it?

DAVID LINDSAY: Can you read that again? I can't see it from here.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: It says, "Amend the Town design criteria for all development to include trees and landscaping around all onsite drainage facilities." Then in parentheses it says, "i.e. detention ponds."

DAVID LINDSAY: I guess with detention ponds, storm water ponds, there is certainly landscaping that is beneficial, certain plantings that are beneficial and certain plantings we want to restrict from being planted around ponds. So if you look at it from that standpoint, you -- it's -- it could be -- you could -- you could tweak it a little bit.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: I guess I was thinking about it from a different viewpoint. You know what I am saying? Or a different perspective. Now that you say --

DAVID LINDSAY: You're correct. It is not really --

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Not to make it look pretty.

DAVID LINDSAY: They're not there to put pretty ornate flowering trees there. Just to serve the purpose of cleaning storm water.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Should we change it to read closer to, "Follow recommended guidelines for plantings surrounding these" -- there -- I'm assuming that the Conservation Board follows some type of --

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Or something along the lines the plantings that are amenable to that particular --

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: To qualify it. I would think if you plant a maple tree next to a detention pond, all it will do is put leaves in the pond, so just as an example.

DAVID LINDSAY: It could probably be reworded better, yes.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I think also from a maintenance standpoint, you want to be able to get equipment in there if you have to maintain that pond, that structure.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Maybe at the end to say, "Around all onsite drainage facilities to support the function or utility of the pond."

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: That is good.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Do you know what I am saying?

DAVID LINDSAY: Are you looking to establish the wording specifically tonight?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Yes.

DAVID LINDSAY: Um, then if you like, maybe pass on that and come back to it and I will come up with some wording for you.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: That would be great.

RICHARD STOWE: This is fraught with danger.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I would really like to resolve this before we move on.

RICHARD STOWE: This is -- this is -- this is a simple objective that asks those responsible for dealing with our existing design criteria to craft language within the design criteria that allows for this objective to be met. Including trees and landscaping.

Those in charge of doing the design criteria are those that are going to have to maintain the drainage ways and they're not going to amend their own design criteria that put things in the way that A, won't work; or B, won't be maintained. It is a broad objective. The nuts and bolts of the design criteria ought to be left to the people who are trying to seek the objective.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: So should we remove G all together?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: No. Leave it as it is.

RICHARD STOWE: Leave it as an objective, but to the extent the Board is trying to recreate the objective and put in the design criteria when you're really delegating that task to

someone else is what you're trying to do. You're not trying to craft the language. I would leave it alone, if it were me.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Any objections to doing that?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: To what, leaving it alone?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Yes.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Makes sense.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I had something on 4-7.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I have 4-5. I guess I'm next.

On 4-5, bullet -- Objective 3-B, my recommendation is to eliminate that. It states, "Explore the requirement that a small percentage of large developments be devoted to affordable housing."

I think that is in conflict with what our zoning code is all about.

I also have a note on here that we have -- in parentheses above that in A, "see Conservation." I think it is -- the objective, I think it is the wrong wording.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: I have the correction on that if you want to do your B. Then I can address that one.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Dropping B, "Exploring the requirement that large developments be devoted to" --

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Yes.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Because you're forcing a situation into all developments that I guess I'm not -- yes, I agree.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I kind of tend to agree, but I would like -- Mr. Stowe is shaking his head. I would kind of like to hear his -- I mean is this even legal?

RICHARD STOWE: Number 1, there is -- there is a State requirement for affordable housing in order to have any Comprehensive Plan and any zoning code pass muster. This is not asking you to do anything other than explore the requirement.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Okay. But my reasoning for saying that is affordable housing is well supported throughout the document in other areas. But I questioned it here. It says --

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: "A small percentage of large development," so if you had a development like the Bellaqua Estates, for instance, it is saying you would have to put a percentage of.

RICHARD STOWE: No. It says an objective for that would be to explore that. If in the wisdom of the folks who craft the ordinances that is not appropriate, they still have to pass muster, but you -- but they don't necessarily have to be included when all you're asking is for that to be explored. That is my reading of it.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: So what we're discussing by me bringing this up, I am stating if I want to remove B, I'm not in favor of exploring that requirement. Is what I am saying by eliminating B?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Is there a State requirement that a small percentage of large developments be devoted to affordable housing?

RICHARD STOWE: No. There is a requirement that affordable housing be available, and I think the goal, if -- if you go throughout this Master Plan, I would agree, Mary (Sperr), there are a number of places where that -- that attempt and that wording is set forth in order to make sure that our codes do pass muster.

I -- I -- I agree with your statement. I don't -- when these are objectives, okay? I -- I understand the Board's concern that these objectives, when they're not met, somehow turn into an affirmative requirement to do something.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Correct.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Yes.

RICHARD STOWE: I guess I would encourage the Board not to forget that exploring does not mean they have to pass something. At the -- at the end of the day, that is a discretionary item with this Board on whether that requirement makes sense or not and that requirement may not be just with this Board. It may be with Boards 20 years from now.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Exactly.

RICHARD STOWE: When it happens. So that --

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: But if we -- if we all feel this isn't something we want to have happen in our community --

RICHARD STOWE: Certainly within your purview to take it out. I'm not saying you can't. I'm just saying this doesn't bind you to do that, in my opinion.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I would prefer to take it out.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: But it might give somebody permission to do it in the future and if we're all saying it is not something we would like to have happen --

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: By putting this in here, it sounds like we support the initiative to explore that, and I don't personally feel that is in the Town's best interest to explore that, so that is why I suggested we delete it.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I concur. Because to sit there and take a development, if you have want to have upper scale development and to force them to have to consider that possibility, it detracts from that upper scale housing development. We certainly have other opportunities for affordable housing in the Town. It is throughout here, but I --

RICHARD STOWE: I think it is within the Board's purview.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: So what is the -- what is the decision?

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: I would like to remove it.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: As would I.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Any issues? Any --

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: No. I -- I think one thing we got to make sure here, though, the Board isn't coming together as a group now, we're reviewing this, we had the time to go and review it on our own. Now we're bringing this all up. That is what the Public Forum is about. There is public opportunity to speak. So this is -- the transparency, so we have our comments. Now it is for the public to hear and sit basically a discussion to see, you know, are there things that need to be modified.

One thing I want to make sure, the Committee did a great job by putting this document together and I don't want to nitpick it to death, but there areas that I feel -- that I personally feel that maybe we should look to modify, maybe we have a little history on why are certain things the way they are and now when we see something, it may contradict some of the history why something took place.

Also, I appreciate Rich (Stowe)'s comments, having the different perspectives to help us make this a better document.

You know, it's -- it's not a knock to the Committee, because you guys did a great job. That is appreciated.

But it is also a time for us to take a look at this and bring it all out in public. But no, I don't have a problem.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: So that is being removed. B will be removed.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: If you --

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Granted the word is "explore."

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I understand that. But --

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I know. Because I know I lived in a subdivision and when the housing market started going slow, the developer looked for ways to help make sales. Well, ultimately we were going to be living there and midstream you don't change course, so I mean, I can understand, you know, both sides of that.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Right above on letter A. Um, in parentheses at the end it says, "see Conservation." It should say "see letter C," because it is referring to Section C of the document, so it -- so -- which is then "Conservation Open Space," and environmental protection Objectives 1-B, et cetera.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: You're asking that to be the title to the actual objective?

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Correct.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Got you. Okay. Any issues with that?

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: No.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Dorothy (Borgus), do you follow that? Do you see what she is referring to?

DOROTHY BORGUS: Either that or change it to a capital C. Just C. Capital C.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Letter C.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Then also the whole thing, Conservation, Open Space and Environmental Protection objective. The name of the objective is the whole thing, not just Conservation.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Down below on D that would be consistent with the way it is worded.

See B, "Managing the built environment." Objective 1. So you want it worded similar to that?

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Correct.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Keep the document consistent the way it is worded, correct? I know we worked -- the Committee worked very hard on that.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: The first time I read this, I couldn't figure out what it was referring to, so I was looking all over the -- and then when I got to number -- or letter C, it is like, "Oh, that is what that was."

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Anything else on --

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: As she is saying, when you're trying to look all over the place, it would have been nice to maybe just had the page numbers of where these things started because C, it was difficult sometimes to find things and if you're using that as an index.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Could we maybe on --

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: You know, a -- A starts on this page, B starts on this page, so you have an index how --

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: On page 4-1 where it lists them all out, maybe have the page number they start on --

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Which I understand they probably couldn't do initially because the document changes.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: This is just a suggestion now.

FRED TROTT: We were saying because the page numbers -- we would eliminate pages.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Exactly. Hindsight here.

RICHARD STOWE: It's a final edit thing.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Just as a final edit.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Guess who is going to have a lot of work to do?

DAWN FORTE: Huh?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Chapter 4?

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I have 4-6. I'm on 4-6. Really quickly, Objective 7, letter

E. States, "Require all street intersections to be illuminated," and I would also recommend that we remove that. That it is not necessary and the cost involved, it is almost like putting a mandate, because it says, "require."

FRED TROTT: We -- just as part of Traffic Safety --

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I know.

FRED TROTT: That was a requirement and that was in our -- what do you want to call it, the Constitution? And -- try to find one that is not illuminated in Chili --

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: An intersection? There is a lot of them.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Subdivision street intersections or main? You see, there is a difference.

FRED TROTT: I take that back.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: It says, "all streets."

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I live in a rural area and they're not all illuminated. A lot can be, but they're not all.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: But in subdivisions, as well, do you want --

FRED TROTT: Fred (Trott), this is in new residential developments. You have to understand what the objective is.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: That is the objective. New residential.

FRED TROTT: This is for new.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: So now if you put that into every subdivision, you might have a sidewalk district, streetlight district. Now at the intersection of a subdivision that you're stating that I -- that a streetlight should be there?

DOROTHY BORGUS: Right.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Every intersection?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Dorothy (Borgus) is saying yes.

DOROTHY BORGUS: Yes.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: In a subdivision?

DOROTHY BORGUS: In a new residential development.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: In a subdivision, you're saying that?

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: T intersections, as well?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Any intersection?

DOROTHY BORGUS: Any intersection.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: I wouldn't want that in my subdivision.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Can I ask the thought process why?

FRED TROTT: Try to find a street at night.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Oh, believe me, I have. Especially when we don't have house numbers on the houses as, well.

RICHARD BRONGO: I thought we're talking about streetlights. I think they're talking about regular lights, the lamp lights.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: That is what it is.

You're talking about a traffic light?

FRED TROTT: Not traffic lights.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: He is.

RICHARD BRONGO: That is what I thought they were talking about.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: They're talking about a streetlight, not a traffic light.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Says "illuminated."

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I'm trying to think, you know, you look at some of the subdivisions that there are in the Town of Chili right now. And some of these shorter streets, I -- you have some very short streets and frequent intersections and you could literally light up the Town with some of these, you know -- distances between.

Let's look at Pumpkin Hill. I mean, Pumpkin Hill, you probably have 12 or 14 intersections in less than a mile span.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: But that is a private drive, though.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: But in subdivisions like that, you could have -- not private. I'm just using that as an example. If you built that. Would you want a streetlight at every intersection?

FRED TROTT: What was involved in this, I think, as part of that with the -- with the walking, people wanted to walk in their neighborhoods and lighting in the neighborhoods, that was always part of our whole green space initiative, if I could state that, before in saying that there was a lot of neighborhood wants to have this stuff. Maybe "required" might be a wrong word.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: How about "explore"? "Explore the requirement," and that takes care of it. Let someone else hash it all out.

FRED TROTT: Maybe a little stronger than "explore."

DOROTHY BORGUS: "Consider"?

FRED TROTT: "Consider."

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I can leave it --

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Or maybe "most," not "all." I -- because I think those two words -- "all" is also very strong like David (Dunning) said. It may not be appropriate.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: You don't quantify it. Just say, "consider street intersections to be illuminated."

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: When you look at Objective 7, "traffic-calming measures"

--

FRED TROTT: Yes.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: How does objective -- how does streetlights reduce speed? Actually, if it is dark, they're going to go slower because they can't see where they're going.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Don't count on that either.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I'd just modify the language.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I'm okay with that. Put "consider" and remove the word "all." I'm fine.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: That works.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Hopefully when we get to the public comment period --

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Thanks.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Anybody else on 4?

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Yes, 4-7.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: 4-7.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Objective 2-D, was already established a while ago when we did the recodification.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: D or B?

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: "Rename all conditional uses as special permitted uses."

