# CHILI TOWN BOARD February 7, 2007

A meeting of the Chili Town Board was held on February 7, 2007 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 Logel.

PRESENT: Councilwoman Ignatowski, Councilman Schulmerich, Councilman Slattery,

Councilwoman Sperr and Supervisor Logel.

ALSO PRESENT: Richard Brongo, Town Clerk; Joseph Carr, Commissioner of Public

Works/Superintendent of Highways; 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.

At this point, a Public Forum was conducted to allow public speakers to address the Town Board. Four speakers addressed the Town Board on various subjects, and the Public Forum concluded at 10:12 p.m.

#### **TOWN LIAISON REPORTS:**

Conservation Report by Virginia Ignatowski

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: This past Monday a representative from the Walgreens came in for the North Chili location to discuss the modifications to the plans that was previously accepted because of the Stage Coach Inn. The Conservation Board liked what they saw.

The only issue that they had, they asked me to bring forward again, I guess is really not conservation, but they wanted to express their opinion. They're not favorable of the -- moving text signs. I guess apparently they've been coming into the Zoning Board requesting different signage and they want to have those -- you know the red signs you see. They're --

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: I thought that was denied.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: So did I. But apparently they're coming forward to the Zoning Board. And they just feel that that is not the place for it. Actually, they don't like it at all in our Town. That might be something we can discuss during our code --

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Right.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: - when we get to the signage, if that is something we want to have not be allowed in our Town.

They reviewed the Planning Board agenda and pretty much they just approved the landscaping on what was presented to them.

And that was it for Conservation.

Drainage Report by Virginia Ignatowski

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Drainage was pretty quiet. Not a lot of work can be accomplished because of the snow, and Joe (Carr)'s crew did work over on Brian Drive, and -- two new members were introduced. A little explanation was given to them as to what the Drainage Committee does, so they have a better understanding of that. They also spent some time reviewing the Planning Board agenda.

# Historic Preservation Report by Mary Sperr

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Mary (Sperr), Historic Preservation hasn't meant.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I wasn't here at the last Town Board meeting to give a report, so I have a couple things I can relate to the rest of the Board. We did welcome two new members, Tom Benner and Chuck Wolf, and we're really excited about their attitudes and their energy that they provided and we're looking forward to having them – work with them on the Board.

One of the items that they're working on, they will be hosting a training session on the

evening of March 20th, I believe at 7 o'clock, here in the Chili main meeting room and it will be -- books are being put together now for that. This is training for the Historic Preservation Board, and I really feel it is going to help. Invitations will also be extended to the Planning Board, the Zoning Board of Appeals and the rest of the Town Board, um, in hopes that education can be a discussion held back and forth as to how historic preservation will fit in with decisions made by both the Zoning Board, Planning Board and the Town Board.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: That date is?

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: March 20th. Speaking into -- providing that training for us will be Cynthia Hawk and Bob Englert from Albany. They will both be coming in to do that. It should be pretty informational. But there will be -- the final topic discussed, and information then sent out from their meeting on Monday. They meet this coming Monday.

Um, and one of the things that they're also working on is a study of the cobblestone houses in Chili. And they are getting -- they are purchasing a new camera and will be having to redo the entire website. So if you go onto the website right now and check on historic preservation, when the server went down, apparently from what I understand, from the board, Chris (Levey), that they're going to have to redo that site. So with everyone's patience, they will convene all their information and get it over to Chris (Levey) to get back on the site. They have to regroup to have that put back in. That's about it.

Library Report by Michael Slattery

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: First, I would like to touch on the --

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: The equipment.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Well, no. Actually, I looked into that for you, Dorothy (Borgus). Tracy (Logel) could have used it earlier.

(Laughter.)

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: The Susan John grant money. Basically that was in the meeting minutes that was sent to the Town. I did not catch that. So they did make us aware of it. They just did not tell us of the press conference that was going to take place. So Ed did apologize. He took the -- he took the blame for that. He said that, you know, he would correct that in the future.

Um, the IT person that they have is going to be leaving for June 14th to the end of August, and they were going -- supposed to touch base with the Town Hall, Chris Levey, and they did talk to you?

CHRIS LEVEY: Yes.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Just for a little back up and so forth. They have the new computers coming in, so they're looking at the scheduling of getting them hooked up, and trying to get everything in place before he left or during it, so -- I'm not sure how much time they asked for you to participate.

CHRIS LEVEY: We didn't get that far into it.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: They did some relamping in the library to make the aisles a little bit more efficient for the lighting because of the way the book shelves were and so forth. Then they also -- one other thank, Joe Carr and his crew for the assistance with the projector and some of the other work that they did in the library. So they appreciated Joe (Carr) and his assistance. That's all I have.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Um, you are aware of the Ray Wagner's group is doing the audit

in the library? COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Yes. I knew that they contacted them. I haven't heard the update. I know that Ray was out of town for a period of time, so they're waiting for him to get

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: They're in the process right now, Dianne (O'Meara), of doing the audit, the library?

DIANNE O'MEARA: Yes.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Pat Tindale indicated that last time.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Do you know where they are with that?

DIANNE O'MEARA: They only just started.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Thank you, Dianne (O'Meara). Thank you.

Recreation Report by Tracy Logel

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Parks and Recreation, basically the one night was Parks and

Recreation and the next night was the Master Plan Committee. Basically they have been being kept up to date on that, and the programs for the spring. But I really want to go and talk to -- I think we need to get them motivated to get involved. I -- I really was alarmed at the observation of that group -- and having been there and seen, you know, the -- they just don't. They just sort of like listen. I think it is maybe because we have a Parks Director who is doing a good job -- Recreation Director who is doing a good job and he has everything so well planned, that they don't have to field that kind of input for new creative ideas. I think we need to get them involved.

# Traffic & Safety Report by Tracy Logel

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Before I make that report, I just wanted to take an opportunity to note the passing of one of our long-time residents in the Town, Mr. Clayton Ness. When I stopped at the funeral home this past week there were — I had just missed 75 firemen came to play tribute to Clayton. He will be missed. Long time member and long dedicated to the Lions Club and the Fire Department. I believe he was a member of Chili Republican Committee for over 40 years.

MR. BRIXNER: He was also Fire Marshall.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: He was the one that managed the closet of the Chili Lions Club with the loaning closet and was responsible for getting that even started. So I just wanted to make sure that I made mention of the passing of Clayton. He will be truly missed.

A couple points from the Traffic & Safety meeting. They did meet last week. I was unable to attend. It was the second workshop of the code book, but I do have a couple highlights to pass along. They are studying Route 259 and 490. The Supervisor and Joe Carr did have a meeting with the DOT's Regional Director, and we will continue to follow up on that in hopes that that intersection will be addressed and work will be done sooner than later.

Another point to mention is that striping was completed on Archer Road and George Bartnett, who conducts the speeds checks on those roadways for the Committee, noted that the speed had decreased once that had been taken care of.

The other highlight I mentioned earlier about the parking and traffic -- the traffic entrance to Walgreens. Those are the highlights from that meeting. I will get some more information at the next one.

# Planning & Zoning Boards Report by Dennis Schulmerich

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Zoning?

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: Zoning meeting occurred at the same time as our workshop for Town Code, so I was not able to attend the Zoning Board meeting. Planning Board is next week.

#### MATTERS OF THE SUPERVISOR:

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Okay. Under Matters of the Supervisor, I wanted to -- Chris (Levey), can I ask you to address Mrs. Borgus' remarks regarding the grant that she needs clarification on?

CHRIS LEVEY: Yes. The grant was really for -- first of all, can someone -- I have the title of the grant?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Abandoned property.

CHRIS LEVEY: There were two parts in — the abandoned property part was irrelevant. The purpose of the grant was to inventory properties within the Town using GPS and GIS technologies to inventory for the purposes of economic development. I'm not really searching for — from code enforcement perspective, find derelict and vacant, abandoned properties, but to get a true inventory of what would be available for future development. That was the angle of the grant that I took.

We did not get the — the grant was four ten awards. We weren't chosen for the ten awards. However, they felt that our proposal merited something, so they gave us a software award, which is software used to program GPS equipment for the collection of that data. We already own the GPS unit. This software will allow us to essentially fancy it up a little bit and collect more data than just points.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Supervisor, can I ask a question? Will we be -- who will be utilizing that?

CHRIS LEVEY: Myself, the Building Department and Highway.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Was there any training that was involved?

CHRIS LEVEY: No. There will be once it is rolled out. The usage is very simple. You turn the unit on. You say collect this point, and you fill in the description blanks.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Easier than pushing a green button here?

CHRIS LEVEY: Yes, it is.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Thank you, Chris (Levey).

CHRIS LEVEY: The whole point of the software is to make the data collection very easy, instead of having to have an engineer or somebody who is familiar with that type of technology go out and do it.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Supervisor, if I may, we weren't voting completely blind. Our Counsel had given us, I think, a very adequate explanation we were accepting the programming software. I was comfortable voting on that. It wasn't like I didn't have any understanding what we were voting on at that time.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: So if we were to vote again, um, after the fact, it probably would -- I will speak for myself. I'm not speaking for anyone else. I would have preferred to know more than I knew. And there would have been no reason not to table it and find out more. Um, the reason --

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: I told Chris (Levey) next time he should give us a cover letter. COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: I'm not being critical. I think Mrs. Borgus raises a fair issue. If we're all sitting here and don't know what we're voting on, there is a concern. I think we thought we knew what we were voting for. There would be no impact on the Town if we tabled it for more information. I'm not justifying myself, but I will anyway. The reason I was comfortable voting on it is we were accepting a grant that I understood to be software, and I assumed that the Directors in Town that run the departments, when they give us advice, I count on the fact that they're using information and they're going to use the assets that they acquire effectively. That is the way I manage. I assume people will do their job and do it well.

I do think in this particular case it would have been helpful to have more information than I had. So nobody is right. Nobody is wrong. Just a situation of awareness. That is my point of view.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Chris (Levey), as long as you're here, you informed me and I informed Mrs. Brixner that the program is download -- can be downloaded in two forms.

CHRIS LEVEY: Yes. There is a broadband version that requires a connection of 128 K or faster, which would be a broadband connection or Road Runner. There is a dial-up version that only requires a 42 K connection, and has actually been tested on a poor dial-up connection at 36 K with no problems.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: It may well be; however, if we used tonight's meeting as an example how long a meeting can go, you can probably drive to New York City and back and pick up a CD rather than download it over a 36 K.

CHRIS LEVEY: You don't have to download it. It will start streaming after a few sections.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: It streams fast enough, even at slow speed, that you can watch it even without breaks?

CHRIS LEVEY: Yes.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: I will try that.

CHRIS LEVEY: I will add one caveat. The dial-up version of the video is much lower quality than the broadband version.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: It will make me look better.

CHRIS LEVEY: I don't have an opinion on that comment. (Laughter).

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: It doesn't break up. It continues to stream. That is interesting. I will try that.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I was just going to ask, the -- the suggestion for having it still be on TV, there was a time you had said you would be looking at Greece.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: They're working on that right now. But her comment about everybody having cable is totally erroneous because I have had many, many people say they do not have cable and they have no access to 12. So --

MS. BRIXNER: I didn't say everybody has cable.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: That is a fallacy. It is probably 50/50. But the thing -- what I do

want to answer and I do want to find out is why January 3rd is not in the library.

CHRIS LEVEY: All of the videos are submitted to the library two or three days after the meeting. I don't know if they sent it downtown for -- I have no idea.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: So we need to check whether they have loaned it out. They should have a loan card on it. They should know where it is.

CHRIS LEVEY: They receive a DVD two or three days following the meeting.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: You can also buy a copy from Mr. Brongo.

MS. BRIXNER: I don't want to buy a \$5 copy. I pay enough bills. So does everybody else.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Can I ask one question on that? Chris (Levey), how many copies of the DVDs do you supply to the library for each meeting?

CHRIS LEVEY: For each meeting the library gets one, the Supervisor gets one. After a while we're going to check the usage at the library. If it warrants them getting ten copies per meeting, we'll do that, DVD duplications.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I know I have been getting a lot of comments that people would prefer to see it on TV.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Well, Greece right now is still working on that agreement, and they are spearheading it. Um, I -- somehow the name escapes me of the girl in Greece that is doing the whole thing.

CHRIS LEVEY: Kathy Ferkins (phonetic).

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Ferkins (phonetic).

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Kathy.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Kathy. She is doing the whole thing. The last I knew the Superintendent – and I think I said this, the Superintendent of Schools, they were meeting – what they're trying to decide is what is going to be the – the agreement. You know, they want to look at all of the legal –

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: You don't know what is – the fee associated is with it. If you don't know how much longer it is going to be, would there be an opportunity to continue with Channel 12?

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: We said we would do this for three months if you remember correctly.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: No. I think you told us -- you made this decision on your own. We were not included in the decision.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: If you want to go spend money, lady, go ahead. Just vote it in. I have no problem with that. You know -- you had it provided for free, and we got this out -- I will clarify this. We got it out of department budgets. It did not require Town Board vote. Did not require anything. I manage the Town. I'm CEO of the Town. I have the right to sign for those things. It falls totally under my purview to it. We did it. If you're not happy with this and you want to hire Channel 12 to come in and film and pay more money for something we're already providing free, that's fine. I really don't -- it's really not relevant. You can do what you want.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: The reason of the discussion, Supervisor, is that when we passed a resolution in the fall of last year to see how Channel 12 performed, it was with the intent we would revisit that and discuss it afterwards, and when we got to that December 29th meeting, we were not given a — the opportunity wasn't presented for us to make a decision or have a discussion on whether or not we really felt that it was a service we wanted to continue.

So that is why some of this discussion has taken place. I think a lot of people have weighed in and told us that they liked watching it on Channel 12. I have been getting several phone calls and e-mails about it and that they liked being able to watch it at their home, tape it themselves and replay it when they wanted to. That was one of the things.

And the other point that has been raised by many of the people is the quality of the filming. And let's face it, when Channel 12 videotaped it, once they got past the first meeting and learned who everyone was and got comfortable with zooming in and out, you would be able to view the side table. I notice Chris (Levey) is sitting there tonight trying to move the camera around, but the quality of the videotaping was better than what we have seen so far. That is why citizens have concerns that they raise to us and we are in a position to talk about it. Not meaning to sit and criticize you. I'm just saying we have to address it. If they come to us and say, "We would like to see it" --

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: We have gone high tech and we're high tech. We're meeting all of the needs. We have more than most of the towns — any of the other town boards are supplying

to the public and we're supplying not only this, but we can now do Planning Board and Zoning Board. And none of the towns are renewing the contracts at this point on the west side of this river with Educable. So if we do that, we will be breaking with everybody else, and saying --

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I don't have any alliance or allegiance to any other town. I'm here to serve the residents of the Town of Chili that have expressed the concerns.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Why do you want to pay money you don't need to pay? That is the key. Let's find out what Greece can supply us first.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Well, we're – that's why Councilwoman Ignatowski asked you how long do you –

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: We'll know when they get it to us. They're working on it now. We have been told that they should have something up and running by the — that they will have answers for us by March. So that's all I can tell you.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I'm just trying --

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: You can call Mrs. Ferkins yourself if you question my credibility.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: No, I'm not questioning that. I'm just trying to look at the options of having it also be on TV and what would be the more prudent --

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Actually, they can take a DVD and put it on TV.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I was just looking for -

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Which is what they will -- they will take our DVDs and they put them on TV and they will be broadcast.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I'm trying to provide the comfort level for residents in the Town that got comfortable with this and have enjoyed being able to tape it themselves --

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: I'm talking about our TVs – ours going to TV.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: No.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Okay. They can come and tape it themselves. We haven't stopped them.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: You're missing the point. You have interrupted me. I didn't get to finish my point. They like to be able to, when it is broadcast on TV, tape that broadcast themselves and watch it, stop it, play it back any time they want. That is one of the complaints that — that they're not able to do with this now. That — I'm just telling you now the complaints that have been raised to us with this.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: I just said that. If Chris (Levey) gives our DVD to the television station and they broadcast it, they can tape it on VHS or anything they want to. We're providing a DVD, which they can show through the channel. Through the cable.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: That is an option, as well. That is what I am trying to say. If you're trying to reduce some of the costs, then if you --

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: With it being a public access channel, not obvious to me we would need to sign a contract. We just simply provide it -- provide the DVD, no differently than any private resident would provide. If they play it, they play it. If they don't, they don't. We've got too many issues confounded now here. This is not about renewing a contract with EduCable 12. This is not about paying Educable Channel 12 to come in and tape it. It is about how do we get the broadcast of this meeting and other meetings on TV, and I think your proposal is reasonable. We make sure that we provide a copy of the DVD to Channel 12. And we allow them to broadcast it with whatever degree of frequency they choose to.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: I think, Chris (Levey), what you need to do and -- as I understand it, the making of CDs is relatively inexpensive. So we need to start providing the Library with two copies immediately, rather than wait and see what the take-out, I think, is. Let's at least give them two. Get one you can immediately send to Channel 12. And one for Dick Brongo. Just increase it by a couple. Okay. Just pop it in a mailer and send it up there. Because then it is their choice to put it on. Because it is public access television. I think that is an easy solution.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I won't address the fact that the quality of the taping has to improve. If we're going to do this, the complaint has been they don't zoom in. And not everyone understands how to take that small little TV screen on their computer screen and change to it full screen either. I understand that is probably an option — I questioned Chris (Levey) about this myself. You did say there was an option if you uploaded it —

CHRIS LEVEY: Downloaded.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I make that mistake every time. My son laughs at me. If you downloaded it and saved it, you could play it back and be able to forward and pause,

which I don't -- maybe it is just everyone getting used to it, but I'm just trying to address the concerns that have been addressed about this.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: And the other thing, we talked about the fact that in the future, the other thing is to get a mount — a — a mounted camera with a remote so it can be moved and zoomed in from the side table over there or by anybody who is — correct, Chris (Levey)?

CHRIS LEVEY: Correct.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: We're just learning.

Under the Parks Recreation Master Plan Update Committee minutes, Dawn (Forte), going back to November, did they just all come in?

DAWN FORTE: The November and the two December ones came in on the 19th of January, and the one from 1/16 came in on the 30th of January. And I guess there was some kind of an issue with approving those minutes, that — maybe Denny (Schulmerich) can help me out with this. I just kind of had a brief conversation with Pat (Tindale) out in the hallway. There was some kind of issue with approving it and some members aren't there, and there —

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: My understanding -- I would really defer for Mr. Curley for the accurate explanation, but draft meeting minutes were available. I have seen them, and the specific delay in approving the finals, I defer to him.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: That answers that question. Back under Matters of the Supervisor, the -- Mr. Bartnett has left. George (Bartnett) has -- was nominated and has received a Traffic & Safety Board Community Service Certificate, and he is going -- it will be presented to him at a luncheon.

DAWN FORTE: Yes.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: The flyer is in everybody --

DAWN FORTE: It's in your folder. I believe it is at Rick's Prime Rib.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: At Rick's Prime Rib.

DAWN FORTE: In March.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Here it is. Right here. On Wednesday, March 7th at 12 o'clock at Rick's Prime Rib. The cost is \$25, and you can buy tickets, and it's being given by the Monroe County Traffic Safety Board. If anybody is interested and wants to go to that luncheon.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Seeing I'm Traffic & Safety liaison, I might want to participate. Can you give me a copy of that?

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Will you give Mary (Sperr) a copy of that?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Just Mary (Sperr).

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: No.

(Laughter.)

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: If anybody would like a copy, give them a copy. Didn't you put copies in their mailboxes?

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I saw it in the paper.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: It should have gone in their mailboxes.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Another secret meeting.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL:, That's right.

(Laughter.)

There was a discussion off the record.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I have a question for you. There has been a rumor going around that Wegmans was entertaining the idea of having Target --

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: I got that same rumor call. The newspaper called me.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Have you had any conversation with Wegmans at all regarding this?

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: There are no conversations going on at the moment. Back — now I will take it — it back. Before when I was in the Legislature and when this Wegmans was built over here, okay, apparently they were approved for a big box. Before NAP, and I was just informed of this recently, before NAP came on the scene a couple years ago, apparently they were talking with Target, or with Wegmans about it, and Mr. Wegman was not willing to sell the property to the Target and Target wants to own, not lease. Now that's to some extent what I know about the Target.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Now perhaps there is a different owner. That is what I am hearing, the situation has changed.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Different owner?

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Well, Mr. Wegman had passed away.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: I got a call from a reporter, too, saying she had -- she actually told me who it was that sent her an e-mail at midnight at night, and I said -- if -- if that -- I can't verify anything. And -- and I can't.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I think it is fantastic. I would like to be able to somehow express to them if this is a possibility, we would very much support it.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: One of the things that — when the NAP called and said that they were pulling out, they highly suggested that we talk to Wegmans or that Wegmans might be interested in flipping the project. And I think I mentioned that to you way back then at some point. I think I said — not to Mary (Sperr), but to Denny (Schulmerich). He might not remember. But it was a flip. In other words, the presentation — that was the only thing they said to me. They are flipping their project onto Wegmans' property, meaning Wegmans becomes the center focus with the two things on each side. And that was — that was — strictly came from NAP people back — when did they move out, in December sometime. I didn't give it a tremendous amount of credibility at that point.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: My understanding was the rumor was it was going to go to the west, where the Chase Pitkin was going to go. West of Wegmans.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: It's a good idea.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I would like to be able to send them some sort of a letter indicating that we would — that we support this idea and are enthusiasticly behind it. Could that be coming from the Board at some time the end of this week, so if there is any possibility we can grasp that?

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: I can call them and tell them about the --

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I would prefer to have something in writing.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Yes.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Supervisor, if we could, I would propose that --

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: You want a letter from the Board?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Letter from the Board, and I think --

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Well, that is not -- one of the things you have to understand that even if they did, all your traffic and everything would stay the same as what is proposed with NAP.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: No, I don't think that is the case, but anyways we can deal with that bridge when it is crossed, but I think that would be good. That is something that you can do --

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: I think it is a very good idea if they do it, but it is strictly rumor. Okay.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: If we could just see a copy of that before it goes out.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Just for clarification, that is for the west side of Wegmans, correct?

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Yes.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Okay.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: I think that is all they own. As I understand it. If you want to talk about rumors, rumors is the other piece is for sale. So I don't know what to tell you. That was the rumor I --

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: What other piece?

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: The other side.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: The other side by Dr. Fallone?

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: I heard that was for sale, but this is rumor night.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Everything is for sale.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Real quickly, personnel policy, the last time, under the last Town Board meeting I asked what we would be doing. I sent the questions. I know you said you sent them off to the lawyer.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Has the lawyer gotten back to us on all of them or not?

DIANNE O'MEARA: Not all of them, no.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: My questions seemed like it tended more towards conversations. That's why I was curious how that would it be addressed.

DIANNE O'MEARA: I'm hoping that -- I just heard some additional information

from the attorneys. Dawn (Forte) and I need to get together and go through the policy and make the -- make the changes that were requested, and then once that is finalized, we can get a new copy out to the Town Board, a new draft out to the Town Board and also at the same time answer the question --

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I don't really recall requesting a lot of changes. I was just looking for clarification.

DIANNE O'MEARA: Yes. But there was -- since the time that you had sent the e-mail, there was additional policies added, additional wording that you will need to see as well, and --

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Once the lawyers get this finished with their -- with their Union stuff, why couldn't we have a workshop that they could get the questions answered directly from Mr. Spinelli or whoever needs to answer it? Would that work?

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I'm looking for more of a discussion as to how we arrived at many of the changes that you would like to --

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Most of those are given to us by the attorneys. Most everything has been given to us by the attorneys.

DIANNE O'MEARA: Some of the changes were made, for instance, the EEOC policy, that was because there were different changes in the federal law. Um, we have a -- Mr. Stowe has alerted us that we needed the workplace violence policy. Some -- some of the policies were -- we have already adopted. I was just putting them all into one document. Um, and some of the policies were because of the changes in the health benefits.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I was under the impression a lot of it is probably driven for –

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: There is nothing that we just suddenly said, "Oh, let's change the policy."

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I just was curious about the underlying reasons. That's why I said, "Gees, there must be reasons behind it."