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: That's been accomplished.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: That was accomplished.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: That was part of the recodification we did a couple years ago.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Yes. That was before the Comprehensive Plan started.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: You would leave the second half of the sentence in and just remove the first or the whole thing?

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Half of the sentence.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: First half.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Remove the first half.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: "Establish criteria for all special permitted uses."

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Everybody all right with that? Anything more for 4?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: 8. 4-8.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: I had something on --

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: 5, Objective 5.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: I have something on 4, Mike (Slattery). Can I jump in?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: 4-8?

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Page 4-8, Objective 4.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Yes.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: If I can jump in ahead.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Go right ahead.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: In -- in letter B, they have, um, the -- basically that transfer of development rights and transfer -- whatever, those letters -- purchase of development rights, PDR and TDR, um, was looking for them in the glossary and they're not there, so I was wondering if we could add those.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Sounds reasonable.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Oh, wait. Maybe it is. Maybe I looked wrong. Never mind. I just saw -- I was thinking I hadn't seen those. Maybe it was "T" that wasn't in there.

BILL STEIMER: PDR is in there.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Maybe it was the "T" I didn't see. There is no "T." It was the "T" that was missing, not the "P."

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: So add the definition of transfer of development rights.

BILL STEIMER: We did have some discussion on whether PDR should be in there because it is looked upon as being pretty ineffective at this point as opposed to PDR and that came up at our first public meeting.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I think you could go back to -- and --

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Microphone won't pick up your comments if the audience at home is watching.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Just speak up, I guess, when you guys are talking or come up to the mike if you could.

But this, again, I will go back to kind of the same thing we have been talking about on other things, "Evaluate the establishment of innovative land use programs such as."

It doesn't tie you to it. It is saying this is one of those programs. It is kind of an i.e., take an example of. I don't know if I have seen any harm in leaving it there. May be difficult to accomplish --

RICHARD STOWE: It is asking to you evaluate. Part of the evaluation process is saying it is not effective, so therefore, we're not going to do it, if that is the conclusion.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: But someone might look to say, "What is that?"

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Do we want to add that to the glossary?

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Definition. Do we have to have a definition nailed down now?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I think there -- I think there is a formal definition to that.

RICHARD STOWE: That exists. Just needs to be plugged in.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: 4-8 5-C. Bingo. (Laughter.)

The -- when you read C and then you have the four bullets underneath them, if you start, you know, what -- first bullet, "Whether to require land dedication for park purposes. To require money in lieu of parkland or combination thereof."

The second bullet, "Which land would be best suited to fit public park or open space purposes?"

Third bullet, "How much money per residential dwelling unit is to be paid to the Town at the time of issuance of a building permit in lieu of land dedication? When to waive the requirement for land dedication or an in lieu payment?"

When you look at that information, is that something you want to -- the Planning Board to be making that decision, or is that something that you think the Town Board should be making those decisions?

And then my thought is, to leave -- to -- to possibly remove all those bullets, except for the second one, "which land would best be suited to fit public park and open space purposes," I think from my standpoint, I -- you know, C, in the second bullet should stay, but the first, third and fourth bullets, I'm not that comfortable with, with that.

I know that in the past I have been, you know -- since I have been on the Town Board, that there has been some issues regarding a developer coming in and -- and in lieu of something that he paid more into the Rec Advisory -- or to the Recreation Fund and that was a Town Board decision. You know.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Yes, we have done that.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: So my concern is the authority given to the Planning Board for that, for making that decision.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I agree with you.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Yes. That makes sense.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I guess, Counsel, from your perspective?

RICHARD STOWE: Strictly read, this is asking for criteria and guidelines to be developed. It says, "to be used by the Planning Board."

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Correct. "In determining."

RICHARD STOWE: Okay. Those -- those -- those criteria would be developed by this Board.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: But then this Board is still giving the Planning Board then the decision-making --

RICHARD STOWE: Should it choose to.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Oh. Right, right, right.

So basically, when you look at the top where it says, "To accomplish this objective, the Town should," it is more saying the Town Board should? Well, not necessarily?

RICHARD STOWE: We're -- you're on this paragraph, but if you go back to the beginning of Chapter 4, okay, in each category we're talking about goals and objectives, generally established. Objectives are listed the goal -- listed following goals, separately proceeding recommended actions.

Many of -- not all, many of these goals can only be achieved by the Town Board's adoption of further Local Law criteria, amendments to the design criteria or additional action. Okay?

And when -- in the previous one we just discussed, when they're talking about utilizing the transfer of development rights and the purchase of development rights, none of those things can actually be implemented without this Board going forward with activity, legislatively, all right?

You have delegated your -- your subdivision and your site plan review, and in some areas, special use permit authority to the Planning Board and/or the Zoning Board or both.

I -- I -- when I read this, the -- the -- the objective was to simply give the -- the Comprehensive Planning Committee was saying to the Town Board, give the folks who are making that determination the criteria so they know where they are, and there is a procedure or at least criteria for when it is appropriate and when it isn't.

At the end of the day, it has to be your call and only your call.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: But it still makes it sound like the decision for that is going to be made by the Planning Board. Even though we do come up with criteria and guidelines for -- the decision for that should be made at a Town Board level. That goes back to the original comment, doesn't it?

FRED TROTT: I think you're reading into it. He had what our thoughts were.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Are you using the mike, Fred (Trott)?

FRED TROTT: No. Sorry.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: In regards -- that is why I feel a little more comfortable with what Rich (Stowe) just stated in regards to it, because we're going to be developing it, but they're going to be -- the Planning Board is going --

RICHARD STOWE: One of the criteria could be that the Planning Board under no situation or no circumstances is allowed to waive the requirement for land dedication or in lieu of pavement without recommending an action by the Town Board. That could be -- that could be the criteria that -- that is satisfactory.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: That will cover -- I'm good with that.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I'm better with that, too.

RICHARD STOWE: This is not the legislation.

FRED TROTT: It is just to be addressed.



COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Thanks, Fred (Trott).

RICHARD STOWE: I had the same problem in reading this. We're used to reading Local Law and -- and dealing with that.

And it becomes a forest/trees exercise, or at least it did for me.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: But if there are some things we don't ever intend to go ahead and do, why have them in the document to begin with, I guess is --

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Why don't we just drop "Planning Board." Just say, "Develop criteria and guidelines for use in determining."

RICHARD STOWE: That's fine.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Take out the "Planning Board."

RICHARD STOWE: You could delegate it to somebody else. That's more than fair.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Didn't I say that?

RICHARD STOWE: I don't think so.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Is that the consensus, that C would read, "Develop criteria and guidelines for use in determining"?

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Leave the rest in.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: The bullets.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: That make it better.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I'm all right with that. Everybody else? Next?

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Wait, wait. I have a question on B, up above. 5-B. And maybe I'm just missing something here, but I guess I have a question in terms of what the difference is between "prepare a Natural Land Inventory" as opposed to the Open Space inventory that we just did.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I have to agree.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I'm guessing Bill (Steimer) can answer that question.

FRED TROTT: I turned the mike on for him, too.

BILL STEIMER: Um, we have actually done that in the Open Space.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: That's what I thought.

BILL STEIMER: Yes. And we had quite a time addressing natural lands, and we came to the conclusion that the natural lands was anything that is not in agriculture, but on the flip side, if it's within our management, it is not a park. It's natural. It's a natural setting that is basically untouched by whatever: Development, agriculture, whatever.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: So that is not documented within the Open Space inventory now?

BILL STEIMER: It is.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Do we need to have this then?

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Or is this already accomplished? Look at that.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Woo-hoo. We did something.

BILL STEIMER: When we were at this point, that wasn't done, so that is why it is in here as such.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: So this is done or accomplished.

FRED TROTT: Also, the Open Space one hasn't been adopted yet, has it? Or has it?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Yes.

FRED TROTT: At the time we were doing these, I don't think that that was adopted.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: You're correct.

FRED TROTT: So that's why -- it's more or less saying, oh, great this is what we accomplished.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: I just didn't know if this was something different that I didn't understand.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I think there was a number of goals when I was reading through here that have been accomplished since the start of this, and perhaps the thought process we just leave it in and -- and we understand that --

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Which is fine.

FRED TROTT: People ten years from now will be looking at this document and they will be going where is this Open Space document, and was then was accomplished? And, "Oh, yeah, here it is."

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: This is called "Natural Land Inventory," so I didn't know if that was something in addition.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Should we just say Open Space Inventory because that is what was just accomplished or do you want to --

BILL STEIMER: Well, there -- there is another piece. Um, there is another piece in that wording that is probably more important than what we're addressing, and that is "documents should be maintained."

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I saw that.

BILL STEIMER: And that's what it is all about. You know, we did a one-time thing. The challenge is now going to be to maintain that. That is what is more important as time goes on.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Should we just change to it say "Open Space Inventory" then?

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: For clarity.

BILL STEIMER: Either way.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: That definition is not in the glossary. Open Space

Inventory is.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Is, so.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: We should probably just for clarity so when someone else is reading this, they understand there is an Open Space Inventory as -- I mean, the natural land is encompassed in it.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: It's in it.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Does that make sense?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Again, what is the change, though?

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: We're changing "natural land" to reflect "open space."

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: So "prepare an Open Space Inventory" instead of a "Natural Land Inventory"?

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Yes.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Okay.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: 4-9. 8-B. The -- regarding the Town's Architectural Advisory Committee, when you read that sentence, under B, I would -- the first line, "Encourage the Architectural Advisory Committee to enhance the site design," and I would say eliminate the words "and landscaping guidelines." I don't believe they should be -- that is for a different Committee.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Yeah. The Conservation Board works on the landscaping. Yep.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Any issues with that?

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: No. Makes sense.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Wait a minute. I want to get it by Rich (Stowe). Is this one okay? (Laughter.)

RICHARD STOWE: I think that was a shot.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Page 4-10, Objective 9-B. At the bottom of that where it cites the, "See C 1-B for brief explanation." That needs to be changed to be consistent as what -- similar situation that Tracy (DiFlorio) mentioned earlier. Just formatting.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Okay.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Should say "Conservation"...

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Anything else on 4?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: 4-22 if nothing is before that.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Hold on. 4-21. 4-21.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: No, 4-13. I'm sorry.

4-13, Objective 1, and then D. It says, "Prepare an Open Space Inventory for the protection or preservation of the most important open spaces."

I think that should be Open Space Plan, because that would be what you're going to be using for protection. Inventory just says what is out there. Plan is actually what you want to have.

BILL STEIMER: That's true.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: It says "plan" just above it, so that would follow. Fine with me.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Everybody fine with that? Okay.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: 4-21, um, under C, um, the -- it recommended an objective to A. I think we need to just --

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: So this -- so this similar to the other formatting issue?

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Yes. To just kind of get the clarity there.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: C at the end of that has just Objective 2-A. It should be formatted like the rest of them.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: To be consistent on that. On that same page, and then you can go back, under E, "Establish a Town Trails Committee and charge it with the preparation of a Trail Master Plan element."

And I don't have a problem with the concept in theory. I'm just wondering as we read through this, we're establishing -- the recommendation is to establish a lot of various committees, and I'm not sure if that is something that should be an actual Committee or maybe a subsection of the Parks and Recreation Committee or, um, Ad Hoc Committee.

I mean, is the thought process -- this just be a one-shot -- do you know what I am saying?

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Town Trails Committee could be Ad Hoc. It just says, "and charge it with the preparation of a Trails Master Plan."

It sounds like an Ad Hoc.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Okay. Just an Ad Hoc Committee.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Could be. Then follow-up of that could be assigned to --

RICHARD STOWE: I'm going to hide now. It could be whatever you want it to be.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: I just got concerned, because there was another Committee somewhere else, that -- that -- establishing, and I don't even remember. I started thinking, "Oh, my gosh, we'll have 20 new committees." Okay.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I have an addition to that. In that same section, I would recommend that we add a K to that and it would state, "To develop a Town wide sidewalk plan and map, and Town wide Sidewalk Fund which would support the installation of new sidewalks where identified in such a plan."

That goes -- my experience in utilizing our Master Plan to submit a sidewalk grant where one of the requirements was that it was detailed in your Master Plan, and I fell woefully short in

trying to submit that -- that grant because the word "sidewalk" was only mentioned in our Comprehensive Plan in two places. So that would be one recommendation.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Would C cover that, "Prepare a pedestrian circulation plan. Seek the cooperation of institutions, businesses and others in its implementation. Require new developments to conform to the pedestrian plan; for example, providing sidewalks and crosswalks where planned. This may be prepared as part of a transportation plan recommended in Objective 2."