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: It hadn't been officially updated - I think the front's a copy -- had all these, it was updated here. This was added, this was added, this was added and it definitely needed to be brought up to speed.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: My last question could be for the Building Department Manager. We really haven't had any discussion. I know we started -- or you sent out the --

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: No one has contacted — not one sole — not one of the four of you got back to me on the ad or the Civil Service definition or anything so —

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I guess I was looking for us to have a conversation about that.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I thought we were going to discuss that.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: How would you have a discussion about it? If you didn't discuss it at the workshop we had regarding the code book? We would have to have a meeting to discuss it

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Well --

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: We would have to have a workshop and discuss it.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Well, what are you looking to discuss?

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: That is what I want to know. The job description is there. The Civil Service approved it. Everything is there.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Have you put an ad out for this position?

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Yes, I have. I put an ad out two days ago.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: We did not have any discussion about advertising this position.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Two weeks ago -- or two weeks ago -- or over two weeks ago, I put this out to you and not one of you responded and in one single way, and when did we put the ad, yesterday?

RICHARD BRONGO: I sent the ad in yesterday for, um, publication Sunday, Monday and Tuesday.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: To get something started. Just to get some people started coming in.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: For me the job description itself was okay. I just wanted to have a better understanding of what you were going to be looking for this person to do when they first came on.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: This ad is in. We thought we'd see what we get, you know, things, and — we have gone over this job description and gone over this job description.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Well, that's -- I guess my question is we agreed upon that job description because we discussed it in the past. So I don't know what you were waiting for the Board to do. If I can finish, Supervisor. You wanted us to -- your -- if we asked the question, then that would be, you know, we would rely on you for an answer. But if the job description we touched on it, we felt comfortable with it, and then you said now you want to have a workshop, but then you just said you just put it in the paper --

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Right.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: -- why have a workshop if you are --

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: To have a discussion whether you wanted to -- once these people start sending in resumes, you will have - need to start looking and say is this going in the direction we want to go? Is this what we're getting from this ad?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Well, that's what I thought the job description clarified that responsibility.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: And I did clarify it. I sent you the answers. I attached it for each of the questions you had. I called Civil Service and I attached and showed you exactly what you asked and exactly what she said.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I thought that by way of mentioning that we wanted to discuss this wasn't whether or not that the job description was what we wanted, but that that was the position that we wanted, and that is where my question -- excuse me. That is where my question lies, in whether or not we wanted to continue to replace our Town Engineer, whether we wanted a Building Department Manager, or whether we wanted to take some combination of that and put an economic development planning position in here. That is what the discussion was, I thought, we were going to have.

So I am surprised to hear you say you decided to advertise it. You didn't need feedback from us. We had already told you we liked that job description in a previous discussion, but things have changed since Jeron Rogers has left. That is my impression of where we're at. We haven't had a discussion on --

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: There is still no harm in advertising for the job position that we discussed through workshops and have created and we have advertised for it. It does not say we're hiring. We have to see what is coming in. You can — we can have a workshop and talk about the other two, how do you want to shape this, you want this to go. We had the workshops. We very clearly decided what kind of job position you wanted.

We have the job descriptions. I got the answers for you. I gave it to you over two weeks ago. I waited for comment. I got zero comment. I said I'm going to go ahead and advertise because the most we're out is the cost of the advertisement and see what kind of response we get --

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: No disrespect, but we had a workshop meeting and the next day, everything was changed anyways, so I guess I'm -- I'm little cautious when --

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Do you want to have a workshop to discuss this or not? Do you want to wait and see what comes in on the ad?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Richard (Brongo), how expensive is the ad? SUPERVISOR LOGEL: 700.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I guess when you say there is no harm by putting an ad in there --

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: There isn't. Because you're going to have people apply for this. You were concerned as to whether this job — and I was very concerned as to whether — and if you remember correctly, I said this job description did not merit a full-time position, and you argued with me this job was a full-time position and you wanted a full-time position there. We need to get the Building Department under this staffing position filled. I have gone ahead and taken the action to advertise. Because I got no comment after over two weeks of waiting. So now you can choose.

When the ad — when the resumes come in, we'll send them all to you and you can read them. If you want to advertise for a different position, you can decide now to advertise for an additional position at the same time or you can wait and see what these come in. It is totally up to you. But I took an action based on the lack of inaction over two weeks to all of the information I gave you, and I even gave you the job description, and I even gave you the ad. I wrote the ad.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I wrote the job description.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: And you wrote most of the job description. So we're all set.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: So that's why I am confused as to why you asked our opinion. We had waited on that job description. And really the question to be asked was did you feel this was the position you wanted to fill.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: It is a position we need to fill, which is exactly why I put the ad in the paper.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Well, you're sitting here grandstanding tonight to try and convince everyone of that fact that no one had responded back to you when the question was improperly asked.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: What do you mean the question was improperly asked? You asked me to give — to get the answers from Civil Service to you and send you copies. You asked me — do you want me to go into what you asked me in Executive Session, because you asked me in Executive —

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I would really like to move on with the rest of the Town Board meeting.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Well, let's go ahead and do that and then you can send me the email and ask the questions, because you asked me in Executive Session and I answered you.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: Actually, I would like to make one comment.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Okay.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: Um, I -- I guess I would have to go back into the meeting notes and find out how many times it has been said we didn't do our job, by you.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: That's - that's -

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: Don't interrupt me.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: I'm not saying that.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: Don't interrupt me.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Well, I wasn't saying that.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: You have not only implied, you stated directly that we were not responding to you. Now, I can — I can tell you on more than one occasion we told you that the job description that you provided to us met the expectations. We reviewed it on multiple occasions. You didn't need a response from us about that. You weren't going to get one about that.

So there is nothing I didn't do that you should have been expecting from me. So don't tell the community we aren't doing our job.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: I wasn't concerned about getting the answer from you because I knew were going through a lot of illness with your family.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: We'll watch the tape, Supervisor. We'll watch the tape and we'll find out how many times you told people we aren't doing our job. I don't appreciate that.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Can we move on?

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: Yeah. I would love to do that.

The Town Board 1/3/2007 meeting minutes were approved as submitted. The Town Board 1/17/07 meeting minutes were approved as modified.

# REPORTS SUBMITTED:

Community Center Revenue Report - January 2007

Recreation Center Revenue Report - January 2007

Senior Center Revenue Report - January 2007

Board of Assessment Review - Year End Report 2006

Conservation Board - 11/27/2006, Year End Report 2006

Drainage Committee - Year End Report 2006

Historic Preservation Board – 12/11/06, Year End Report 2006

Library Board - 11/28/06, 12/12/06, Year End Report 2006

Parks & Recreation Master Plan Update Committee Minutes — 11/28/06, 12/5/06, 12/11/06, 1/16/07

Planning Board - 12/12/06, 12/13/06, Year End Report 2006

Recreation Committee - Year End Report 2006

Town Clerk Report – January 2007

Traffic & Safety Committee – 12/7/2006, Year End Report 2006 Zoning Board – Year End Report 2006

#### **CORRESPONDENCE:**

- Richard Brongo has received formal notification from Norma Gimibert-Maier, President, Sparkle Plenty & Co., Inc. trade name German House Theater and Banquet Center, License #3110229 that they are petitioning the NYS Liquor Authority to move it's liquor license to Doublin Hills Bed and Breakfast, 2262 Scottsville Road, Scottsville, NY 14546.
- 2. Mr. Brongo has received formal notification from Chili Country Club, Inc., 760 Chili Scottsville Road, Scottsville, New York 14546 that they have made application for a O-P Liquor License with the State Liquor Authority.
- 3. Mr. Brongo has received formal notification from Retro Enterprises Inc., DBA The Village Pub, 3240 Chili Avenue, Rochester, New York 14624 that they have made application for a Liquor License renewal with the State Liquor Authority.
- 4. Resignation letter from Peter Widener, Zoning Board of Appeals.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Will we be replacing that position?

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: We probably need to. I - I can't do it this evening because he has not given and we called him and told him he needs to give the Town Clerk a copy of the formal notification. That letter does not say anything about the Town Clerk. I asked him if he could retype the letter and add the Town Clerk on there in the message.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Okay. All right.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Then might I ask that at our next Town Board meeting we be prepared to appoint someone to fill his position. I would assume that paperwork would be done by then.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: You would have somebody in mind that you would like to appoint from those interviews that we did? Do you have a list of what you want to look at again or what?

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Do you? Have you given any thought?

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: I have not given any thought to it. We have to pull the files and take a look at who we had on our list of people that we didn't pull from. So we have to go over those again. We can pull them up and relist them.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Between now and the next meeting?

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Between now and the next meeting.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Dawn (Forte), can you pull up all of the applications?

DAWN FORTE: Yes. I have them accessible.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: We'll do --

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Since we can't do anything tonight since we don't have the official resignation.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Yes. I asked for it so we could get it.

5. Mr. Brongo has received formal notification from Amateur Sports Park located at 525 Ballantyne Road, in the Town of Chili, that they have made application for renewal of their seasonal beer permit #3010875 with the State Liquor Authority.

# TOWN BOARD DISCUSSION RELATING TO THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION:

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Don't we usually not vote on this the same night we have the public hearing?

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I have raised that concern several times over about having time to review what was been heard. I don't like to vote on rezoning the same night as a public hearing.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: There was a request to put this on because of the time frame. Dick (Brongo), do you remember what the story is on this?

RICHARD BRONGO: I always put this resolution on immediately. That has always been there on the nights that we have the --

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I have asked not to vote -- put it on the agenda. I just want to make clear that it is your agenda you give to us and I voiced my concerns on the past about having a rezoning of this nature on the same agenda as the public hearing night.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Actually, Supervisor, if I can, historically they have not been on the same night. The problem is we hear the community's concerns and so forth, so that is why we take the time to review the concerns, comments. If there is research that needs to be done, we go back and we do that research and we do not vote on it the same night.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: And I said that about the Master Plan. That is why that is not on there. But I have a special — we had a request to put this on from the Clerk's Office.

RICHARD BRONGO: They would like to move forward with this particular rezoning because they can't do anything else until the property is rezoned. Now it is your option to table it. We will not have another meeting this month. We won't have a meeting until the March time frame. So --

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I can appreciate that everybody wants to get moving on -- on their projects. That -- that's pretty much standard in any development, housing, commercial or anything. But I think I can also appreciate that we have to weigh what was said tonight, too.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: Is there a particular hardship that is created by waiting the four weeks, or is it simply an issue that the developer wants to move forward?

RICHARD BRONGO: I have no idea.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: This is something would you have to ask them.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: Are you facing a particular hardship --

MS. BRUGG: Obviously --

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: -- or just timing?

MS. BRUGG: It has something to do with timing. We did start the process a while back, and unfortunately with holidays and things, there were delays because of meeting schedules and that kind of thing. Every little delay is one more step. We have certainly tried to do everything we could do to submit all of the information and meet all of the requirements and get all of the necessary comments and so forth.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I can appreciate your position, too. And you have done a marvelous job providing the information tonight. But I like to take a — get a chance to follow up on anything I have heard tonight, and once a decision is made to rezone a property, I — this has happened to us in the past. Once it is rezoned, anything — any business can go in there. You could decide tomorrow not to put your building there and we have rezoned it for General Business. And so I like to make sure, and I understand your position. I'm not — I'm not doing more work and extending more costs until this has been done. But I don't want to ever give anyone the impression this is a done deal or that our minds were made up before you came in tonight.

MS. BRUGG: Sure. We appreciate your position. And certainly, an invitation to all of the members of the Board, the staff, anybody who has questions or requires any further documentation, please do not hesitate to contact myself or anyone on our team, if you need any additional --

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: How did this — when this was presented by the Clerk's Office, it was presented that if we didn't vote on it tonight, and we held up when you would be able to get back before the Planning Board, all of the waiting, the applications, all of that.

MS. BRUGG: Absolutely. It delays every step of the process. And on paper when you look at these things on a time line — as a practical matter, I think everybody knows when you look at the time lines and you go okay, well, this Board meets this date, and this Board meets this date, here is the time period. It never works out that way. And along the way, there have been, you know — like I said, the holidays changed things up and meeting schedules and the modification requirements and so on and so forth.

In the end, it just ends up dragging it out further and further. And there are multiple steps involved.

RICHARD BRONGO: Because of the fact that we had to notify the public, we had to send out for SEQR, um, we -- and because of the way our meetings fell, we have probably had the request for six or eight weeks already, and because we didn't have a meeting -- or I think we did put it on the December 29th meeting to set the public hearing for the 7th, so that we could at least get that process started. So it is not that this is something new in the process that we're rushing. It has been around for a while.

MS. BRUGG: Correct.

RICHARD BRONGO: But that is your option, to table it.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: My comments are not personal to this application. My comments are about how I feel about every issue where a rezoning that has come before the Board. It is not particular to this. Nor is it my intent to delay anything. It is a big decision to make and it affects a lot of people.

RICHARD BRONGO: Well, then I guess I would like some clarification as to when we do rezonings, when you would like this particular resolution -- not this one, but any rezoning resolution put on the agenda, because it would be much easier for me to put it on the night of the resolution and then you guys table it, because there could be a situation sometime when you need it on that night, and if -- you know, if I'm going to be directed to put it on always two weeks or the next meeting afterwards, that's fine. I have no problem with that. But then you know, it won't be on that night if we needed to -- to do action on it.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: I have no problem with it being on the night of the public hearing as long as we understand that generally we'll table it until the following meeting.

RICHARD BRONGO: That's fine. That takes care of any time frame.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: As long as we have a general understanding.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I don't have a problem with that as long as that is the understanding.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: So I move to table.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: Second.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: We didn't move or second the resolution at all.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: So then do we just not table it?

RICHARD STOWE: You can move to table Resolution 111.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Without having moved it?

RICHARD STOWE: Yes. I think you just did.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I apologize for you folks having to sit through this all tonight. Hopefully we can communicate better in the future. I apologize.

MS. BRUGG: For clarification, will we be put on the agenda for the next meeting automatically then?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Yes.

MS. BRUGG: Which will be?

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: March 7th.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Well, check with the Supervisor. She sets the agenda.

MS. BRUGG: We thank you and appreciate your taking the time.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: If I could have someone's business card so if I need to contact you, I can call you.