Would that --

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: That is similar. I don't know, does that necessarily include a Town Sidewalk Fund to support the installation of sidewalks. It doesn't, does it?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: No.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: It is similar. But --

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: What is the specific wording you're suggesting?

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Develop a Town wide Sidewalk Plan and map and Town Sidewalk Fund which would support the installation of new sidewalks where identified in such a plan."

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Okay.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: That was just a suggestion.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I know you kind of got burnt on that. I appreciate your vigilance to make sure that is inside here.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: My expectation is should the State become a little more solvent and funds become available again for us to submit for, that we are prepared. They withdrew the funds so we weren't able to submit on that biannual grant again.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Anything that can help us --

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: That is my motivation.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Especially from the standpoint of you made the attempt. I know you and Dave Lindsay worked hard on that, and for that to be a sticking point at that point, I think it is critical that we do get that included.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: It was also a suggestion as something that other communities have done, and -- by Kevin O'Buckley who was the Region IV Director at the time when we submitted the grant, was one of the recommendations or comments we heard from him at the time, and we followed up after our grant was submitted, so.

I did have -- we skipped 4-16. I had a comment on 4-16. D-2.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: We didn't skip it. You missed as we went by it. (Laughter.)

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: You said 4-21. I should have jumped in. Under D-2, under "Objectives," to remove the words "that are setback from State routes."

Okay. It says, "Small scale commercial areas both present and future that are setback from State routes."

My recommendation is to eliminate that verbiage, and it goes on to say, "and that have good circulation, good vehicular access," blah, blah, blah.

To remove the words "that are setback from State routes," and I did this a while ago, and I can't remember why I put that on.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Maybe because it doesn't really give it any merit. You're only targeting small scale commercial areas that are setback as opposed to those that aren't?

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: That sounds similar.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Possibly a thought from the Committee or the portions of the Committee?

FRED TROTT: We're reading the whole thing here.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: I think there is conflict in the sense that wasn't one of the things to put -- buildings closer to the road, so this -- this is in conflict because now you're saying to set them back from the road.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I thought the idea was the parking in the back and the buildings up closer.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Put the buildings closer to the road, so if that is your goal, then why would you want the buildings set back? As an objective.

BILL STEIMER: Um, this portion was really spearheaded by Ron Brand and he gave the example, you know, and I will bring that up, because it -- because it gives you a better picture. His example was we have a tremendous advantage in the future development on Beaver Road, for instance, where there is going to be ever-increasing traffic. We don't want a lot of road cuts. And having set back with feeder roads to clustered commercial areas makes a lot more sense than having them on that road.

So you need to look at, first of all, State routes and the type of road. This isn't -- we're not looking at Chili Avenue and the village atmosphere. We're looking at a different setting in this, and that is what it is trying to get across.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Chili Avenue is a State Route, so if you say "from State routes" --

BILL STEIMER: It should probably be addressed as -- as -- as future development aspects or something like that, but it is -- but you certainly can't -- you can't do this in an area that is developed on any of our State roads at this point.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: But I think also the municipality that owns that road, they're going to be looking at your access. They will be looking at your sight distance. They will

be checking for the vehicles per day, vehicles per hour and so forth. They will be looking at your peak times. They will also look at the number of accesses in the area. They will look at accidents. There is a number of criteria that they're going to be looking at, and that is going to help them determine the type of access, whether you put an improved shoulders, turning lanes, traffic signals and all of that.

So the municipality that owns that road will be looking at that.

And Dave Lindsay, if I could, I will refer to you, you know, as far as the input that we could give them, or you know, things they would be looking at, I know there is sometimes that we have certain things and they said it wasn't warranted and they will basically, you know, do what they want and put in their recommendations.

Your thoughts?

FRED TROTT: We're also looking -- if you read the whole paragraph, we're also talking about buffering, shade and character, which I don't think the State really cares anything about.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: They will. They will. They will -- sure they will, Dorothy (Borgus). They will look to make sure that that is outside the right-of-way, because they won't want any obstructions within the right-of-way.

So yes, they will be looking at that.

FRED TROTT: But we're also talking about to enhance it.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Which would be outside the right-of-way.

FRED TROTT: Right.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: So Dave, your thoughts?

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: The setback, the piece that is highlighted, is the piece that is in conflict, not the whole paragraph. Do you know what I am saying?

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Maybe what you do is get rid of both the present and future because right now what you have existing on Main Street, you want to have up there but your future development should be the ones that you want to have --

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: But KMart plaza let's say got knocked out. That would be a future development on a State Route.

Do you want that to have a setback? That is what I am saying. So you --

FRED TROTT: She has the same fantasy that I have.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: You might, because -- well, I think there is a --

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: That was just a --

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I would say -- KMart as a large scale business, not a small scale. This is small scale. So I think the intent, if I recall, if I can -- is you -- let's take the KMart site you mentioned. All right. You have KMart sitting there. KMart goes out of business and all of a sudden, they want to put in five or six different types -- they want to do something like a Bed Bath Beyond and an AC Moore and a bunch of small shops all detached from each other.

Do we want ten curb cuts or do we want the one entrance into it and get back so that you can get in and out and weave around. Am I right?

FRED TROTT: I remember the example of the Wal-Mart in Newark or whatever that you couldn't see the Wal-Mart from the road.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: That are set back. Not specifying the setbacks. But small developments that set back. So if the plan says they will set them back, they don't want ten roads going in. They want one road going in with ten routes inside the development.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: But the purpose of that area was to have stuff more up front with the parking in the back again. Again, you could have one curb cut --

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: That is one of the recommendations in the plan, to bring developments up to the front, but are there other --

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: But it is in conflict with other parts of the plan.

FRED TROTT: Because you have different plans that want -- you have different criterias for. We break down in this plan, like the Chili Center Corridor, and this is what we would like to see in that corridor. This isn't --

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: This is a more generic statement which is further specific -- the specific -- right. Right. Whatever. But how --

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: How does this define this as not being that area?

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I don't want to get too technical. We don't need to debate this all night.

FRED TROTT: Please. I'm not a wordsmith either.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Seems in conflict with the other part.

FRED TROTT: I know what you're saying, but this is a broad statement, and then you go to your Chili Center Corridor and then that breaks down how we want -- what we envision that area to be.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I also look at it from the standpoint of Paul Road next to Wegmans where that development is going to be close to the road.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: But they only have one entrance and five or six roads.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: We're talking about curb cuts. If it said small commercial areas that only have -- that minimize curb cuts or something, it is the whole setback from the State road thing.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: There is your wording. "That minimize curb cuts, have good circulation, good vehicular" -- that captures what you're --

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: The spirit of what you're trying to accomplish without defining the setback.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: The way this was worded and the reason I brought it up, because it lent a totally different meaning to me from what you just explained. Now when you explained that, Bill (Steimer), and you mention the words "feeder routes" and the curb, now that is different.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: That should be in --

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: That clarifies it.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: And this might just be stock terminology for this objective that Ron Brand brings, so he may already have a stock statement that says what we're discussing, that we want to use, rather than trying to determine that right now. Up to you.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Leave it there. Small commercial areas that reduces -- minimizes curb cuts and have good circulation.

BILL STEIMER: There is a little more to it than just curb cuts, though. I think we're using the setback terminology to kind of have everything else after that fit. If you just look at curb cuts, it's going to be pretty ugly, if it is close to the road.

In other words, you can have a feeder and you're going to have development off that, and you can see the back side of everything from your main road.

The objective here was to try -- was to use setback to try to make it visually pleasing.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Isn't that the job of Architectural --

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: But that is still -- that would still be a part of the document they would --

BILL STEIMER: This is looking at an area from a bigger standpoint than having one big store come in and say, "We want to put this on that route."

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: This is small scale.

BILL STEIMER: Right. You can still have -- and still have group development with small pieces. But if you don't look at something like this, at this level, it will never happen.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: I don't understand --

BILL STEIMER: If you just let one developer come in after another, and you don't have some sort of plan like this, you're never going to look at anything that has any appeal.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I guess go back to right under D-2, look where it says, "Goal. To provide for a limited number of small scale neighborhood-oriented commercial areas which are safe and attractive."

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: How that goal is accomplished should be up to the Architectural Review and Planning Board.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Or Planning Board. The Architectural will look at the buildings.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: But both together.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Let's go down to the end of the table.

RICHARD STOWE: If you read the whole paragraph, the whole thing, it says, "To accomplish this objective, the Town should: A, rewrite; B, prepare guidelines; C, review and revise as necessary; D, discourage strip development; E, use special permit procedures; F, work with local businesses."

The -- they're -- this statement is up here (indicating). How you get there is all of the things we just did. And those are -- they're global statements in order to get whoever it is that takes the next step with all of this, to concur with okay, we're -- we're generally all right with the broad goal. How you get there in any district is going to be determined by your zoning code.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: But again, I go back to if our overall big goal is to always have setbacks, then -- and somebody says, "Well, our particular development would look better up close because of all this other stuff we just did, it is now in direct conflict with the objective.

RICHARD STOWE: Your zoning code is going to have --

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Setbacks.

RICHARD STOWE: Determined in feet and density requirements.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Criteria.

RICHARD STOWE: And --

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Which will prompt a variance if it didn't conform.

RICHARD STOWE: Whatever. Whatever. But I -- but I -- I'm going to shut up after this. I promise.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Just seems like it is in conflict with other pieces we have in the document.

RICHARD STOWE: No. No. No. No. No. No. I'm not telling you it is not.

I'm telling you that that those sorts of conflict are what get resolved at the next step.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Okay.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Okay. Should we leave it?

RICHARD STOWE: When some group brings you the proposed Local Law that says in order to attach, you know, proposed development to this area --

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Right.

RICHARD STOWE: -- we want you to consider this, that and the other thing. Whether it is set back physically and how much, this Board is going to be in charge of with the actual zoning codes that implement these objectives. You're not writing the code now.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Right.

RICHARD STOWE: That is what you're used to. It is a particular perfectly natural response, because that -- because that is where you are. You got -- you got to attempt to step

back, because that is not what really this is about. This is about trying to set the tone for what the next steps are.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: The only problem I have with that statement then is why do we have "State routes," because you -- because you mentioned Beaver Road, Ballantyne, that used to be a County road up until a couple years ago, so I mean, that is why I say remove -- just taking the "State" right out of it.

RICHARD STOWE: I didn't write it. I can't answer it. Mine is a process observation.

DOROTHY BORGUS: Take it out.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: "That are set back and have good circulation"?

RICHARD STOWE: You can take out "State routes."

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Yes.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: So just only remove the words "from State routes."

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Right.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Okay. All right. Now that you have explained setback.

DOROTHY BORGUS: You can take "setback" out, too?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: No, no, no.

FRED TROTT: Just take the word "State" out of it. And have major roads or something like that.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Major collector roads.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Why limit it to that?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: No. That -- that is why I say, "that are set back and have good circulation." So just eliminate "from State routes." Those three words. "From State routes."

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I'm okay with that.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I hope so. You're the one that brought it up.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Anything else on 4-16? Or previous? We were on 4-21.

Anything after that?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: 4-22.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Have you something on 4-22?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: That's correct, ma'am.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Go ahead.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: In regards to 4-22, um, 3-E, I would say, "Provide safe pedestrian crossings that meet ADA standards at appropriate locations."

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Yes. Good idea.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Makes sense.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: American Disability Act. That is what ADA stands for.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Okay. Anything else? Everybody okay with that?

Phew.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Let's go.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Anything else? 4-22? 4-23 or previous?

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Anybody --

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Anything else in 4? Only a couple of you caught that. You realize that.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: I do on 4-26. I guess I'm just not clear on Objective 2, the assessment quality -- the -- "an assessment of the quality and cost of water and waste water collection and treatment systems, both public and private." Then it said, "The Town should gather and analyze baseline data on the quality and cost of drinking water."

Correct me if I am wrong, Mike (Slattery), if you know something different than I do, but the County currently does that on all of our --

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Monroe County Water Authority.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Yes. Yes.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Yes.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Well, in the Environmental Health Department.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I would not know that.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: At least they used to, because I used to work there in another former life. I'm just not sure why this needs to be a Town objective.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Are you talking about the drinking water or the waste water?

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Says "drinking water and waste water." Says both. I don't know why we would be doing waste water. How would we as a Town be able to do that?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Dave (Lindsay)? I would go to Mr. Lindsay.

DAVID LINDSAY: I have to see the section here.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: I don't know how we would even have the -- how we would even have the ability to implement something like that.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: You will gather and analyze baseline data -- they may have the information and you just get it from them.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: I don't understand why we would even need to do this. What is the benefit, I guess?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I guess I will go to the Committee. Any thoughts?