# RESOLUTION #111 RE: Rezoning of 3127 Chili Avenue and 778 Paul Road from R-1-12 to GB

~~~		
Offered by:	Seconded by:	
	 occonded by.	

WHEREAS, Fix Spindelman Brovitz & Goldman, acting on behalf of the record owners of the property located at 3127 Chili Avenue and 778 Paul Road, made application to the Planning Board for rezoning of these parcels R-1-12 (Residential) to GB (General Business), and,

WHEREAS, the Planning Board held a public hearing on December 13, 2006 on said application to rezone said premise to General Business by a vote of six yes and,

WHEREAS, the Town Board on February 7, 2007 conducted a public hearing as required by its Zoning Local Law,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Board, lead agent for State Environmental Quality Review Act purposes, has reviewed the environmental record with regard to this application and determines it to be an unlisted action and makes a determination of no significant environmental impact, and,

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the recommendation of the Planning Board to rezone the parcels at 3127 Chili Avenue and 778 Paul Road, from R-1-12 (Residential) to GB (General Business) is hereby approved, and,

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the Town Clerk is hereby directed to modify the Town Zoning Map, accordingly.

Motion to table:

Offered by: Councilwoman Ignatowski Seconded by: Councilman Schulmerich

On the motion to table: UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

RESOLUTION #112 Re: Approving Extension of the Chili Consolidated Drainage District to Serve the Dario and Rita G. Marchioni Property Located at 100 Scottsville-Chili Road Tax Map No. 146.03-1-5, Churchville, N.Y. 14428, in the Town of Chili, County of Monroe and State of New York.

Offered by: Councilwoman Ignatowski Seconded by: Councilwoman Sperr

WHEREAS, a petition for the extension of the Chili Consolidated Drainage District to serve the property located at 100 Old Scottsville-Chili Road Churchville, N.Y. 14428, Tax Map No. 146.03-1-5, more particularly described in Schedule A (Property Description) on file in the Town Clerk's Office; and

WHEREAS, an order was duly adopted by the Town Board on January 17, 2007 reciting the filing of said petition, the boundaries of the proposed district, the proposed services to be provided, the fact that no drainage improvements are proposed to be constructed therein by the Chili Consolidated Drainage District at this time, the estimated costs of the Chili Consolidated Drainage District, as extended, to the typical property, or if different, to the typical one or two family home, within the Chili Consolidated Drainage District, as extended, and specifying February 7, 2007 at 7:00 P.M. as the time and the Town Hall in the said Town of Chili as the place where the said Town Board would meet to consider the petition and to hear all persons interested in the subject thereof, concerning the same; and

WHEREAS, such order was duly posted and published as required by law; and

WHEREAS, a hearing on the matter was duly held by the Board on the 7th day of February, 2007, commencing at 7:00 P.M. at the Town Hall in the said Town and discussion upon the matter having been had and all persons desiring to be heard having been duly heard; and

WHEREAS, this Board has duly reviewed and considered the short Environmental Assessment Form submitted in this matter, as well as all other information obtained at the public hearing

referred to above; and the Board has duly considered the impacts which may reasonably expected to result from the proposed action by using the process and criteria set forth in Article 8 of the State Environmental Quality Review Act and applicable regulations thereunder ("SEQRA");

NOW, THEREFORE, upon the evidence obtained by the Town Board at said public hearing and upon all other information obtained and reviewed by the Board, it is

RESOLVED AND DETERMINED, that the proposed extension of the Chili Consolidated Drainage District is not likely to result in the creation of potentially significant adverse environmental impacts and therefore, this Town Board does hereby make a Determination of NonSignificance, or a "Negative Declaration" (as the same is defined for purposes of SEQRA); and be it further

RESOLVED AND DETERMINED, that (a) the petition aforesaid is signed and acknowledged or proved as required by law, and it duly complies with the requirements of Section 191 of Town Law as to the sufficiency of signers and is otherwise sufficient; (b) all the property and property owners within the proposed district extension are benefitted thereby; (c) all the property and property owners benefitted are included within the limits of the of the proposed district extension; (d) it is in the public interest to extend the district only if the expenses of the district (except as otherwise provided herein) shall be assessed against the entire district, as extended; and (e) it is in the public interest to grant in whole the relief requested; and be it further,

**RESOLVED AND DETERMINED**, that the extension of the Chili Consolidated Drainage District as proposed in said petition be approved; that cost of the formation of the district extension shall be paid by the petitioners; and that such district shall be bounded and described as set forth in Schedule A, available in the Town Clerk's Office; and be it further,

**RESOLVED AND DETERMINED**, that all expenses of the Chili Consolidated Drainage District, including this extension and all other extensions heretofore and hereafter created, shall be a charge against the entire area of the district, as extended, except as otherwise provided above; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, that the Town Clerk of this Town shall within ten (10) days after the adoption of this resolution file certified copies thereof in duplicate in the office of the State Department of Audit and Control at Albany, New York; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, that the Town Clerk, within ten (10) days of the adoption of this resolution, shall cause to be published and posted, as required by law, a notice setting forth an abstract of this resolution, the date that it was adopted and a statement that it is subject to a permissive referendum.

Upon a call of the Roll of the Members of the Town Board of the Town of Chili:

#### **UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

#### TOWN BOARD DISCUSSION RELATING TO THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION:

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: The signs, Master Plan Parks & Recreation, they talked about uniform signs. Would this fall under that conversation?

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: This is a repair.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I'm not sure what extent the repairs are.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: It is being done with the same people that actually produced the signs, and, um, they're going to be restoring it to its original format.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: What is wrong with them?

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: These are not the parks signs.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: No. We understand that.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: I know where they are. They look great.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Joe Carr went out to look at them. Closer inspection. They're --

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: Mr. Carr, could you educate us?

JOSEPH CARR: All right. First, you may recall that we received an e-mail or a memo from the Conservation Board. They had inspected those signs and expressed to us a real concern that they were deteriorating. I then sent a couple of people out to check for ourselves and the information is, they are deteriorating, a great deal. I agree with you that they still look very good. I think they look good.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: They look great, yeah.

JOSEPH CARR: But you have to understand those signs have been up there for 14 or 15 years, I believe.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: I have been alive 53 years. I still look pretty good, too.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Beauty is in the eye of the beholder.

JOSEPH CARR: But sir, you don't stand out in the weather 24/7.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: Point well taken.

JOSEPH CARR: They're coming apart. The colors are fading. The paint is starting to chip, and they're starting to come apart. So we — we agree with the assessment that they need to be refurbished. Simply refurbished by the same company.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: I'm just wondering how good I would look if you put \$3,000 into me.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Well, that's a start. (Laughter.)

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: It's a lot of money.

JOSEPH CARR: Can I decline to answer that?

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I have a question. I know you got this quote from the company that put them up the first time. Did we need to get more than one quote on this? Is this is the only one you got, Joe (Carr). I mean --

JOSEPH CARR: Two answers. First of all, it — it does fall within our buildings or under our procurement policy to proceed like this. It does comply with our policy. I — I frankly don't know who else I would ask to quote on the refurbishing of the signs. They're still in business. They did these signs. I think it's probably — our first choice is to have them do this repair. That's how I felt about it.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Okay.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I'm trying to recall. I think Mr. Schickler did even explore other options, as well, before he came up with this recommendation. But I – that – this was several meetings ago.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: Huh. That sure seems like a lot of money to me.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: They do all --

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: 1500 a piece.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Joe (Carr) -

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: Somebody is driving by -- it's late. I understand. Somebody is driving 65 miles an hour down the road by 490, and we're going to pay \$1500 a sign to say Welcome to Chili? I'm just having a problem with that.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: How much did the signs cost originally?

JOSEPH CARR: I don't know. It is not a decision that we have to make tonight.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I know that Dick (Schickler) was saying that if they don't get taken care of, you will have to be replacing the sign as opposed to refurbishing.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: I find it hard to believe it would cost much more than \$1500 to replace that sign. I'm trying to imagine what a \$1500 refurbishment of a sign is.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Does it have anything to do with the gold leaf? I know that is not cheap.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: How many gallons of paint does it take for 1500 bucks?

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: If George Bartnett were here, he could help you out with that.

Is it possible to table this until the next meeting when we have a little more information? Would that be the Board's pleasure?

JOSEPH CARR: I do have some information about new signs. Um, we purchased one last year, the year before for one of the properties.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: For the parks.

JOSEPH CARR: The cost is surprising, but I have some additional information. We can talk about it. We do not have to make this decision tonight. We're not going out in this weather to fix the signs.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Mover and seconder okay with tabling it? I am.

# RESOLUTION #113 RE: Repair I-490 Welcome Signs

Offered by: Councilwoman Ignatowski

Seconded by: Councilman Slattery

WHEREAS, the two "Welcome to Chili" signs located on I-490 expressway have deteriorated over time and are in need of repair; and

WHEREAS, a quote was obtained from Signlanguage Inc., the company which manufactured these signs, to re-furbish both signs at a total cost of \$3,000.00

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, to authorize Signlanguage Inc. to proceed with the proposed repair work at a cost not to exceed \$3,000.00, to be paid from account A 7110.4 (Parks – Contractual).

Motion to table:

Offered by: Councilwoman Ignatowski

Seconded by: Councilman Slattery

On the motion to table: UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

RESOLUTION #114 RE: Letter of Credit Release For Union Station Section V Release No. 6 (Final)

Offered by: Councilwoman Sperr

Seconded by: Councilman Schulmerich

BE IT RESOLVED that per recommendation of the Town Engineer, \$33,723.33 be released from the letter of credit with HSBC (#SDCMTN548413) for Union Station Section V, leaving a balance of \$0.00; subject to engineering fees and street light bills to the Town.

#### **UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

RESOLUTION #115 RE: Letter of Credit Release Maple Hollow Subdivision Release No. 5

Offered by: Councilwoman Sperr

Seconded by: Councilman Schulmerich

BE IT RESOLVED that per recommendation of the Town Engineer, \$8,037.34 be released from the Letter of Credit with Ontario National (#1013) for Maple Hollow subdivision, leaving a balance of \$94,985.41; subject to engineering fees and street light bills to the Town.

## **UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

#### **RESOLUTION #116 RE: Transfer to Assessment Reserve**

Offered by: Councilwoman Sperr

Seconded by: Councilwoman Ignatowski

WHEREAS, the Town of Chili has received \$51,035.00 of 2006 Assessment Aid money; and

WHEREAS, it is desirable to reserve these funds for future assessment expenses,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, to revise A3040 (Real Property Tax Administration) and A9950.9 (Transfers to Capital Projects) by \$51,035.00; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED to transfer \$51,035.00 to H23 Assessment Reserve Fund.

#### **UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

#### TOWN BOARD DISCUSSION RELATING TO THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION:

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: There were questions brought up from the audience. In the letter that we received from both Chris Levey and Dianne O'Meara who have asked us for this position, it was stated they would be working 19 ½ hours per week, but it did not tell us which part of the 19 ½ hours, from my understanding would be one department or another. I don't know if that's relevant.

RICHARD BRONGO: Wait a minute. That's — this is the afternoon receptionist.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: This is not the one they asked us for.

RICHARD BRONGO: They will be working 20 hours a week as a receptionist and then she will be working the other three hours -- at least three is my understanding. Three hours a day in the other position.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Okay. But it did say she would work 19 1/2.

CHRIS LEVEY: Not to exceed.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Got it. That is different than 20 hours a week, for benefits, isn't it?

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Karen is very capable and both Dianne (O'Meara) and Chris (Levey) have used her.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I did have a conversation with Chris (Levey) and Dianne (O'Meara) last week or earlier this week about this, because I did have some of the same questions. It was not in the budget. But it will be next year. From my understanding, they will utilize some of the money that Jeron (Rogers) would have had for his salary. Then my other question was, is this a temporary need because of the staffing situations we're having with illnesses and that, or is something that is going to be needed on a more permanent basis? The answer given to me by both of them was a permanent basis. It was not going to be realized—they would not have the work once we have those illness situations being resolved.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: So the work load will still be there?

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Uh-huh.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I guess my question, concern would be we just went through a budget process. We went through an organization meeting. These needs just --

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: They were not presented prior to this letter.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I guess I would question, are there other positions that we're going to see coming forward here?

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Not to my knowledge.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Okay.

DIANNE O'MEARA: From other departments.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: From anywhere. I -- I will go back to my comment was that we just went through the budget process, organization meeting. It didn't appear that we needed it at that time, and one month into the year, now there is a need. I'm just--

DIANNE O'MEARA: Speaking for myself, I knew that I was going to be coming to the Town Board definitely for the budget 2008 asking for another position. At -- during the process for 2007, I was feeling a real crunch. I have been utilizing her many, many, hours each week, more than she probably should be used, but I have been using her quite a bit.

But in the -- traditionally, once I get over the crunch period, you know, February, March, things calm down. Well, they haven't been calming down.

Chris (Levey) is feeling the same sort of pressure. I guess the point that I am trying to make is that I needed somebody else, but I didn't know if I needed somebody for a full  $19\frac{1}{2}$  hours yet. Chris (Levey) was in the same boat. So we combined the two positions and — and between the two of us, we needed somebody for the  $19\frac{1}{2}$  hours. Now with the timing — the time

we did the budget, we did not realize we would have a work load that would be continuing that wasn't going to let up.

CHRIS LEVEY: What is happening in my case is I have been traditionally working 8 to 15 hours a week in addition to my regular hours at Town Hall to keep up. I have been utilizing the reception staff as much as I can to help keep things flowing. The recent server issues brought to light the fact that I am never going to catch up. I need additional support. The support I was getting from the reception staff has been dwindling as other departments are utilizing them for support.

So I went to Dianne (O'Meara) and said, "Dianne, I don't need somebody for a real full-time position, but I do need some additional support a few hours a week. What can we do?"

She indicated she is in the same boat and from there --

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I guess that -- by the sounds of it, other departments are utilizing your resources, staff member. Do we need see -- do we feel, Supervisor, that there is going to be a need for them to request this?

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Actually, what is -- the Assessor's Office when they have a mailing, they use the reception area. Mr. Brongo, when he has a mailing, he is going to use the reception area. The morning person would still be there to do that kind of thing. I guess you could better answer that, because you -- because you're here. Linda (Leach) is not here to answer her question. But --

RICHARD BRONGO: We use -- I use the receptionist sometimes to search meeting minutes for a particular resolution or something pertaining to one subject or another. We use them at tax time to kind of help with the filing of things, tax bills that have come in and are being paid. We send work out there.

Joe Carr has been using them to help type up some vouchers and things like that.

So we try to direct some work out to the receptionist. Dianne (O'Meara) has been using the receptionist quite a bit to help with her work load, and it is getting to the point where, you know, now they have more specific need -- need somebody and rather than hire somebody at 20 hours a week, they can pick up somebody for 15 hours a week by utilizing a part-time individual that we have already working and this part-time individual would like some extra work. So it seems to be a win/win situation for everybody.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I guess, the -- going back to my original comment, it was budget time. We did approve a budget. There is, you know -- if Mr. Rogers didn't leave, then where would this money be coming from? The situation would have to be reviewed.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: That's right. It definitely would.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I would strongly urge department heads to review their needs and prepare for them.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Dianne (O'Meara) talked about, as she said, that next year's budget she was going to put it in, but I think the opportunity arose, "Hey, we can take advantage of it now."