DOROTHY BORGUS: Talk -- I think we were -- I think we were concerned about wells here. Private systems.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Says "public and" --

DOROTHY BORGUS: Right.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: "Public and private."

DOROTHY BORGUS: But I think we were trying to make a comparison, maybe. You know, we were trying to -- not compare, but --

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: When you look at G-2 on 4-25, "Water, waste water collection and treatment system. Goal, to provide high quality public water and sewage utilities"

--

DOROTHY BORGUS: Where are we?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Previous page. This is an objective under G-2. And so we're talking about water and waste water collection and treatment systems. Where the Town doesn't -- the Town doesn't own any. We have a storm sewer system, but it's not your drinking water, which is Monroe County Water Authority and waste water which is Monroe County DES.

DOROTHY BORGUS: All I can say is it is too bad Mr. Brand is not here today.

RICHARD STOWE: Mr. Who?

DOROTHY BORGUS: Ron Brand, because some of these objectives and wording were from his expertise and his knowledge of other Town's plans and are the things we were trying to accomplish. The Committee did not make these words up.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: No, no, no.

DOROTHY BORGUS: And I -- honestly, I -- I.

FRED TROTT: I can't remember.

DOROTHY BORGUS: I cannot remember and there is something to do with wells that is connected with that, but I can't not remember.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I'm wondering if perhaps that your interest was of the poor quality of the well water in the Town and that -- and to come up with some sort of an assessment of that so that -- for the use of extending water lines. We know what the well water is.

RICHARD STOWE: It says that.

DOROTHY BORGUS: And septic systems, as well.

RICHARD STOWE: It says that. That is the goal. That is exactly where they were going. "To provide high quality public water and sewage facilities at reasonable cost to protect the health and safety."

The objectives are public -- A, was to do public and sewer location. Know where we already have public utilities.

B was an assessment of the quality and cost of water and waste water collection and treatment systems, both public and private.

There is a certain point when the private well water treatment systems for bad water and the cost creates an issue that the plan is asking for an assessment, public versus private, and when is it that the cost gets to a situation where down below they say, "Determine where problem areas exist with the quality or cost and where there may be problems in the future and what approaches should be used to address them," as B-2 in Objective 2. That is clearly the goal that Committee was trying --

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Not putting a ton of money in the water softener systems and the salt and replacing fixtures and everything else with that. There is a cost associated with having a private well, and it is actually cheaper for them to be on public.

RICHARD STOWE: So they're -- all they're trying to do is gather data to see when it is that the districts can be extended and under what circumstances, et cetera. That is how I read that.

DOROTHY BORGUS: I think Mr. Stowe has hit that right on the head.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: We okay with the way it is then?

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I'm fine.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Tracy (DiFlorio)?

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: So --

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: When you read the whole thing and put it together --

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: I guess. But I guess I'm still not sure how we'll do it. We'll go to the County and have them do it and then we get their information?

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: We don't have to determine that tonight.

RICHARD STOWE: You don't care where you get the data from as long as you go get it.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: I guess --

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: That won't matter.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Maybe you're right and I'm just not reading it in the totality, I guess.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Are we okay?

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: I guess.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I have 4-27. I would like to recommend that we add -- I know on -- halfway down the page, under G-3, um, Number 2, I would like to add a D to that. There is A, B, C. I would like to add a D. That would be to create a Comprehensive Emergency Management Program. We did have a representative come and present that thought to us and we all thought that was a great idea and added in our thoughts to the list of things we would like to accomplish.

And he even suggested that there were grants available and some funding opportunities for us to help do that, so I would like to add that --

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Well, and what are you looking for, Mary (Sperr)?

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Emergency Management Plan. But I put the word "program" down, because that would encompass the plan and then --

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: If you look at A, "Support Monroe County Emergency Management Office efforts to enhance 911 emergency phone system and maintain the County Hazardous Mitigation Plan."

Could we add the plan to that? Or do you want a whole --

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I guess it was easier just to write that we create our own.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I kind of -- I kind of agree with Mary (Sperr)'s statement, because A is a support statement. What she is suggesting is an actual creation of another document.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Yes. I had that, too, as well.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Are we okay with that again?

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I like that one.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Anybody else on 4?

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: 4-29.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: 4-29. Go ahead.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: The recommendation is under Objective 3-B, to remove that line. It says, "Solicit proposals from the YMCA and similar organizations to develop a Southwest Monroe County facility."

But I have in the past, when there was some discussion about a Community Center here in Chili, spoken to people from the Y, and they have that facility on Elmgrove Road. They're not interested in putting one in Gates that close and adding another one in Chili. They weren't interested at all. So that is my basis for asking us to just remove that one. I don't think it is -- feasible.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: 4-29, 3-B.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Last line.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Doesn't mean in 30 years it won't be feasible, though.

FRED TROTT: Yes, I think --

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: This is a 30-year out plan.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: And I understand where you're going because I had talks with somebody when they -- when they were looking at that.

If -- would it hurt if we kept that there?

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Probably not when you mention it from that point of view. No harm, no foal, I guess.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: And similar organizations. I would fix the sentence -- "to develop" should be dropped. All of the grammar stuff I did separately with Dawn (Forte). I did all of the little grammar --

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: That should come out. "To be developed" should be removed; is that correct?

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Yes.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Are we okay with leaving the statement in there, Mary (Sperr)?

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Yes. Different point of view.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Probably the Y was put in there to give the flavor of --

RICHARD STOWE: Similar organization. Absolutely.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: That's fine. Everybody is familiar with what that is.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Anything more on 4?

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Not for me.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Chapter 5?

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Chapter 5 I had small things or grammar. That was it.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: I had the map, 5-1. Can we change the coloring on this? All of the pinks look alike to me. For the most part. At least the pink. If we could change one of the pinks to like blue or -- I don't know. Different color that is not pink. Because they're next to each other and so you can't delineate the Mixed Residential --

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Yeah.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Those are pretty close.

We did have comments come before us when -- when we had a development and the maps discussion started that the colors were difficult to tell and were misinterpreted.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Or make one --

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: David (Dunning), in regard with changing the colors, who do we need to talk to?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I think we need to go back to Ron (Brand) for that.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Passero.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: That will be an action item that you will bring back to Ron (Brand)?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Yes. Just for the sake of -- for the benefit of the people in the audience, I mean changing the color designations, we're not changing any other land dispositions. We're simply changing the color to -- or recommending a change in color to better differentiate between --

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: User friendly.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: All right. So -- all right.



COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: There are many colors in the spectrum.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Got you. Okay.  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: You can tell it better illuminated on the --  
FRED TROTT: There was problems with that, too. I think that was Mark (sic) from Passero.  
DOROTHY BORGUS: Matt (Nissen). Matt (Nissen).  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: That will be an action item we bring back. What else in 5?  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I just want to ask, are you a student and -- and taking notes? I know you have probably got school tomorrow. Do you have to have something signed by this Board you would like to get signed and maybe be on your way?  
I am assuming this is your mother that came in to pick you up? If you would like, bring your form up and we'll sign your form and let you go ahead and be on your way so you can get some sleep tonight so you can study tomorrow.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: First you need to give a presentation on what you learned.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: That's not true.  
Wow, she actually took notes, too.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: David (Dunning), didn't she just come back in?  
(Laughter.)  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Tell your teacher you deserve an A.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Thanks for sticking with it.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I recommend next time you check the agenda before you come. (Laughter.)  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Moving on, are we all good with Chapter 5?  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: No. I have a typo on the map on 5-8. Um, Bullet Number 3, um, it says in the fourth line down, the word sent -- sentence that starts with "Changes that have" -- it says, "be made." You need to put "have been made" or "to be made." I'm not sure.  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: I can't read that.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: "This map is a work map for the members of the 2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee's use and realize the changes that have been made to the" --  
FRED TROTT: Where are you?  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Map on 5-A.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Number 3.  
JORDON BROWN: Three lines up.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Says "have be made."  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Jordon (Brown), your --  
JORDON BROWN: Should have been.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: "Have been made."  
DOROTHY BORGUS: "To have been made."  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: So that is just a typo. All right.  
FRED TROTT: God bless you to read the little wording.  
DOROTHY BORGUS: We're wondering if 3 should be on there at this point?  
BILL STEIMER: It shouldn't be in there.  
DOROTHY BORGUS: I think it is a note for the Committee at the time, because we were going around and around about maps, and I think it was a -- that was just a note for the Committee. I don't think that should be there. I think 3 should be out of there. Should be gone.  
RICHARD STOWE: That will take care of the typo.  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: That will fix the typo.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Anything else on 5?  
DOROTHY BORGUS: Maybe that is a point for the Board, maybe we should check all of the maps for that, because that maybe had been put on more than one map as we went forward. Mind you, we were working on this for 2 1/2 years.  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: No criticism.  
DOROTHY BORGUS: But maybe we better look at what is on each map and make sure there aren't work notes on other.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Remove work notes. Good point.  
I happened to be looking at it. Don't ask me how I caught it. There's a typo.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Once again, the removal of anything like that would not affect the overall character of this plan.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: On 5-19, unless someone has --  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: 5-18. 5-18.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Do I hear a 5-17? 5-17 going once.  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I feel really bad for...  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Under 5-18 -- the State -- the sentence that starts with -- well, it says, "Under Airport Major Investment Study, areas, sub areas 5 and 6."  
Do you see where that is?  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Yeah.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Good. Well tell me. (Laughter.)  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I had a comment myself.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I --  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Michael (Slattery), I have a note to myself, is it possible -- it says, "For the past ten years the Town has felt that." I mean, I personally would rather remove

that and just start the sentence, "With the extension of the airport expressway," and take out the first -- how can we State that the Town has felt for the past ten years. I don't know how you can make that statement. I had a note on mine, too, I would prefer maybe we take that out. It's a subjective statement that says for the past ten years --

MS. BORGUS: At the top.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: It starts, "For the past ten years the Town has felt that." I guess I would remove that sentence and just that part -- start the sentence with a capital T, "The extension of the airport expressway," blah, blah, blah.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: No longer viable.

DOROTHY BORGUS: That -- that I think was a correction that was supposed to have been made and has not happened.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Because being a part of the airport -- Major Airport Corridor Study, back then, when they talked about 204 going into the airport for the back, going through Gates, I know the Gates Supervisor was very involved with the decision on how that played out at that time.

Thank you.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I also had something on 5-19. Just trying to keep moving along. Fourth paragraph down. Fifth paragraph down.

It says, "Much of the land bounded by Beahan Road, the Rochester and Southern Railroad."

I should say "Paul Road." That is the wrong boundary. It should say "Paul Road" instead of "Beahan." If I read that right.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Oh.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Beahan stops at Paul Road at the T intersection and Paul Road continues around the back.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I have a note to myself to bring this up.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: It crosses Beahan.

BILL STEIMER: Railroad is on the south side of the big curve on Paul.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: There is a couple different ones. You -- you have the one that is right by the -- where the pedestrians can pull off and watch the planes that cross there. That goes towards Brooks Avenue. Then you have the other one that goes across Paul Road by the Laborer's Union building, and then you have the other one that runs across Scottsville Road over the Genesee. So there are three different ones in that area.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: It says in the Runway Protection Zone.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: General boundaries, so I think you need both roads on there to be honest with you.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Add Paul?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Yes.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: So we're adding "Paul Road" in. "Much of the land bounded by Paul Road, Beahan Road," right?

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Yes.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Yes.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: It changes name.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Thanks, Michael (Slattery). Right back at you.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Anything else? Chapter 5?

And in Chapter 6.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: 6-3.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: 6-3.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: I have 6-2.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Okay. 6-2. Go ahead.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: On 6-2, um, the "Prepare and adopt an official sidewalk Master Plan and map," um, was -- the date on that was 2011. I'm thinking that is not going to happen this year.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: You want to make that like 2015 or something?

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Yes. That needs to get pushed out. Do you agree?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I don't see us being able to do that in the next couple of months.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: We can fit it in during budget time or another --

DOROTHY BORGUS: Don't you need to look at all of the ones that are 2011 since we're very close to the end of the year?

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: A lot were done. Open space is done. This Master Plan will be done. The Drainage District is done. Highway/Public is being worked on right now. I mean, that is pretty much done.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Because on the next page I have the top two to change to 2011 because they're done.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I'm fine with removing that because there is no way it will get done.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: So on 6-2 all of the 2011 stay with the exception we want to change the Sidewalk Master Plan to what?

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: '14/'15 maybe. I don't see that happening -- I don't -- I don't know.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: "Prepare and adopt."

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: It is the outside date you have to have it done by. If you leave it 2015 --

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: You could do it in 2012 if you want to but you don't have to.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: The goal would be to have it done by 2015.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I guess I would go to the Traffic and Safety Committee.

FRED TROTT: We're looking at it as this is a high priority. We're looking at this saying it is a high priority and that should be done as soon as possible and not shoving it off until 2015.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: To 2012 and 2013 then.

FRED TROTT: If you look at the date plans --

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Not necessarily true. It says 1 to 5 years, so we could go as far as 2016.

DOROTHY BORGUS: They're in order.

FRED TROTT: They're in order of the what the priority --

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: So these -- these -- okay. These were intended to be in order of when they got done?

DOROTHY BORGUS: Uh-huh.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: They're prioritized that way.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Should these then be rearranged to the ones that are actually done to the top and moving ones that aren't done to the bottom? Perhaps numbered?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Or lettered.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Usually when you have a list this long and you want to refer back to something, it is easier rather than just putting bullets, that you number them. So you can refer to the Number 4 of the high priority action items, blah, blah, blah. So we could always just ask Dawn (Forte) to format that.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: We haven't budgeted for it for next year.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: That's correct. It's not going to start next year. Well, unless the Town Board chooses to make modifications to the budget --

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Or we find grant money available. So we could leave it there as an objective and amend it --

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: 2012/2013. They want it to still be a high priority, so put it in the 2012 to 2013.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I'm fine with that.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I'm fine with that.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: So 2012/2013 on this one, right?

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Yes.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Will we then move some things around here to put these in some kind of order?

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Well, somebody else --

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: These are the recommendations from the Committee as to their priority, so we need to look at that and say do we agree with their priorities. Based on what Dorothy (Borgus) laid into us, that they were organized by their priorities.

But at the top of 6-3, we were -- we have already done the first two, so I was just going to recommend we take out -- it's done, so take the 2012 off, because it is done.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: So changes those two to 2011 --

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: 2011. And just eliminate the 2012 because those were done.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: What about also "Amending the Town and creating criteria for special use permits"? That could also be moved to 2011 because we have done that.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Yes.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I don't know. That is presuming we -- well, we'll have to a resolution to pass that --

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: You could put it '11/'12 in case it goes into January.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: '11/'12.

If I could, in these high priority actions, on 6-2, 6-3, are there any other changes that need to be made or we would like to address?

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I had put a note to myself here on the one that -- "submit grant application." I was struggling with the wording, but I wrote down "submit grant application to fund preparation of" -- "preparation and adoption of Chili Center Master Plan."

I couldn't read the whole thing again just before the meeting tonight, so I don't know if that is feasible or not.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: I guess the rest of it is fine.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: No reason we couldn't submit a grant application providing there is a type of grant available for that. You know, that is something that certainly Ron (Brand) can help us with if there is some type of grant out there to do that.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: But it says to -- and "Prepare and adopt Chili Center Master Plan," so better wording, wouldn't it be better to say, "To fund preparation and adoption of" -- it is up to you. If you want to change it, fine. If not, that's fine.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: "To fund the preparation"?

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: "To fund the preparation and adoption of," as the recommendation to change it to that. If not, fine. If not, fine.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Up to the -- anybody else? Michael (Slattery)?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: No.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Huh?  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I said, "No."  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: No problem.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Nothing else. You asked -- he asked me, "Anything else?"  
And I said, "No."  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Do you have issues with changing the wording?  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: And I said, "No."  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: I do have a question on the third bullet down,  
"Compare and adopt a Compensatory Flood Plain Storage Program."  
I don't know what that is necessarily, so I'm not sure if 2012 is realistic.  
I'm not sure if I -- if I'm 100 percent sure what a Compensatory Flood Plain Storage  
Program is and whether 2012 is a feasible date to have that completed.  
DAVID LINDSAY: I guess I would like to provide some flexibility with that date, yes.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Could you explain what that is?  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: What the plan is.  
DAVID LINDSAY: It is to look at when we're building within a flood plain, um, or filling  
within a flood plain, one of the criteria is compensatory cuts and fills. That means you take out --  
you want to put in 100 cubic yards of material, that maybe we should have a program set in place  
that mandates you take out other 100 yards of material so you compensate for what you're putting  
in that area.  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: So 2012 to 2013?  
DAVID LINDSAY: 2012/2013, yes.  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: That makes it -- the top of the 2012, 2013, still high  
priority but adding --  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Adding a little wiggle room.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Anybody else have anything on those?  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Thank you, David (Lindsay).  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: 6-3, the high priority items? Okay?  
On the medium priority? Does anybody have --  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I did on that.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Obviously we're putting this together and there will be a  
lot of -- a lot of things will dictate what happens, what takes place. You know, I think these are  
fine. I -- for the dates. Looking at the medium priority and then -- for the ongoing and so forth.  
I -- I guess I'm fine with them. I mean -- I mean if we want to go through every one of them  
and --  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: There was just one I questioned on the 6-4. "To  
prepare a Town of Chili woodland protection map and regulations."  
Why couldn't that just be part of the Open Space Plan?  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Correct.  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I had it indicated here -- if we want to make sure  
the language with that, back on 4 --  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: We just changed it to open space.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Replaced to open space.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: That is all we had.  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Because if we wanted to say, to make sure that we  
don't lose that whole wood lot, especially since the County came back with -- that was the one  
place they commented on, was maybe back on page 4-13 and D, where we said, "Prepare an  
Open Space Plan for the protection and preservation of the most important open spaces," we  
would add to that, "which includes a woodland protection map and regulations," and add it into  
there so we don't lose that and not have to have it inside its own priority action. It would actually  
be added to the Open Space Plan.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: What would you like to see on page 6-4, under that bullet,  
would you --  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Take that out.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Remove it?  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Yes, because you already have Open Space Plan as  
something that you're going to be doing. Instead, capture it back in the objectives underneath  
your Objective 1, page 4-13.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Right. Got that.  
Anybody have a problem with that?  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: No. That was a good idea.  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: I just have one other point. Right above that, the  
"Prepare Trails Master Plan map" and -- map and -- whatever. "Plan and map."  
In terms of who is charged with that, um, instead of the Conservation Board, should that  
not be the Trails Committee that we're going to create.  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Oh, yeah. Yep.  
FRED TROTT: Didn't know you were having a Trails Committee.  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: You said you were earlier. Remember?  
BILL STEIMER: Generically.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: So you are saying you want to convene --  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: That was one of my other points earlier.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Fred (Trott) said he would chair the Committee.  
(Laughter.)  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Since is he done.  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: If we create the Committee, we should charge them with doing the trails.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Okay. That's all right.  
Anything else on this?  
Can we go to just the ongoing actions then? Do we want to talk about that?  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Page 6-5.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I have lots of blue ink on this page.  
I was kind of confused.  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I do, too. First of all, some of these are ongoing and some of them are one shot additional. And I think we need to separate the difference between ongoing efforts as opposed to this is a stand alone, one-time issue, because they're kind of getting muddled in between.  
On -- know, on pages 6-5, 6-6 and 6-7.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: So, Ginny (Ignatowski), in regards to these for the ongoing then, would -- I think because you have some questions, concerns in regards to them, do you want to go bullet by bullet and then create ongoing and then create another, you know, one time, or how -- what is your thought then to move this along?  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I don't know. Is it the quickest thing to run down and say, one time, ongoing, one time and separate them out?  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Does it make a difference one time, ongoing?  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Let's change the title to additional actions instead of -- and remove the word "ongoing" completely and just put additional actions and leave it at that, as a group?  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: There you go. I'm fine with that.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Then we don't have to go through tonight and change.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Whether they're one time --  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Right. It is irrelevant.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: All right with everybody?  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Yes.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: We'll change the title to additional actions rather than ongoing.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: The only other comment from me would be whether or not we wanted to keep them all in or not.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Does anybody have any comments about removing any of these?  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Well, there are some like maintain the Town's Architectural Review Committee. Why does that need to be on there? We don't have "maintain the Drainage Committee."  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Right.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Let's add it.  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: No.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Just kidding.  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Take the bullet out. Why do you need it there?  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: What was the thought process from the Committee?  
Jordon (Brown)?  
JORDON BROWN: I honestly don't know why Architectural Review was singled out.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Thanks, Jordon (Brown).  
Dorothy (Borgus), any comment?  
DOROTHY BORGUS: What page is this on?  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: 6-6.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Halfway down, it says.  
DOROTHY BORGUS: I don't know.  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: All right.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Then -- then I propose we remove it.  
JORDON BROWN: Thanks for supporting me, Dorothy (Borgus).  
FRED TROTT: Don't we have it maintain off the --  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: You have "maintain Conservation standards."  
FRED TROTT: Good question.  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I say just remove it.  
DOROTHY BORGUS: Just probably take it out.  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Second bullet down.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: What page?  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: 6-6. "Prepare incentive zoning criteria to accommodate" instead of "promote."  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: I had that circled, as well.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Makes sense to me. I like that one.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: So eliminate the word "promote."  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: So "accommodate" is a better choice of words, I think.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Any issues with that?

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Nope.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Anything else on our --  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: "Enforce property maintenance regulations," don't we do that already? I'm not sure why that needed to --  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I know it is not an ongoing item.  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Well, the Building Department does a lot of ongoing items that aren't listed here.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: That is already a duty of that department.  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: We list --  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Wait. Jordon (Brown) has something to say.  
JORDON BROWN: The idea behind that was just to assure that the Board would actually have a discussion about how it went that year, kind of, you know, evaluate or take a look at it. That was the idea of -- by including it in there.  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Why are we not then not also including how it went in the Highway Department, the Assessor's Office and everything else?  
JORDON BROWN: We didn't recommend that, but if you wanted to add that, you could.  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: That's the --  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Yeah.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: That would --  
JORDON BROWN: We were selective what was included in there. That's true.  
DOROTHY BORGUS: On purpose. (Laughter.)  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: I don't know that if we feel we have a problem in a certain department, we need to incorporate that into our Master Plan, I guess is my...  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I guess I recommend we take it out.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: The only other option there to maybe satisfy the Committee's desire what they may have wanted, maybe we change it to similar to the next bullet down where it says -- instead of strictly saying "enforce," maybe "enhance and enforce." Maybe there is an opportunity there.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Why don't we put --  
DAVID LINDSAY: Could you put something like "evaluate" or "assess effectiveness"?  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Yes. That is where I am headed. I don't like the word "enforce."  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: "Assess effectiveness of property maintenance regulations."  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: That's fine.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I'm good with that.  
You guys okay with that? Dorothy (Borgus)?  
DOROTHY BORGUS: Sure.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Going back to the one with the second bullet we talked about "Prepare incentive zoning criteria to accommodate," why can't we put "Prepare incentive zoning criteria for affordable housing needs" instead of "to accommodate"?  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: That works, too.  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: That works either way.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: To address, to --  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Just for. Just for affordable housing needs.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Okay. I'm okay with that. I don't think it changes the intent of it at all. That's fine.  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: The bullet below the Town's Architectural Review Committee we're removing, "Establish and create procedures for Town of Chili Agricultural Protection Board."  
This is the first time we're calling it that. We had a Farmland Advisory Committee that has been mentioned in the objectives but certainly not within this -- in the actions.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: So we should revise that, right? To be consistent?  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Actually, if I recall, and I'm sure Bill (Steimer) will stop me if I am wrong, but when we talked about the -- going after, looking at a Farmland Protection Plan, one of the things that they would actually call out for is more of an Agricultural Protection Board rather than specifically what it has been called previously.  
Am I -- am I accurate in that Bill (Steimer), do you know?  
BILL STEIMER: Um, I'm kind of drawn here between the two. We talked about this a number of times, and it -- it depends on, you know, we have a -- we have an application out there for the grant and that is specifically for looking at farmland protection, but I -- but I think -- if we're looking at a Committee to work toward that, from the agricultural community, I think it should be more broad than a Farmland Protection Committee or group.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: So your intent is to have it be an advisory capacity?  
BILL STEIMER: An agricultural resource group as opposed to strictly farmland protection.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: So it would be an advisory capacity, right?  
BILL STEIMER: Yes.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Farmland Advisory Committee is going to be more -- sounds more like what you mean than Agricultural Protection Board, right?  
BILL STEIMER: I think so.  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: So we'll change that.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: So we'll --