And we knew that Karen was asking for more hours, and we don't want to loose her because she is good and she can do those things for them. So it all worked.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Will she operate the camera? (Laughter.)

# RESOLUTION #117 RE: Account Clerk/Typist - Part Time

Offered by: Councilwoman Sperr

Seconded by: Councilman Schulmerich

BE IT RESOLVED to appoint Karen Paxon as Account Clerk Part Time for the Information System and Finance departments effective February 8, 2007 at a rate of \$10.00 per hour; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED to transfer \$12,000.00 from A1440.1 (Engineer-Personnel) to A1680.1 (Director of MIS-Personnel).

#### **UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: In regards to the training conference, will this give Dennis (Scibetta) and Ed (Shero) their training that they need, that is required of them for the year?

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: I don't know if it covers the whole year or not. There are different things that they're required to have. We just got a new thing that they have -- that we have to -- Joe (Carr), do you know off the top of your head?

JOSEPH CARR: I don't.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: I don't think it is all the training. Ed (Shero) has been going to training right along.

JOSEPH CARR: I don't know.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Dawn (Forte), you had something?

DAWN FORTE: I just want to comment that this is a resolution that he had on here the previous year, so it is something that he had -- Dennis (Scibetta) had on for last year also, so it is a yearly thing that he needs to go to.

DIANNE O'MEARA: This is one of the training conferences that is recognized, his hours towards certification.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Now with Jeron (Rogers) gone, who was keeping track of the training, who is keeping track of the training and what is required for the employees?

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: All of that is being kept in Lee (Frank)'s office.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: She is keeping -

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Keeping it in the personnel files. It is a logical place for it.

#### RESOLUTION #118 RE: Annual Continuing Educational Conference

Offered by: Councilman Schulmerich

Seconded by: Councilman Slattery

BE IT RESOLVED that Dennis Scibetta, Building and Plumbing Inspector and Edward Shero, Asst. Building Inspector attend the Finger Lakes Building Officials Association annual conference March 19-22, 2007 at the RIT Inn and Conference Center in Henrietta, NY at a cost of \$390.00 each.

#### **UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

#### RESOLUTION #119 RE: Annual United Way Campaign

Offered by: Councilman Schulmerich

Seconded by: Councilman Slattery

**BE IT RESOLVED** that Dawn Forte attend the annual United Way Coordinator Workshop on February 14, 2007 at the Rochester Riverside Convention Center.

#### **UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

# RESOLUTION #120 RE: United Way Campaign Incentives

Offered by: Councilman Schulmerich

Seconded by: Councilman Slattery

**BE IT RESOLVED** the Town Board of the Town of Chili authorizes its United Way Campaign Coordinator, Dawn Forte to seek donations from commercial enterprises to use as incentives to encourage employee participation.

#### UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

# TOWN BOARD DISCUSSION RELATING TO THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION:

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Page 5 of the abstract. Home Depot building supplies. I assume that is for this work that was done here in this room.

JOSEPH CARR: That's correct.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Thank you, Joe (Carr). Down for buildings, General Fund. One exit sign, court house. 1507 Union Station Park.

JOSEPH CARR: Yes.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Courthouse at Union Station Park?

JOSEPH CARR: Oh, no.

DIANNE O'MEARA: No. It is one each.

JOSEPH CARR: Three live signs go to Union Station Park. And one exit sign went to the courthouse.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Cross out Union Station on that.

And page 10, at the very top, um, Verizon Wireless, 1 p.m., cellular phone 397. What is that for?

DIANNE O'MEARA: This is their monthly.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: For one phone?

DIANNE O'MEARA: No. This is --

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: One admin.

DIANNE O'MEARA: The one should not be there. It is for their monthly phone bill, phone services.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: For central communications.

Who is this for?

DIANNE O'MEARA: No, it's not for a phone. It's for the monthly cellular telephone bill.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: For a number of phones.

DIANNE O'MEARA: For a number of phones.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Because when I went down to the next one under central communications, one direct cellular, 64, so --

DIANNE O'MEARA: I would have to go back and take a look at those.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: When you go from 397 to \$64.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: They have been like that on all of the abstracts. I noticed the administration has been much higher than the Rec --

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: For a one-month period.

CHRIS LEVEY: The admin cell phones, there is about 12 or 14 lines; whereas, the Rec entry is for three lines.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I'm assuming then also for DPW.

CHRIS LEVEY: Right.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Page 19. Under youth programs. This one won't take as long, Denny (Schulmerich).

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: No, I'm enjoying it.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Postmaster prepayment mailing brochure postage, \$1600? DIANNE O'MEARA: They're going — it is a combination of a Recreation/Senior Center brochure mailing three times a year.

The, um -- the brochure has been printed up. We have to have the postage.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I know there is - is there a special rate that we get?

DIANNE O'MEARA: Yes. Correct. We're getting - I can't remember. But it is - it is a bulk rate.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: All right. That is all I have. Thank you.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: You sure?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Yeah.

# RESOLUTION # 121 RE: February 7, 2007 Abstract

# Offered by: Councilwoman Ignatowski

Seconded by: Councilwoman Sperr

**BE IT RESOLVED** to pay vouchers 199-444 totaling \$334,961.48 to be paid from the Distribution Account as presented to the Town Board by Richard Brongo, Town Clerk:

General Fund	\$2	239,461.95
Highway Fund	\$	61,281.65
H43 Annual 2006-7 Reassessment	\$	85.00
Consolidated Drainage	\$	1,028.52

Chili-Scottsville Fire Protection Special Light Districts \$ 23,484.00

TOTAL

\$ 9,620.36 \$334,961.48

#### UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

#### TOWN BOARD DISCUSSION RELATING TO THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION:

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: One last thing. I would like to add a resolution to Town Board tonight. You guys can take one down, take one pass one down please. This is to provide an update to color mapping for the Town of Chili Comprehensive Plan 2010, the maps that we have. Due to the amount of — due to the amount of confusion that is out there, I can read the resolution if you would like.

Whereas, the Town Board believes that in light of the recent confusion over what the future land use recommendations are for the Town, that it is in the best interests of the Town to have GIS color mapping prepared for placement in the adopted Town of Chili Comprehensive Plan - 2010 and also to be placed on the Town's website; and,

Whereas, the Town Board further believes that such mapping should be coordinated by a knowledgeable planning professional familiar with the mapping contained in the adopted Town of Chili Comprehensive Plan - 2010; and,

Whereas, the Town Board desires to know the costs (which is not to exceed \$6,500.00) associated with providing a total of 12 GIS color maps, for the adopted Town of Chili Comprehensive Plan - 2010.

Now, therefore be it resolved, that the Town Board does hereby direct the Town Supervisor to enter into a contractual agreement with RLB Planning Group, in an amount not to exceed \$1,500.00 to coordinate the solicitation of services for the preparation of a total of 12 GIS color maps to be reviewed by and accepted by the Town Board and Town Engineer.

Be it further resolved, that the above-referenced agreement specify that upon a Town Board decision, to be made at a future date, that per recommendation from the RLB Planning Group, for the preparation of 12 GIS color maps (from the adopted Plan).

Finally, be it resolved that RLB Planning Group is directed to commence work on this assignment within 30 days of this authorization to proceed.

We may have to fine tune this, but with the amount — the reason I am bringing this forward is the amount of confusion that is out there, the amount of comments that we're hearing, I think what we need to do is finally put this to bed. Bring in somebody who worked on the Master Plan, who is familiar with it, and to also provide RLB Planning with the document that Mr. Brongo created, with the resolutions for the rezoning that took place. So.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Can we have this moved and seconded before we discuss it? COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Yep. I will move it.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I will second it.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: My only question is, you need to clarify this, because — because as I understand it, what we had, what was passed in 2002, we have a conflict between the verbiage and the black and white maps that were passed at the time, is that correct? So where are they going to make these up from? What are they going to use — I guess my question is, what will they use to create the colored maps?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: What do you mean "what will they use"? SUPERVISOR LOGEL: They need to do the entire thing.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: There are three large books that when I went in and took my colored maps into the Town Hall the day after the Town Board meeting, as I promised, the ones I held up, there were three large books that have various forms of maps in different — from different versions. And that material was what I had assumed we — when I said please, let's get this cleaned up and everyone asked that we get that done, you assigned Jeron (Rogers) to do that. That did not get done. From that — so from those three volumes and all of the other information that is available to us, to have the consultant that — that worked on the Master Plan and can help us get this finally done right, the right thing to do seems to be have the person that worked on that finish this for us and clear up any of the problems that we have, done right.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: I have no problem with that, except I have a problem with the fact that -- I am just concerned because he didn't do it right to begin with --

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: The maps were never done by him to begin with. COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: That is correct.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: In order to save money, the maps were never done. They just took like the black and white maps from like the one that preceded it and tried coloring it with crayons in the Building Department. And then we just tried having the MIS Director work on it. The maps were never produced by RLB as part of another document.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: I don't want to make excuses. I wasn't here then. I don't know any of the history.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: That is why I am trying to give you a history. That is the problem. Those maps, the money was never expended at the time of the Master Plan adoption to --

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: We got to make sure, though, that the book that Kathy Reed has, because it has got every little thing -- and what Dick Brongo has got for every resolution, because I -- maybe Jeron (Rogers) didn't finish, but I know a tremendous amount of work went into taking every resolution and a lot of research, every single resolution ever passed by this Board prior to and up to that time needs to be incorporated in that. He needs all of that.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: That's what RLB Planning Group would do, coordinate that. And then there will -- would be an RFP put out for an engineering firm. And I have got a few on a list I can provide to you, to produce those maps.

Are the -- the only thing I would add to this resolution - and had asked me questions about maps, myself. The only other thing that we might want to add would be what they call an orthophoto mosaic, which would be a photo of the Town. To reference what it looks like, it's what -- Google Earth. If you do Google Earth and get an overview of the Town. Those can be produced, whichever size you want, and to utilize that map, those maps can be produced in such a size and laminated that they can be utilized at any Planning or Zoning Board meeting for their -- in their reference or it could be hung in the hallways for people to take a look at or in the Clerk's Office or whatever. That was a suggestion made to me when I was inquiring about maps.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: So the three books you're referencing, I'm assuming one is Mr. Brongo's book. One is Kathy Reed's book, because those have got every single thing that ever passed.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Right. I can -- Chris (Levey) can answer that better. I didn't ask --

CHRIS LEVEY: They were all from the Building Department.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: All three books from the Building Department.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Those are the ones that I saw. I did not ask --

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: What about the book than is -- he has got that was passed by resolutions and it's by law legal. That is not counted? Because that really should be included.

RICHARD BRONGO: Mine is the same as one of those.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Is his the same exact as one of those, because I want to make sure nothing gets left out. If this is going to get done, it needs to get done.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Absolutely.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I guess I just questioned is 6,500 going to be enough? In conversations with Ron (Brand), did he give you --

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Well, we can go --

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: That is for him to farm it out?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: He is going to do the research and all of that, and then -- SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Can we put a time line on him, because he has a reputation for never finishing anything? I mean -- I'm throwing this out there, because it -- I was in the Legislature for ten years, and I listened for this go on and on and on, and one of the problems is they don't seem to finish anything.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I inquired about a time line on this. I thought you might ask. If we were able to proceed with this, pass this resolution tonight and engage the services of someone to produce the maps and vote on that on our March 7th Town Board meeting, he said within 30 days to proceed. I didn't inquire about how long it takes to do the maps and it would only take a period of about three months. The bulk of it would be at least four or five weeks for him — I'm just giving — for RLB Group to assess all of the information, to determine what is correct. It doesn't take that long to produce the maps. They only need about three or four weeks to produce the maps. Then the final 30 days would be — because it has to come back to the Town for approval, see if everything is okay, the final maps are then printed. So you can actually

accomplish that once it is voted on. Within the three to four-month period, we should be ready to go. That is the information I was able to get today.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: See if everything is okay compared to what? That --

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Let me rephrase. Maybe I didn't make myself clear.

When maps are produced by someone, they are presented for verification that everybody -- like a proofreading, that this is what you wanted to see, and then the final ones are done. Multiple copies of the final maps.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: You have to be very careful. Say you want to see this and she wants to see that. So you make this guy put those in and then you are saying it is okay because it shows what I want. You have to go with what that Master Plan calls for.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: You're absolutely right, Supervisor. I agree with this 100 percent. This is the same situation with the personnel policy, with the Burke Group, with the code, how long we have been extending things out. So what — how would you like too much — what — first, I would like to go to Counsel and see is there a problem after reviewing this document, this resolution, any problems that exist.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Any wording changed or anything? The --

RICHARD STOWE: The \$1500 is the first step and then he comes back here?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I'm sorry.

RICHARD STOWE: \$1500 is -- is for him to come back here?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Yes.

RICHARD STOWE: You're not expending any more money until there is another resolution?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: That's correct. Well, not to exceed \$6500 associated with providing a total of 12 maps. What we have to do is we have find out what firm is going to do that work.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: We have to put an RFP out.

RICHARD STOWE: Your resolution says you desire to know the costs.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Right.

RICHARD STOWE: You are authorizing a contract with the RLB Group in an amount not to exceed \$1500 to coordinate, solicit, and bring it back, color maps being reviewed and accepted by the Town Board.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Right. Got to modify that.

RICHARD STOWE: Well, when we get a contract with RLB Planning Group, you're not intending to spend more than \$1500.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: With RLB.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: That's correct.

RICHARD STOWE: The balance is with the third party yet to be determined by RLB.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: That's correct.

RICHARD STOWE: That requires another resolution by this Board to engage that third party.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: That's correct.

RICHARD STOWE: Therefore, that amount would be coming back to this Town Board in another resolution.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: So we don't need to have that amount in.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: So this needs to come out?

RICHARD STOWE: The \$6500 is your best guess because you don't know yet.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: So can we say approximately then? I don't want to say not to exceed. That's my concern. I don't want to be locking ourselves in without having --

RICHARD STOWE: Estimated to be.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I rather have that.

RICHARD STOWE: I have no problem with it as long as you understand you're spending \$1500 to engage RLB to come back with another resolution to engage someone else.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: What is RLB doing for \$1500? You can go out for RFPs without spending any money.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: He is using his experience as working on the Comprehensive Plan, and hopefully it will minimize the amount of research he has to do. He will look at the information that we have, the -- that information that was put together in the books.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: He will not change the verbiage?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: No. He is not changing the verbiage at all. That is --