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: To Agricultural Protection Advisory Committee?  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: No Farmland Advisory Committee.  
BILL STEIMER: I wouldn't put the word "protection" in there. To me that is -- sets a -- a subsidized block. It's not right there. We're leaving the "protection" out of there. It doesn't -- it really shouldn't probably have "Board" there.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: "Committee"?  
BILL STEIMER: "Committee."  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: "Committee" I think is -- most committees are advisory. Traffic and Safety is an Advisory Committee.  
BILL STEIMER: Conservation, even though we call it a Board, it is really just a Committee reporting to or -- or --  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Yes. I think "Committee" is fine.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Any other issues.  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: What about "Enforce conditions of approvals for site plans and subdivisions"?  
I am not really -- what are they looking for there?  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Maybe --  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I do. Maybe "enforce" isn't necessarily the right -- we have a gap. We have a gap in some of our approval processes. When the Planning Board approves a particular application, there are instances where the Building Department doesn't have to issue a permit and somebody goes -- is able to do something. We currently don't have a mechanism to go back through and monitor, did that actually -- did -- did what the Planning Board approve actually get done the way the Planning Board approved it, because there is no permitting process, there is no inspection process and there is no follow-up through the Town.  
So "enforce" is probably not the right word. Probably -- you're probably right. "Establish procedures to address conditions of approvals," perhaps. Maybe that is the way to say that.  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Or what about following up? To follow up?  
DAVID LINDSAY: I would agree --  
RICHARD STOWE: "Enforce the building" -- whatever this was --  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: He said and --  
RICHARD STOWE: "Enforce property maintenance regulations."  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: We don't have procedures, so we need to create the procedures to review conditions and approvals.  
DAVID LINDSAY: I would agree "enforce" is not the right word. It implies we're not doing it now, which is inaccurate. We are.  
As Supervisor said, there are some gaps in there we need to fill. There is also some modifications or some -- I guess some discussions we can have with the Planning Board on how they word their own conditions that make -- that help us enforce those conditions. So, um, specific language there -- I will give it a thought for a second here.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: While he is thinking.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: "Create procedures"?  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: "Create procedures."  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: You said that? Did you say "create"? Did you really?  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: "Assess and evaluate" kind of got the same place, didn't it?  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: If we don't have procedures right now, we can't assess what we don't have.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: But you're evaluating your evaluation. You find out you're lacking procedures.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Let's evaluate.  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: "Creating" is a more appropriate term if we don't have it. So "create procedures or design" --  
DAVID LINDSAY: Maybe something along the lines, "Assess compliance with approvals for site plans and subdivisions."  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Can you repeat that?  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: "Assessment compliance with approval"?  
DAVID LINDSAY: "Assess compliance with approvals for conditions of site plans and subdivisions."  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I'm fine with that.  
DOROTHY BORGUS: It's a different tone. We think that sets a different tone. "Assess compliance."  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: It will ultimately do what I think you mean to say.  
DAVID LINDSAY: How about something like assess -- you will assess compliance and identify any gaps and try to fill those gaps. So we just want to create language that -- that does that for us.  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: "Creating procedures to assess compliance with conditions of approvals."  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: There you go.  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: "Create procedures to assess compliance with conditions of approvals for site plan and subdivisions."  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: That covers it all. It -- you're creating the procedures and you're assessing --  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: That works.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: You okay with that?  
DOROTHY BORGUS: It's better.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Okay. All right. Next?  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: 6-7. Anything on 6-7?  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Oh, the last line. Do we really need to say, "Work with local land trusts to identify land preservation techniques and preservation plans"? Aren't we already on that? Should we leave that in, Tom (Ryther)?  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: That isn't being done right now.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Leave it?  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Yes. I would like to see that left myself. I think it should stay.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Okay. Just a thought.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: You're welcome.  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: The fourth bullet down on 6-7, once again, you got Town Agricultural Advisory Committee. We need to keep it in a consistent name.  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: The next bullet down, the same thing.  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Keep it the same.  
BILL STEIMER: This one is actually better, closer than the last one.  
DOROTHY BORGUS: It is closer than the last one.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: That's fine.  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: On two -- two down from that, "Maintain adequate public transportation." How about "Advocate for adequate public transportation routes"? It's not up to -- we're not the RTA. We don't set it, but we can only advocate for it.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Yes. They're in the process of studying all that now.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Any problems with that or are we okay?  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Good. I'm not -- I'm not clear on the intent of "maintain appropriate development fees for park" --  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Where are you?  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Second bullet.  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Second bullet down.  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Yep.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I still think we --  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I think that was a suggestion, that we do that, and again, I think I said we can do that because it won't change the content. It will just identify these --  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Numerical.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Either numerical or by letter category.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: But in regards to her comment for the second bullet --  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: We have the whole paragraph with the in lieu of determining all of the things.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I guess I'm fine with that, to be honest with you. We already have that.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Those are fees that are -- that are assessed to a -- to a particular development. Somebody wants to put a subdivision in an area, they pay fees that go --  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Okay.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: It's not a Parks and Rec fee. It's not a parks fee for -- that we charge Softball or Baseball or Soccer.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Fee per parcel.  
FRED TROTT: We have a question. Can we change "Town of Chili Agricultural Committee" to "Town of Chili Agricultural Advisory Committee"?  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Instead of "farm," just call it --  
FRED TROTT: Instead of just being "Agricultural Committee," "Agricultural Advisory Committee."  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: That is the way it is here.  
FRED TROTT: Yes. But you were taking about taking the "Advisory" off and going to "Agricultural"?  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: No.  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: On 6-6 we called it a "Farmland Advisory Committee."  
FRED TROTT: Yes.  
BILL STEIMER: Let's make it the same way in both spots.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: That's what he said.  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: All three spots would say "Farmland Advisory Committee," isn't that what you want?  
FRED TROTT: Okay. Okay.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: You are having your own little meeting over there. You got to pay attention, Fred (Trott).  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Anything else on 6? Then we have -- 6 is done. I don't think we have anything under pending -- Appendix B is the Environmental Assessment Form. Any issues with that?  
Any issues with Appendix C, which is basically your Committee and the charter and the minutes.  
Any issues with Appendix D, official certified copies?  
And the final would be under Appendix F, the glossary. We have already defined some



issues there. So -- so these are the comments from the Town Board.

I will ask and open this up now to the public. Based on the comments you have heard from the Board and the changes made here tonight, is there anyone here that would like to speak on the 2030 Comprehensive Plan besides Dorothy (Borgus)? (Laughter).

COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

TOM RYTHER, 1 Peach Street

MR. RYTHER: Good evening. I'm Tom Ryther. I reside at 1 Peach Street in Rochester. I have been involved with the Brookdale Preserve, the Black Creek Watershed Coalition. As a result of this, I have come to know and appreciate this Town's landscape.

My presence at the Comprehensive Plan meetings has been oriented toward providing voice for the landscape of this Town that was here prior to our human footprint. I continue this involvement concern with my comments this evening.

Thank you for the opportunity to leave these thoughts with you.

From noted naturalists, conservationists philosophers who speak to our human need for the natural world, landscape. They remind us of that larger link that ties us to the land and the land to us.

From Wendell Berry, poet and farmer, we and our country create one another. Our land passes in and out of our bodies just as our bodies pass in and out of our land. Therefore, our culture must be our response to our place. Our culture and our place are images of each other, and inseparable from each other, and so neither can be better than the other. In short, what we do to the land we do to ourselves.

From Joseph Wood Krutch, writer and conservationist. Some familiarity with the natural world is important not only for physical health, and in order to avoid the psychological effects of overcrowding, but also for deeper reasons. We are inclined to insist that there is such a thing as a permanent human nature and that it needs some contact with the natural world of which it is a part.

From Aldo Leopold, educator, conservationist. We abuse the land because we regard it as a commodity belonging to us. When we see land as a community to come we belong, we may begin to use it with love and respect.

Overall, land was remarkably resilient, but different lands could stand different use or abuse by man. Some lands were inherently fragile or poor, less capable of sustaining violent alteration and returning a profit to mechanized man without undergoing a progressive degradation. Hence the need for objective criteria to guide man in his relationships with the land.

From Sigurd Olson of the north country, a writer and conservationist. And I think I found this some time ago as I was attending meetings, and it spoke to me as to what a significant part of the landscape in Chili is.

Despised and avoided by people, the swamplands keep their old primordial ways free from intrusion, from cities and roads, from the sounds of industry. They're like forgotten islands in time where people can still sense the ancient presence of nature absolute.

I know we have all looked at aerial photographs or land use maps in Chili and we have seen the dominance of the wetlands here. These are now seen as gifts remaining from this ancient presence. They are both economic and spiritual gifts for us.

Today Chili's natural heritage is from the evolution of this place over time, altered by development. Remnants only of the original heritage now remain. Given this is our time, it is our role to care for it. In our loving and leaving this landscape for those who will follow us, there are increasing expectations that we'll need to extend ourselves, perform at our best to do so.

In Chili, this heritage includes the remaining Town's swamps. Today we call them wetlands, shaped long ago by other than human hand. This original landscape was left as this planet emerged from its water-covered existence eons ago and then was reshaped by the glaciers of some 12,000 years ago. These significant shaping forces of geologic history are today transcended by the forces of the human hand as the landscape is altered to absorb the present growth with its development.

Today we know human hand continues to alter Chili's natural landscape.

Today we know the strength of our human link to the natural world.

Today we know our responsibility for preserving and protecting this place.

The Chili Comprehensive Plan, the results of both tedious as well as invigorating labors of the Committee, brings forth recommendations, action steps, which includes the recognition of the importance of the Chili landscape, for living, working and most importantly, conserving and preserving. It includes criteria to better guide this community towards maintaining the naturalness of this place so that I -- and I quote from the plan, "To create a more suitable" -- "a more suitable framework to guide future development...over the next 20 years."

In a context, the plan is a vision statement of the importance of this unique place we live in.

I urge the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan as submitted by the Committee. Doing so will strengthen the role of that, as Aldo Leopold noted, "criteria" for continuing to retain this landscape that is Chili. In its adoption and implementation can be a living legacy for all of Chili, for today, and its tomorrows beyond 20 years.

Some -- some specific comments I want to make. I'm not clear on the adoption of the Town Wide Drainage District.

Has that occurred?

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Yes.

MR. RYTHER: Then I will move on.  
Supporting the completion adoption of the Town Open Space Plan as numbered on page 3-6.  
I urge consideration to be given in moving the Environmental Protection Overlay District to be accomplished prior to 2014/2015. That's an important zoning feature that will, of course, impact land use changes in Town.  
Thank you. I appreciate your time.  
Any questions?  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Thank you very much.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: 6-7?  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Tom (Ryther), where was that, please? The -- the overlay that you mentioned?  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Third from the bottom on 16.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: 6-3.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: It's listed now as 2014 to 2015.  
MR. RYTHER: I know that your agenda is burdensome. That is an important feature relative to how the land is used.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: You're supporting those particular dates, correct?  
MR. RYTHER: No. I want it moved up.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Like 2012/2013.  
MR. RYTHER: I recommend you consider moving it up if your agenda will allow it.  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: We have "Prepare and adopt Open Space Plan" for 2012 to 2015. I'm wondering if part of that plan would be able to come out of there as well as that Environmental Protection Overlay.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I would assume it would be discussed in that process. So you could put it there.  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Put it in conjunction with that up to 2012/2013.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Yes. That's a good idea. Does that work?  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Or even '13 to '14 because maybe it is something called out more in the plan and you can follow that up the following year?  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Will you adopt it when you --  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I have no problem with -- you can go to 2015, right? So -- go ahead.  
BILL STEIMER: You have to change the wording, though, because it wouldn't be "adopt." It would be encompassed within that Open Space Plan. Is that -- was this the intent.  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: I don't think she is saying to do them together, but to just put them in pecking order together.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Same time frame.  
BILL STEIMER: Okay.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: So we're okay with changing 2014 to 2013 and leave it to 2015 as an outlier there, correct?  
COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: So it moves it up a little about.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Moves it up one year but leaves little leeway if we're overburdened with other projects? Fine with that?  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Yes.  
Make sense, Tom (Ryther)?  
MR. RYTHER: Thank you.  
DAVID LINDSAY: Supervisor, could you go back to -- sorry. Could you go back to 6-6, bullet 12.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Which is 12?  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: The one from the bottom --  
DAVID LINDSAY: Subdivision, site plan.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Approvals for the site, enforce --  
DAVID LINDSAY: Could you just read to me what you have there?  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I didn't change anything.  
MR. LINDSAY: I was giving it some additional thought and spoke with Jordon (Brown) about this and have some change in language I would like you to consider.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Go ahead.  
DAVID LINDSAY: Say "Assess compliance with conditions of subdivision and site plan approval, and if necessary, develop or modify procedures to maximize compliance."  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Like it.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: That works.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: 2 1/2 years to come up with that, Jordon (Brown).  
JORDON BROWN: It was pretty good.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Sounds -- sounds wonderful to me.  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Fine with me.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Any concerns with that? Go to the Board or Committee?  
Any issues with that? Good.  
DOROTHY BORGUS: There is something that we thought, the Committee thought was fixed and I see it is not. I thought maybe somebody on Town Board would catch it, but.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: That was a shot.  
DOROTHY BORGUS: On page 4-1, we have A, B, C, D, E, F, and --

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: There is a G.  
DOROTHY BORGUS: There is all Gs. There is no G. So if you go to page -- starts on page 4-24, all of the Gs should be Fs.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Didn't catch it.  
DOROTHY BORGUS: Goes all of the way to the end of the chapter.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Shame on us.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Gees, Dorothy (Borgus), because we were trying to go through the other pages with the bullets.  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Every G should be an F.  
DOROTHY BORGUS: That was something we took up in the Committee and our engineering gentleman, he fixed this front sheet but he didn't fix the rest.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: You set us up, didn't you?  
DOROTHY BORGUS: No.  
And there is something that -- there is something that I brought up in Committee a couple of times, and more than twice maybe, and --  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: If I change all of the Gs to an F, what happens to the F above?  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: There is no F. When you look on page 23 or whatever --  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: The list is okay.  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: It goes from E to G. The body goes from E to G.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Should say F.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: 4-23? Right?  
DOROTHY BORGUS: Starts on 4-24. Where it says --  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Page 4-20 we have E. The next letter we go --  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: We understand.  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: He doesn't understand.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: He does now. Because somebody said 4-23, so he was --  
DOROTHY BORGUS: Starts on 4-24, the correction.  
COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: He has got it. We're all set now.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Move on.  
DOROTHY BORGUS: Something I would like the Board to think about putting in the Comprehensive Plan was the discouragement of so many drive-thrus. Some of the towns -- I know Penfield, I think Perinton, they have put it in their verbiage, their various to codes and plans. They're trying to discourage these. And when you think about it, banks want a drive-thru. Pharmacies want a drive-thru. Restaurants want a drive-thru.  
I guess -- and I know that it is zoning. I know it is the zoning code issue; it is not Comprehensive Plan, and -- this -- and this is why I was kind of discouraged from doing -- bringing this up in the Comprehensive Plan meetings, but I think when the time comes, I think it will strengthen the changes to the zoning code if there is some mention of it in the Comprehensive Plan.  
If we want Chili Center to be a village-like atmosphere with stores and businesses closer to the road and rear parking, you discourage that no end when you allow everybody to have a drive-thru. You don't encourage them to walk. People -- you don't encourage people to walk. You don't encourage them to do anything but drive through. We don't want Chili Center especially to be a drive-thru community.  
And I say I know the Comprehensive Plan probably technically is not the place to put it, but I would like just a few words about, you know, monitoring maybe the extent of drive-thrus.  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Could that be in the Chili Master Plan?  
DOROTHY BORGUS: Anywhere really because North Chili is the same.  
COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: I mean to discuss it at that point in time.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: What if there was some -- this might satisfy this initially. What if you put some verbiage about evaluating future use of drive-thrus?  
DOROTHY BORGUS: That would be fine.  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: That would at least call attention to it to evaluate. But I -- but when you think about banks and drive-thru windows that incorporates an ATM, I have to tell you, when my kids were little, before that came about, I had to take my kids out of the car and in the bank physically. So when that came about, it was so much easier for me when the kids fall asleep in the car, to not have to take a baby and carry them into the bank.  
So if you discourage that, then that sort of doesn't serve our part of --  
DOROTHY BORGUS: But it was a good idea that has kind of gotten away and now every store you can think of is ballooned to the point what -- what -- what restaurant now if they have got the means to do it, doesn't want a drive-thru? You know, pick up your meals here. You know --  
COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: They all provide parking spots that is a pickup.  
DOROTHY BORGUS: Well, I don't know.  
SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Let me just throw something out there for some consideration. I understand and hear what you're saying.  
However, that type of an addition to this Comprehensive Plan would be a significant change to the plan if you added the words in any way, shape or form to this document, which would then constitute an additional Public Hearing for that consideration to adopt the Comprehensive Plan.

Now, if you feel that this is something you just would like the Planning Board to look into and work with more maybe -- perhaps this may be something more of a -- let's call it a public forum issue where you would like the Town to address that through its Town codes and deal with that separately as a legislative issue versus trying to do it in Comprehensive Plan --

DOROTHY BORGUS: I certainly don't want to cause another Public Hearing. That is not necessary. But I just -- you're probably -- I'm sure you're right, it would be a change.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: In fairness to people who would be interested in building facilities with a drive-thru would be very interested in whether or not the Town adopted something to further regulate that or control whether we do or do not use drive-thrus. So in fairness to them who aren't here probably tonight, um, I guess it's --

DOROTHY BORGUS: It's just a thought. I -- I was amazed to find out that so many of the towns on the east side of the city have done this already.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I can agree at this point that we can take this up further as a code issue in part of building codes if you would like.

There was a discussion off the record.

BILL STEIMER: I'm going back to this Farm Committee business. In looking at this, I would like to recheck both of these, but I would really like to be consistent and call it an Agricultural Committee versus Farm, Farmland, um --

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Agricultural Advisory Committee.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Bill (Steimer) are you a farmer? (Laughter.)

BILL STEIMER: Yes. I would just go with Agricultural Committee, because it may or may not be about farmland. It could be about farm stands, economic development.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Is this wording, "Town Agricultural Advisory Committee" adequate?

BILL STEIMER: That's fine.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: We could just change the one previous instead of these --

BILL STEIMER: But "Agriculture" should be "Agricultural."

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Spelling needs to be worked on.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Agricultural Advisory.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Let's ask our professor. Ginny (Ignatowski)?

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Our grammar expert.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Any objections to that?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: No.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Issues with that?

BILL STEIMER: So it would be in both locations?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Three locations.

BILL STEIMER: Yes.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Correct.

BILL STEIMER: Thank you.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Any others?

FRED TROTT: I would just like to say that being on this Committee and being on the one previous on the Master Plan in a small part, I just hope that this doesn't become just a bookshelf, that it gets used and it gets looked at because we spent a lot of time on it, and I think that we spent a lot of sweat and tears on it. It's our baby. We would like to see it used and done with what we planned with.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: We all agree, friend.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Providing all of us are here to meet the commitments and goals of that, certainly I think this Board is committed to -- to living up to the goals and expectations --

FRED TROTT: And I don't want to work on the 2000 whatever next one, okay?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I already put you down for that Committee.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Your kids will be.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: 20 years from now.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: We'll all be walking with walkers at that point.

Anybody else that would like to speak on Comprehensive Plan Public Hearing?

Seeing none, I will close the Public Hearing for that.

The Public Hearing was closed at 9:51 p.m.

---

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I would like to thank the Comprehensive Plan Committee for their efforts. It was a very good effort.

I would also like to thank the people who are here tonight who stood through this to listen to this because this is a very important plan for our Town and to have enough concern for our Town and the growth and future of our Town, to sit and go through and listen to this with us, I applaud your attendance and sitting through and enduring what we have just gone through. I want to thank you very much.

I also am very disappointed the amount of people that aren't in this room. Again, this is a plan for our next 20 years. Those who want to be the future leaders of our Town obviously don't care enough to be here in this room to listen to this, what is going on with this plan and add

comments to what the future is of the Town.

So thank you to -- to all of you who are here tonight, the Committee, our other residents that are here tonight, Tom Ryther from the Land Trust and everyone else.

Again, thank you very much for your caring about your community. We appreciate that. We appreciate that.

---

At this point, a Public Forum was conducted to allow public speakers to address the Town Board. The following speakers addressed the Town Board on various subjects: Virginia Barclay and Dorothy Borgus. The Public Forum concluded at 10:02 p.m. Approval of Minutes – 9/7/2011

**MATTERS OF THE SUPERVISOR:**

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: We'll go ahead and move onto Matters of the Supervisor. I really have nothing additional -- actually, I will just touch briefly, I think, on the minutes that was mentioned at the Public Forum. I know some of these committees haven't met on occasion and that is the minute -- they don't get a chance to get approved until they do meet.

So we have actually recognized that, and -- in our budgets in -- 2011 budget and also the 2012 budget, sometimes these committees don't need to meet as often as they do and we have cut back the meeting frequencies. It's going to happen. If there is nothing significant they need to address at a meeting, they cancel the meeting.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Preservation Board did not hold an August meeting. They met in September. This will be the first agenda you would see those minutes on.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I will forewarn the Conservation Board has canceled the last two meetings for precisely what you said. They looked at the agenda. There was really nothing applicable to them, so they canceled instead of holding a meeting just to hold a meeting.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: And I will guess based on the Comprehensive Plan that we went through, some of these committees might be a little busier in the coming year.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: The other thing with Drainage, we're down a member right now so in August we didn't have -- we -- I don't know. There was at least one person missing. We were down a person, didn't have a quorum, so we couldn't approve the minutes from June and August because we didn't have a quorum.

**MATTERS OF THE TOWN COUNCIL:**

Nothing reported this evening.

**REPORTS SUBMITTED:**

Dog Control Report – August 2011  
Monthly Financial Report – August 2011  
Recreation Center Revenue Report – August 2011  
Senior Center Revenue Report – August 2011  
Town Clerk Report – August 2011  
Drainage Committee Minutes – 6/7/2011, 8/2/2011  
Historic Preservation Board Minutes – 7/11/2011  
Planning Board Minutes – 8/9/2011  
Zoning Board Minutes – 8/23/2011

**CORRESPONDENCE:**

1. Mr. Brongo has received formal notification for a Liquor License with the State Liquor Authority for the property located at 2771 Scottsville Road, Scottsville NY 14546 (Pando's Family Restaurant Liquor License #3009943 ).

---

**RESOLUTION #262      TRANSFER OF ASSESSMENT RESERVE FUNDS**

**OFFERED BY:**      **Councilman Slattery** **SECONDED BY:** **Councilwoman DiFlorio**

**WHEREAS**, the Town of Chili has reserved funds to assist in reassessments of the town as needed to maintain equity, and

**BE IT RESOLVED** that funds in the amount of \$6,500 from the Assessment Reserve be transferred to the 2012-2013 Assessment Rolls, for the 2012-2013 assessment update program, subject to Permissive Referendum; and

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Town Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to give notice in the official newspaper of the Town.

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

---

**RESOLUTION #263 RE: Addition to Chili Fire Department, Inc. Active List**

**OFFERED BY: Councilwoman Ignatowski SECONDED BY: Councilwoman Sperr**

**BE IT RESOLVED** that the following individual be added to the Chili Fire Department, Inc. Active List effective October 10, 2011:

Zachary Roberts

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

---

**RESOLUTION #264 RE: Penflex Inc Agreement**

**OFFERED BY: Councilman Slattery SECONDED BY: Councilwoman DiFlorio**

**BE IT RESOLVED** that Supervisor Dunning is authorized to enter into a Service Fee Agreement with Penflex, Inc. To perform standard administrative services for the Chili Fire Department Inc Service Award Program for the term November 1, 2011 to October 31, 2012.

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

---

**RESOLUTION #265 RE: Authorizing Surety, Form, and Amount of Official Undertaking for the Faithful Performance of the Duties of the Town Clerk and Receiver of Taxes and Assessments**

**OFFERED BY: Councilman Slattery SECONDED BY: Councilwoman DiFlorio**

**BE IT RESOLVED**, as follows:

Section 1. The Town Board hereby approves the surety, form, and amount of the official undertaking for the faithful performance of the duties of the Town Clerk and Receiver of Taxes and Assessments as follows:

Type of Undertaking: Government Form P Faithful Performance  
Insurance company: Utica National Insurance Group  
Amount: \$500,000

Section 2. A true copy of this resolution shall be affixed to the undertaking to indicate this Board's approval thereon in accordance with Town Law Section 25.

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

---

**RESOLUTION #266 RE: Letter of Credit Release Indus Chili Avenue Assoc. - FINAL**

**OFFERED BY: Councilwoman Sperr SECONDED BY: Councilwoman Ignatowski**

**BE IT RESOLVED** that per recommendation of the Town Engineer, \$24,336.80 be released from the letter of credit with M&T Bank (#SB1297040001) for Indus Chili Avenue Assoc., leaving a balance of \$0.00; subject to engineering fees and street light bills to the Town.