RICHARD STOWE: He can't.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Right. He can't.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: But he is going to look at — he is going to look at all this stuff. It doesn't say that here. It just says he will go out and solicit services. It needs to say he is going to review —

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: He is going to coordinate.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Should be "review."

All he is doing there now is going out and getting an RFP, the way it is written.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: To review the --

RICHARD BRONGO: Current.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: -- current Master Plan.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: Actually, I might say review and reconcile.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: There you go.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: Review and reconcile the current Master Plan in place because there is multiple sources of --

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: In light -- as it regards to the maps.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: Specifically related to maps.

RICHARD STOWE: Without splitting this hair too fine --

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I don't have a lot to split.

RICHARD STOWE: It is my understanding that what you really want is the maps that were supposed to be with the plan when it was adopted.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Yes.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Correct.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: That is why we're hiring the consultant to finish the job.

RICHARD STOWE: Well, okay, but when we're reviewing and interpreting other information, I have a problem.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: Good point.

RICHARD STOWE: What we are doing is finishing and mapping what was already adopted.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Correct.

RICHARD STOWE: Good, bad or indifferent.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: So what we're going to do is to finish the job. We can't say it that simply, though.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: To produce the maps --

RICHARD STOWE: I don't know that the maps — shouldn't reflect any amendments that have occurred --

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Should not.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: But we should have an actually correct starting point so that at that point any changes made from that point can be made to that map and we have the correct point and we're not at that point and it needs to be done. So whichever way --

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: We're producing the maps for that.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: I understand what we're doing, but we need to absolutely, 100 percent, say it in this agreement.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Joe (Carr).

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Do you have an idea?

JOSEPH CARR: I do.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Thank you.

JOSEPH CARR: But I would ask to meet with the Board in Executive Session for just a very few minutes. I'm concerned about what you're discussing, and I know we all want to get it correct. Could I ask to do that?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I move to make a motion to go into Executive Session.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Second.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: For what purpose? We need a purpose on that. Got to be justified.

JOSEPH CARR: To clarify what we believe is required to be done to complete the Master Plan of 2002.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: That's --

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: That's not a justified reason to go into Executive

Session.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Counsel? No.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: You will have to say why you need to go into Executive Session.

JOSEPH CARR: Well --

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: If there is a reason.

JOSEPH CARR: Well --

RICHARD STOWE: Does this involve the personnel of this Town and the persons involved with the Master Plan --

JOSEPH CARR: Could I speak with the attorney for a minute?

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Sure.

Richard Stowe conferred with Joseph Carr.

There was a discussion off the record.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Supervisor, I will make a motion, due to some additional research needed, to table this resolution until the March meeting.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Okay.

RICHARD STOWE: Supervisor, to the -- to the extent there is delay associated with this, I will take responsibility for that. I didn't -- I didn't have this before tonight's meeting.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Correct.

RICHARD STOWE: I – I have got a couple of questions that I would like to ask the RLB Planning Group about just exactly what is the scope of their services and what they contain, so that if I could have the Board's indulgence to table it for 30 days until we know better where we are and what we're really asking. I have heard the comment of what was done and what wasn't done and how this may finish it. I would like the opportunity to have that conversation with will RLB Planning Group and bring it back.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I second to table then.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Thank you. Appreciate it.

RESOLUTION #122 RE: Provide Up-to-date Color Mapping For The Town of Chili Comprehensive Plan - 2010

Offered by: Councilman Slattery

Seconded by: Councilwoman Ignatowski

WHEREAS, the Town Board believes that in light of the recent confusion over what the future land use recommendations are for the Town that it is in the best interests of the Town to have GIS color mapping prepared for placement in the adopted Town of Chili Comprehensive Plan - 2010 and also to be placed on the Town's Website; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board further believes that such mapping should be coordinated by a knowledgeable planning professional familiar with the mapping contained in the adopted Town of Chili Comprehensive Plan - 2010; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board desires to know the costs (which is estimated to be \$6,500.00) associated with providing a total of 12 GIS Color Maps, for the adopted Town of Chili Comprehensive Plan - 2010.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Town Board does hereby direct the Town Supervisor to enter into a contractual agreement with the RLB Planning Group, in an amount not to exceed \$1,500.00 to coordinate the solicitation of services for the preparation of a total of 12 GIS color maps to be reviewed by and accepted by the Town Board and Town Engineer.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the above-referenced agreement specify that upon a Town Board decision, to be made at a future date, that per recommendation from the RLB Planning Group, for the preparation of 12 GIS color maps (from the adopted Plan).

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that the RLB Planning Group is directed to commence work on

this assignment within 30 days of this authorization to proceed.

Motion to table:

Offered by: Councilman Slattery Seconded by: Councilwoman Ignatowski

On the motion to table: Tabled by a vote of 4 yes to 1 no (Mary Sperr).

#### **PUBLIC HEARING**

A Public Hearing was held by the Chili Town Board on February 7, 2007 at the Chili Town Hall, 3333 Chili Avenue, Rochester, New York 14624 at 7:05 p.m. to discuss the rezoning of 3127 Chili Avenue and 778 Paul Road from R-1 to GB.

Attendance as previously noted in the 2/7/07 Chili Town Board meeting minutes.

Betsy Brugg was present to represent the rezoning along with Larry Roscini.

MS. BRUGG: Thank you very much, Madam Supervisor, members of the Town Board. For the record, my name is Betsy Brugg. I'm an attorney with the firm of Fix, Spindelman, Brovitz & Goldman. I'm here tonight in connection with this request for rezoning of 3127 Chili Avenue and 778 Paul Road from R-1-12 — or, excuse me, from R-1 to GB. This is our first appearance before this Board, and we are requesting a rezoning of two parcels in connection with an overall proposal to develop a total of six parcels at the corner of Chili and Paul for development, and a Walgreens store.

The site itself -- the site itself that we are talking about sits at the corner of Paul and Chili. It is -- consists of six parcels. The two parcels furthest in are the two parcels that require rezoning from R-1-12 to GB. The remaining four parcels are already properly zoned for the development. Pikuet Drive would be abandoned in connection with this proposal and it would become part of the overall project.

We did appear at the Planning Board in compliance with the Town Code provisions for a request for rezoning. We did take the — this is just a conceptual drawing. This is our first stab at what this would look like. We're looking at developing a total of 11 percent lot coverage where the code would allow 30 percent. Access would be provided to the site from Paul Road and from Chili. We have already received an initial letter from the State agreeing with the location of those curb cuts

The Walgreens store itself that is being proposed and contemplated for the site is 14,820. Total of 14,820 square feet in size. It does include a pharmacy drive-through. It is very similar to some of the other Walgreens stores that you may have seen popping up around Monroe County.

Um, as far as the visit to the Planning Board, we were there on December 13th. We did—we did appear for a public hearing and a resolution was passed recommending that the Town Board grant the requested rezoning for this project and also finding that the proposed rezoning is, indeed, consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. I did submit a letter with my application and request to this Board and to the Planning Board outlining the manner in which we comply and are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, and I would like to just touch on that briefly since that is obviously related to the rezoning.

Specifically, the Town's Comprehensive Plan recommends quote, "Rezoning to commercial of the parcel to be Chili Avenue — Chili Avenue, Paul Road and Grinnell Drive." The project will be a positive addition to the Town's core. The core part is already properly zoned for this type of use.

The Comprehensive Plan further states that quote, "The significant expansion of commercial development within the core area is likely to improve the overall competitiveness of the area and would generate substantial reinvestment in and improvement to the existing commercial development."

It goes on to say, excuse me, "The commercial core would not be like a regional shopping mall. It would instead be a fairly large community scale commercial complex. Residents would still shop at regional malls for many major items or specialty goods but more of their every day needs would be satisfied in Chili."

In particular, the Walgreens type of use is exactly what the Comprehensive Plan

contemplates.

The Comprehensive Plan goes on to say that "general types of goods and services that would be available would be similar to those that are currently available in (groceries, household goods, clothing, restaurants, banks) however, a greater variety would be available and through competition, more high quality goods and services would probably be offered."

In this case, the Comprehensive Plan specifically refers to the location and the property that we're talking about. The type of development that is proposed is exactly what we're talking about. This is a — a Walgreens is the place where you stop for your local — for your quick bottle of milk, loaf of bread. They sell grocery items. They sell basic household items. They sell overthe-counter and pharmaceutical drugs. It is exactly the kind of place that somebody stops on the way home from work. Something that you run out for a few minutes in an evening when you need a couple things around the house. So this is exactly what the Comprehensive Plan contemplates.

As far as the approval process that would be involved, should this Board decide to grant the requested rezoning, we would need to visit the Planning Board. We need site plan approval, approval of the subdivision to combine the lots. We need abandonment of Pikuet Drive. We have requested that the properties be included in the drainage district. I believe only one of the six parcels is currently already in the drainage district and that would be this one right here (indicating). 778 Paul Road is already currently used for commercial uses. There is some offices in that building presently.

Um, let's see. As far as any variance, there is a possibility we night need variances for signage. There is a possibility we might need variance to allow parking in the front yard, depending on the plan and the review of the code that is involved in taking a look at the plan. But otherwise we have sufficient parking. We have extensive green space, and we comply to code in all other respects at this point in the — in the process.

Um, as for our visit to — as to our visit to the Planning Board, there were some comments that came up, and we have taken into account, and we have represented to the Planning Board during the process that we would certainly address, you know, their comments and concerns. For example, they had asked that we keep the "Welcome to Chili" sign that is currently right near the property, and we're committed to keeping it there, and if it needs to be replaced with a newer nicer sign or moved a little bit, we would certainly do that.

Buffering was an issue and we certainly will provide buffering as appropriate. Architecture was also a very big item for the Planning Board and we are prepared to offer, I think, something that will satisfy the Planning Board with respect to architecture. Certainly all of those site plan factors will be considered at the appropriate time in the site plan review process. I guess I can stop and ask if you have any questions.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: The driveway cut, was there ever consideration given to lining that up with the Wegmans entrance coming out at the bottom there, instead of a separate one?

MS. BRUGG: I will defer to Larry (Roscini). Larry Roscini, our engineer is here tonight. He can speak to that.

MR. ROSCINI: We did do a plan to move the driveway as easterly as possible, but the location of this property line prohibits us from lining up directly with the Wegmans driveway, and offsetting it just slightly creates a poor traffic situation in our opinion.

Another issue that came up was a driveway on this side (indicating) – at the Planning Board, was the possibility of people short-cutting the intersection by zipping straight through. So we -- we feel this is the best situation and come up with the point that Betsy (Brugg) mentioned, it has been submitted to the State D.O.T. and we have a positive response from them.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Is that being limited to a right-hand turn only as exit?

MR. ROSCINI: Not at this point. It wasn't submitted to State D.O.T. as in – restricted in any way. It is one of the discussions we'll be discussing with the Planning Board as we proceed further on. We do intend to have a traffic consultant become involved with the project.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: The only reason I would have that considered, and I think the rest of the Board members should consider this, is coming out of there, turning right -- if you're turning left across traffic in the middle of a curve on a hill.

MR. ROSCINI: We discussed that when we met several months ago, yes.

Like I say, other than our initial preparation and submittal to the State DOT for their comments, we haven't gone too much further for it.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Has the State responded that this is okay?

MR. ROSCINI: Yes. Yes.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Have you talked to Monroe County DOT in regards to this?

MR. ROSCINI: No.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Are you aware Monroe County DOT two years ago was supposed to do a land transfer?

MR. ROSCINI: Yes.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Do you plan to talk to the Monroe County DOT?

MR. ROSCINI: We have no objection talking to them. We were informed in a previous meeting that that land transfer was probably not going to happen any time in our lifetime, so we haven't pursued it. I have no objection to doing it.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: You heard that from?

MR. ROSCINI: I can't tell you specifically. It was a comment made at a meeting.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: You can't tell me the name? Was it a State representative?

MR. ROSCINI: No. Someone locally.

MS. BRUGG: A lot of people talk about that topic.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: They have been considering — last two years it has a been a topic of discussion. Joe (Carr), has there been anything said recently you have gotten through transportation discussions with the County and the State?

JOSEPH CARR: The latest information I have gotten, it is once again being considered at the State level. There is no time frame that was established, but that it -- there is an effort to bring that back to the -- to the -- to the floor for a vote.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Yes. I wouldn't say it is a dead issue.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I wouldn't say it either.

MS. BRUGG: We can commit we'll do whatever is necessary, obviously, to have the curb cuts, you know, properly reviewed and to comply with any requirements of the State or County as -- as they are -- as they apply.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I would think that whether it does or doesn't, this way if you get that legwork out of the way now, then you wouldn't have to in the 11th hour try to play catch-up. That is your business. I don't want to tell you how to do it.

MR. ROSCINI: Good point.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I would like to weigh in. As liaison to Traffic & Safety, that committee did look at your plans for the Walgreens, and if I could read what their minutes state so I have it exact. The committee reviewed plans for the new Walgreens at the intersection of Chili Avenue and Paul Road. Committee agreed that the proposed entrance/exit on Paul Road closest to the intersection of Paul Road and Chili Avenue should be closed. Have the entrance/exit across from the Wegmans entrance/exit and install a signal light. I have listened to what you just said about how it might be more difficult to do that, but, um, I would recommend -- don't they have to talk to Monroe County about a signal light? Because there are traffic counts involved as to whether or not they would even be able to put one in.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: That is a State road as of right now.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: It's a State Road still. But a signal light was also a suggestion by Traffic & Safety.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Right.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I have also concerns with the traffic that that will create at that particular entrance and exit on Paul Road. Based on also the current conditions of that intersection, and what the future is for that Mobil gas station across the street with the drive-thru Dunkin' Donuts and how that will change the traffic pattern there, and this will add to it is my thought on that. So I really believe that that entrance and exit should be reconsidered or further studied.

MR. ROSCINI: I don't mean to present that anything that is on that plan is set in stone. This is a plan we have developed to date for conceptual discussion. This is a plan that was sent to the State D.O.T., upon which the State responded.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I understand.

MR. ROSCINI: As I think I mentioned, subsequent to action by this Board, I believe my client will be prepared to spend some more money and then we'll be bringing a traffic consultant on board who will work with these details and these various agencies. But I will point out, that we need to bring the County on board, too.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: And we're not here to play Planning Board. We just-there

are questions.