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

---

**RESOLUTION #267 RE: Letter of Credit Release Bivone Commercial - FINAL**

**OFFERED BY: Councilwoman Sperr SECONDED BY: Councilwoman Ignatowski**

**BE IT RESOLVED** that per recommendation of the Town Engineer, \$52,954.00 be released from the letter of credit with Steuben Trust #402 for Bivone Commercial, leaving a balance of \$0.00; subject to engineering fees and street light bills to the Town.

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

---

TOWN BOARD DISCUSSION RELATED TO THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION:

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Mr. Lindsay, can you help explain the parameters of this,

please?

DAVID LINDSAY: Looking for feedback on scope of the work we're doing there?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Basically where is the fence going? What is it for?

DAVID LINDSAY: The -- we're replacing the fence on Fields 2 and 3 down at the Memorial fields there down behind the highway garage. The existing fences are old and falling apart, so we need to replace them with updated fencing.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: The back stop?

DAVID LINDSAY: Well, the outfield.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Not the perimeter?

DAVID LINDSAY: Perimeter fencing, outfield, not the back stop per say. The perimeter fences.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: What is the linear feet of that then?

DAVID LINDSAY: Sorry?

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: This is an awful lot of money for fencing. What is the linear feet?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Outlining of the field.

MR. LINDSAY: I don't have the specific numbers in front of me, but I can get that for you if you would like.

**RESOLUTION #268 RE: Award of Quote for Athletic Field Fence Replacement**

**OFFERED BY: Councilwoman DiFlorio SECONDED BY: Councilwoman Ignatowski**

**WHEREAS**, quotes were received for the replacement of the field fencing at Memorial Fields #2 and #3; and

**WHEREAS**, the quotes were tabulated as follows:

NYS Fence \$20,155.00

All American Fence \$20,584.00

Empire Fence \$17,844.00

**WHEREAS**, the Department of Public Works has reviewed the quotes and recommends that the quote from Empire Fence be accepted; and

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, per the recommendation of David P. Lindsay, P.E, Commissioner of Public Works, to accept the quote from Empire Fence for the fence replacement at Memorial Fields #2 and #3, to be paid from account A7110.4 (Parks – Contractual).

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

---

TOWN BOARD DISCUSSION RELATED TO THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION:

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Question about doing this now. One of the things as we look at the new facility, we look at the old facility. I think getting ahead -- myself, getting ahead of this particular -- and understanding what we can or can't do with the old facility is critical at this point in time. If we wait and try and do this into the wintertime, it is not going to be as easy to work with. Some of the issues and concerns we need to have addressed and looked at, so I think for this Board to understand for future budgets where we are and what we'll be doing with the decommissioning of this building, whether or not it is tearing the facility down, leaving the building standing and doing remodeling for other purposes, whatever it is, I believe this will help us with that.

As far as not having the money, that is not true. We obviously do have the money. We have -- the Town has set aside for things like this. And now with the consideration of the 2 percent tax cap, will these things and doing these studies be as feasible down the road? We do have the money now. I think this is the right time to move ahead with this so we do get a full understanding of the use of this facility.

That is my take it on. I don't know if anybody else has any comments on that.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I have been questioned by several people, "What do you plan to do with existing high garage?"

We have not had an opportunity to study that to start that discussion. This, in my estimation, will allow us to do that.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I do, as well, Supervisor. In regards to the contingency account, how much will we have left in there after this transfer?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Dianne (O'Meara), do you -- do you remember that number? I don't offhand.

DIANNE O'MEARA: I think it would be about 25,000.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Are there plans for the remainder of those funds for

anything specific?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Not for this year, no.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: And completion of this study?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Outlined in the proposal.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: But is that -- I understand that, and do we find -- you know, there is going to be a lot of things depending upon that. My concern is, you know, doing this study now before we vacate that building and things happening afterwards, so as far as soil, you know -- so it is just something to keep in mind.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Again, this isn't -- there is nothing here to suggest we're vacating that building. This will help us understand what is in that building.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: We're vacating it to move to a new facility. How we utilize this building in a different capacity --

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Perhaps.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Possibly. Correct.

You say we're not vacating it.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: The Highway Department will be vacating.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: That is why I said that if we don't, then we'll use it in another capacity. So if we don't vacate it, that will mean we'll still utilize it.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Possibly.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: So then we would have something sitting empty then and not doing anything with it.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Possibly. We don't know what this is going to come back and tell us. We really don't. I don't know if anybody sitting here can -- it's money. It will all be contingent on money, and again, we have the money to do this now, and what are we going -- what are we going to be faced with? Is it going to cost us X amount of dollars in the future? We need to know that.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: We have to be able to set a budget up to -- I'm trying to think. It is getting late. I can't think of the word for it. If it a brown field condition, because since the 1930s, all those chemicals and oils and everything has been leeching in the soil and if we need to clean that up, then we need to have an assessment of what is there to then make those next decisions.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I can understand that.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: In order to budget in future years, certainly knowing this now, and especially with going under a tax cap today, um, that we have to understand what our expenses will be, and what in reality we can actually accomplish, and what we can actually accomplish in time. For me to provide a -- if I'm here to do this next budget after this one, if that -- I need to know.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I didn't state that at all. My question was in regards to then if we're going to utilize it in a different capacity, and you said, well -- I said, "We're going to vacate it."

And you said, "We're not going to vacate it."

"We're not going to vacate it, but we'll utilize it in different capacity then?"

Then you said, "No."

Then I said, "So we're going to keep it empty?"

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: I said, "Possibly."

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Possibly. I think we're going back and forth here.

The reality is you don't know what we're going to do. We're moving Highway out of there. We don't know if we're going to move anybody else in there. So what my concern is having a vacant empty building, which could be safety concerns, vandalism concerns, and there is a -- so that is my concern.

That is why I was trying to get a dialogue going here where we're going to go. I mean -- just those points. I know we don't know. But my point is, so -- so something to think about here, and then the study about moving out of there. So those were the points I was trying to bring up. So.

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: Any other questions or concerns?

**RESOLUTION #269 RE: Environmental and Planning Consulting Services for Decommissioning the Highway Garage Facility located at 3235 Chili Avenue**

**OFFERED BY: Councilwoman Sperr SECONDED BY: Councilwoman DiFlorio**

**WHEREAS**, the Town desires to procure the services of a qualified professional services firm to provide environmental and planning consulting services for decommissioning the existing highway garage facility located at 3235 Chili Avenue; and

**WHEREAS**, a "Scope of Services" was developed and proposals have been received and reviewed from

Bergmann Associates - \$103,375

LiRo Engineering Inc. - \$88,885

Lu Engineers -- Declined to submit proposal



**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, to authorize the Supervisor to execute an agreement with LiRo Engineering Inc. To provide environmental and planning consulting services for decommissioning of the existing highway garage facility located at 3235 Chili Avenue, subject to review by the Town Attorney for a cost not to exceed \$95,000; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, \$20,000 to be paid from 2011 budget account #A1440.4 (Engineer -Contractual) and \$75,000 to be paid from 2012 budget #A1440.4; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, to transfer \$20,000 from #A1990.4 (Contingency) to #A1440.4 (Engineer – Contractual).

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

---

**RESOLUTION #270      RE: Bids for Sidewalk Plowing**

**OFFERED BY: Councilwoman Ignatowski      SECONDED BY: Councilwoman DiFlorio**

**WHEREAS**, on September 27, 2011, the Chili Town Clerk received written sealed proposals for the plowing of sidewalks for the 2011/2012 season. The proposals identified a total cost for the main general sidewalk areas, and for Sections 1-10 of the Park Place sidewalk district. Three proposals were received as follows:

David Krenzer	
Bid Item #1    General Sidewalks	
Bid Item #2    Park Place	
Total Bid Amount	\$837.03

J. Scott Krenzer	
Bid Item #1    General Sidewalks	
Bid Item #2    Park Place	
Total Bid Amount	\$855.00

JoAnn Krenzer	
Bid Item #1    General Sidewalks	
Bid Item #2    Park Place	
Total Bid Amount	\$876.00

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, to award the sidewalk plowing bid to the low bidder, David Krenzer at a cost of \$837.03 per trip for both general area sidewalks and the Park Place Sidewalk District.

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

---

**RESOLUTION #271      RE: Establish Budget for H48 Highway Garage/DPW Facility Engineer and Site Work Phase**

**OFFERED BY: Councilwoman Sperr      SECONDED BY: Councilwoman DiFlorio**

**BE IT RESOLVED** to establish the following budget for the Engineer and Site Work Phase for construction of the Highway Garage/DPW Facility:

H48-1380.4157 Fiscal Agents	\$ 20,000
H48-1420.4197 Legal Notices	\$ 5,000
H48-1440.4600 Engineer-Design	\$ 450,000
H48-1440.4630 Engineer-Construction Management	\$ 180,000
H48-5110.4665 Site Work	\$1,882,000
H48-1990-4000 Contingency	\$ 163,000
Expenditures	<u>\$2,700,000</u>

H48-5710 Serial Bonds \$2,700,000

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

---

TOWN BOARD DISCUSSION RELATED TO THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION:

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I did. This is page 20. Just not even so much expenditures. Just a curiosity. Hold on. I can't read my own notes.  
Oh, yeah. I have two questions on the abstract. The -- the -- we had a sign, a temporary

sign for the future site of the new facility. Just curious if that sign is going to meet our code?

SUPERVISOR DUNNING: What page?

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I wonder if I'm on the right abstract. I had two questions on both abstracts.

DAVID LINDSAY: To answer your question, yes, it does meet code.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Okay. Just making sure. I don't want to get in trouble for putting a sign up there.

I will just ask my other abstract question, too. I see that we had to have repairs done to bathrooms in -- already to our newly done bathroom? I ask what happened with that. Davis Park restroom repair, rural piping, sheet metal. Did someone come in and --

DAVID LINDSAY: It goes back a little bit. I can't recall exactly what had to be repaired, but I can provide it to you. It wasn't anything under warranty. It had to do with one of the sinks in there, one of the faucets.

COUNCILWOMAN DI FLORIO: Oh, the -- I know the sensors wasn't working on one of them.

DAVID LINDSAY: If you like, I can find out tomorrow and send you an e-mail on it. I just can't recall specifically what it was.

**RESOLUTION #272 RE: September 21, 2011 Abstract**

**OFFERED BY: Councilwoman DiFlorio SECONDED BY: Councilwoman Sperr**

**WHEREAS**, January 5, 2011 Resolution #1 authorized vouchers to be paid September 21, 2011 by all Council signing a waiver form; and

**WHEREAS**, Council did authorize by a majority vote vouchers 2554, 2628, 2806-2810, 2814-2832, 2834-2857, 2870, 2872-2919 totaling \$236,190.75 to be paid from the Distribution Account as presented by Richard Brongo, Town Clerk; and

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, to note for the record vouchers 2554, 2628, 2806-2810, 2814-2832, 2834-2857, 2870, 2872-2919 were paid from the following funds:

General Fund	\$ 62,899.69
Highway Fund	\$126,981.40
Library Fund	\$ 725.25
Assessment Reval 2012	\$ 1,750.00
Consolidated Drainage	\$ 34.92
Fire/Ambulance	\$ 32,506.00
Special Light Districts	<u>\$ 11,293.49</u>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$236,190.75</b>

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

**RESOLUTION #273 RE: October 5, 2011 Abstract**

**OFFERED BY: Councilwoman Ignatowski SECONDED BY: Councilwoman Sperr**

**BE IT RESOLVED** to pay vouchers 2920-2922, 2936-2938, 2040-2942, 2967, 2969-2973, 2976-2984, 2992-2993, 2998, 3000-3001, 3003-3035, 3039, 3041-3046, 3050-3059, 3061-3062, 3064-3120 totaling \$172,968.40 to be paid from the Distribution Account as presented to the Town Board by Richard Brongo, Town Clerk:

General Fund	\$ 64,577.37
Highway Fund	\$ 91,928.41
H48 200 Beaver Road	\$ 460.00
Consolidated Drainage	\$ 4,535.54
Special Light Districts	<u>\$ 11,467.08</u>

TOTAL \$172,968.40

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

The Chili Town Board 2012 Budget Workshop meetings will be held on October 12, 2011 & October 18, 2011 both at 6:00 p.m. in the Chili Town Hall Main Meeting Room. The next regular meeting of the Chili Town Board will be on Wednesday October 19, 2011 at 7:00 p.m. in the Chili Town Hall main meeting room.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:16 p.m.