MR. ROSCINI: No. We welcome your comments. The comments are very similar to what we have been hearing.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Ideally if you could have a conversation with Wegmans, there might be a way to line that up for a traffic light, which would solve a lot of problems for everybody there.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I'm not sure if the State has a tickler file that if there is future development down the road on Wegmans parcel or not, that Wegmans is obligated to put a signal light in at that location. That could be possibly something for you to look into.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: That is the only reason I asked about speaking to Monroe County DOT because of the local nature of that area.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: One comment if I could. You mentioned parking in the front yard. What did you mean by parking in the front yard?

MS. BRUGG: I believe there is a code provision, I believe, that --

RICHARD STOWE: There is a code provision on front parking, in general.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: Triangular property creates many fronts.

MS. BRUGG: That's exactly it. Our intent is -- you know, this is again a conceptual plan and we'll do whatever we need to do to go through the appropriate processes and work with the appropriate boards and officials as necessary.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I guess what's the front yard?

MS. BRUGG: Well, that is -

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: Yes, Michael (Slattery), yes. (Laughter.)

MS. BRUGG: I can tell you where the backyard is.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Gees. And I thought I was the only one that got that.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Continuing with the road cuts, across the street is the Mobil, where they will have the Dunkin' Donuts. Where is their driveway in relationship to where your driveway is going to be coming out?

MS. BRUGG: The driveway at - (indicating).

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Actually, I have the plans that you submitted to the Board members and I was just verifying that there is -- accurate, the same as what you have up there.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I was wondering about the clash of that, trying to get in and out of those, as well.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: How many feet is that?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: You can barely see them on there.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: The distance from where -- from the corner to that --

MS. BRUGG: What does it look like?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: You have "curb cuts" written on here.

MS. BRUGG: Looks like about 200.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: They're closer to the more residential.

MS. BRUGG: Looks like about 240 feet to the intersection.

MR. ROSCINI: I'm sorry.

MS. BRUGG: 240 feet.

MR. ROSCINI: How far did you say? I think it is more than that.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: At least.

MS. BRUGG: I'm looking at numbers on here.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: I don't think they're aligned with Mobil.

MS. SUPERVISOR: No. Mobil is way up.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: It is.

MS. BRUGG: Mobil is here (indicating).

MR. ROSCINI: 450.

MS. BRUGG: 450. Okay. There you go. Don't put me on Price is Right. (Laughter.)

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Is that your 30 scale?

MR. ROSCINI: Yes. I - also my 20 (indicating).

(Laughter.)

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Have you met with the neighbors at all in regards to this, the --

MS. BRUGG: We have not. We really did not have a lot of neighbor interest going up to

the Planning Board, surprisingly.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I know we're going through right now our code changes, and one of the recommendations I brought up from the Master Plan Update Committee was increased buffering between residential and the -- you know, the non-residential uses as the commercial. What was our compromise? 70 feet, 60 feet.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: 60. There is definitely 60 on the top part.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I don't know. But on the bottom part.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: 36. You have 36. Right down by the drive-thru. When you go to the Robert Hallman (phonetic), I believe it is.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Actually put your finger back up. There you go. 36.

MS. BRUGG: It is not on this drawing.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Or is that 36 inches? Those are the size of the tree. 71.3, it looks from the property line.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Feet.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Yes. 71.3. I'm sorry. It was a 36-inch tree. So using his scale (indicating). (Laughter.)

MS. BRUGG: Well, I think clearly, you know, our intent is to do as much buffering as we can along here (indicating), given the conditions that are there. I think there is a slope over here (indicating), as well, and, you know, we may need to add some other type of buffering.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Any other questions?

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: No. Most we're talking about is a Planning Board issue. They have clarified the alignment with the Master Plan very well.

#### COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

#### GEORGE-BARTNETT

MR. BARTNETT: I would like to hear the reasoning that was presented for moving the entrance further up towards Chili Avenue. I could not hear that. This gentleman over here gave a reason why it should be done.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: No. I don't believe up towards Chili Avenue. I believe it was to the east.

MR. BARTNETT: Oh, further.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Away from Chili Avenue.

MR. BARTNETT: Oh.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: More in line with the Wegmans access.

MR. BARTNETT: Was there an objection by the presenter to not allowing a left-hand turn?

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: No. There was no objection. They said the State did not object, is what she answered.

MR. BARTNETT: And is everybody on the Board aware that perhaps the next three or four years that won't be a State highway, but a County highway?

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Right. We had that discussion. Thank you.

#### **DIETRICH JEFFRIES**

MS. JEFFRIES: I live at 3134 Chili Avenue. This proposed Walgreens would be starring my home directly in the face. Either the back entrance of it. The home — is this application for considering 3127 Chili Avenue? That —

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Yes.

MS. JEFFRIES: I have some pictures to show that if — taking the pictures, that home, I can see 3127 from my kitchen window. That is how close I am a neighbor, and on the 9th of January, my home, the application for 3134 Chili Avenue for rezoning was unanimously declined by the Planning Board.

And I moved into that home 23 years ago, and I had neighbors. Now I have the Mobil station. It is currently going to be a Dunkin' Donuts, a carwash. To my left. And now a Walgreens directly across the street. And technically I feel that I have been rezoned already and just not legally. If you're going to put up a Walgreens right in my face.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: I think -- what was your number?

MS. JEFFRIES: 3134 Chili Avenue. I have some pictures I can show that I took at the

base of my driveway, and 3127.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: You can leave the pictures with us this evening. I'm just trying to figure out where you are.

MS. JEFFRIES: I'm right next door to the Mobil. Right next door to the Mobil. The vacuum wakes me up. It is right at my bedroom window. And now we'll – I will have a Walgreens across the street.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: You can leave them on Sandy (Hewlett)'s desk there.

MS. JEFFRIES: I'm appealing for reconsideration of my home.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Thank you.

# DANNY KUNTZ (phonetic), 11 Trails End

MR. KUNTZ: Who is the developer? I live in Chili. I'm sorry. I apologize. Daniel Kuntz. 11 Trails End.

I'm interested in who the developer is.

MS. BRUGG: McFarland Development.

MR. KUNTZ: Thank you.

#### DOROTHY BORGUS, 31 Stuart Road

MS. BORGUS: I maybe missed it, but I believe Mr. Slattery asked where the front of this building was. Was that answered?

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: No.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: We figured out where the back was.

MS. BORGUS: Where is the back?

(Laughter.)

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: The question is where is the front yard. We don't know where the front of the building is.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: I think what was determined, and correct me if I am wrong, Betsy (Brugg), these are all decisions when it goes before the Planning Board will have to be, you know, decided by the Planning Board.

MS. BORGUS: Right. Um, is everything that's in green there to be Walgreens' boundaries?

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Buffers. That is all green -- that is green grass, plantings, trees.

MS. BORGUS: So it will have the jog on the side?

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Uh-huh.

MS. BORGUS: Okay.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: But I think your first question, Mrs. Borgus, was based on the way the drawing is conceived today, which may not be ultimately what is built, where is the front of the building.

MS. BORGUS: Where is the front?

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: As conceived today. I think that is the question that is being asked. Can you answer that question?

MS. BORGUS: In some ways that is a Planning Board question, I realize that. But, however, I think that would have an impact on what this Board does tonight as far as rezoning, because I think the last thing we need in this Town is a store that is – that obviously – that has four fronts. Three fronts anyway. I mean if that — it is a difficult piece to develop. I can see that. But this just seems a little awkward for that piece of land and it might be a consideration that this Board has about rezoning it, is the complexity of trying to develop it and what we end up with on that corner. That's a major, major part of our — our center of our Town.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I guess I would concur. It would have been nice to have some sort of rendering of what the building was going to look like from the different directions, because it is an important entranceway into our Town, and have — as to what —

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: I don't disagree that renderings are -- I'm not speaking for the developer. That's not my job. But I don't disagree that would it be helpful to see it, but I have also been in plenty of meetings where the developer has gone the extra mile and tries to give a sense of a rendering and it ends up an hour or two-hour discussion about the renderings when, in fact, it is about the rezoning. So it is a double-edged sword. It is a double-edged sword.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I think a concern, as well, is the elevations. Are they going to be cut and fill, or, you know — I think that is, you know, a question. We don't want to play

Planning Board, but at the same time --

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: We want to understand. Yes.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: And you had a comment.

MS. BRUGG: Right. I will respond to some of the comments.

I guess the first comment I need to make is that I just want to remind everyone that the corner is already properly rezoned and there could be a commercial use at any time. We're really only talking about two out of the six parcels involved. The other parcels are already properly rezoned. Somebody else could come in and never come to this Board and open a smaller pharmacy perhaps or something different.

MR. DUNNING: Could we have this turned around so we could see?

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: As long as we can still see it, yes.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I have mine, so I mean -- I don't --

MS. BRUGG: I can put it --

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Just prop the other one up there so they can see what you're talking about.

MS. BRUGG: Feel free to come over and take a look at this one (indicating).

Again, this is sort of a preliminary step. Obviously the project can't go forward without a rezoning. There is only a certain amount of work that has gone into the site work design. As far as the interpretation what is the front and the side, that is all steps that will occur through the Building Department, through the review process, through the development process.

Um, as for elevations, no, we have not designed elevations. This developer really would like to, you know, satisfy the Planning Board. We're going to have to go through their review process, and I have to be clear on the record that this is not necessarily the building we're offering, but I will tell you, um, I have Chris Danaher here for McFarland Development.

As soon as the Planning Board said we don't want your cookie cutter building, I was sent a couple e-mails. Well, these are some other things we can do. We'll work with the Town, and we have some very nice, I think, brick designs, something more similar to some of the newer stuff in Town, and some of the nicer development.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Thank you.

MS. BRUGG: Hopefully that will address your concerns, but obviously all of these things will have to be hashed through at the site plan level with the Planning Board, and again, they will get into every detail of the site plan.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Did you finish your question?

MS. BORGUS: No. I had another one. Can this project go forward without this rezoning? SUPERVISOR LOGEL: No.

MS. BORGUS: So it is crucial what this Board does tonight.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Yes.

MS. BORGUS: Just caution the Board, we may end up with a store there that is going to have — want signs on three sides. It could be a very unsightly thing no matter what kind of an architectural spin they put on it, and I'm all for good architecture especially in Chili Center, especially in North Chili, in the centers of this Town. We have a couple. We need to be very careful about architecture. But just be aware, if this is approved, they will probably be back before the Planning Board, and in a way this is your concern, and that they are going to want signs and signs and signs. So bear that in mind before you vote. Thank you.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: One question. The — I was trying to look on my plans that I have in regards to where the property lines would be for the store. Is — is the one line that is — actually, I can get up. Is this the property line (indicating) for the — for the lots over here (indicating)?

MS. BRUGG: Yes.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: So --

MS. BRUGG: The existing zoning line, I believe.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: That is going through a third of the store. Just to touch on what Mrs. Borgus was commenting on, for the rezoning. Because that would be for the -- for those two lots.

MS. BRUGG: Yes.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Thank you.

MR. DANAHER: Chris Danaher with McFarland Development. We were obviously before the Planning Board and lot of the concerns raised were initial concerns raised by the Planning Board, by the audience, and we recognize and appreciate that, but we also, from our

perspective, there is a — there are steps in this process and the initial step is — before we really invest in the project is the zoning. And to jump to the site plan and go to the drawings, I think the Board can appreciate there is a significant amount of cost and time involved in that, and if we can't be able to rezone the property, there is no reason to go any further.

As to the concerns raised, I think as Betsy (Brugg) pointed out, we're already looking into different kinds of architecture. The Planning Board recognized that. We recognized that concern. We're already trying to address that before we go to the first Planning Board meeting for site plan. We recognize that. We're committed to that. That is a process that is down the road if the Board were to see that these two properties were rezoned.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Thank you.

## BEVERLY NEDER, 82 Attridge Road

MS. NEDER: I was just wondering if in the future Walgreens has any ideas for selling off any of the land. I know some of their restaurants like the one in Gates, they have pad sites available for restaurants and things. If that is in any of their plans.

MR. DANAHER: I was going to say. I — we have developed — we're developing the site currently in Henrietta. There is a significant amount of extra acreage there, so it could be developed as a pad site. That may be sold as a pad site. But here, the configuration of this site, and the access and — and ultimately as approved — the final site plan, but — it wouldn't warrant any type of co-development or separate parcel. I fail to see how that could even be conceived on this parcel.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Thank you.

#### BEV HARRINGTON, 5 James Drive

MS. HARRINGTON: I know it is consistent with the Master Plan to rezone that area, but any store like that, the traffic is going to be a problem. I can't see any -- anyway that is going to make it any better.

MR. DANAHER: Just a quick thing. I think from our perspective, from a commercial development, a drugstore, from a traffic impact is — is one of the better commercial developments for a less traffic impact. You never see a huge amount of volume. It is a consistent, low intensity volume we find for a drugstore use. Like — those — without those two parcels you could have any type of commercial development. And it might be a significantly higher traffic intensity than a drugstore use, we feel.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: An example of that would be, that could fit on the smaller parcel?

MR. DANAHER: I don't know your zoning, but you could possibly put a convenience store, or gas station. No.

MS. BRUGG: You could have almost any kind of retail. You could have a restaurant. MR. DANAHER: And again, that's -- we're going to do our traffic studies, what we need to do from a site plan perspective to satisfy the Planning Board and your Board, and that will be evaluated, but just to counter to that point.

MS. BRUGG: You could have a restaurant, a video arcade center. Um, some — any kind of generic retail use. Certainly if you had a Starbucks there, you would have, you know, traffic issues certain times of day probably. There are a lot of — more intense uses that could go on this site. And ultimately, truthfully, the charge here is that — you know, the question that the Board is charged with answering is whether or not this is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and we believe it strongly complies.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Any further questions on this?

#### ALICE GUSHEROWSKI, 8 Bellmawr Drive

MS. GUSHEROWSKI: I don't consider myself a big shopper any more. I have been in Walgreens and they're not real just drugstores. Many of the things offered in Walgreens are already offered right almost in the same location.

But my biggest concern is traffic. Anybody that goes in and out of Wegmans regularly knows that people coming down that incline, if they're going straight — so many people coming in and out of Wegmans think only people are going in Wegmans. There have been so many near-misses there already that I think the traffic is a real, real big consideration.

I just have another question that doesn't even need to be answered, but when did all of the other homes that were there become commercial and what — what was the planning behind that?

I mean I don't need a true answer, but I wondered what provoked them to be zoned commercial beforehand. Thank you.

#### RON PIKUET, 1030 Paul Road

MR. PIKUET: Um, with this kind of development, I really wouldn't foresee something like this. I would think with commercial zoning, that the idea was that little businesses could buy places and homes, like along Chili Avenue and maybe have a dentist office or something like that. Um, we have been already involved with Walgreens in North Chili where that would rip out a major section of at least eight buildings in the center of North Chili. And maybe a lot of them are not very valuable, as far as most of you are concerned, but it did provide an identity to that particular area. And all of a sudden, everything is gone and we have a brand new store with a 20-year life in there. And we have this in Chili Center.

Pikuet Drive was actually named after my uncle who was one of Chili's Road Supervisors. But aside from that, you're looking at an area of homes that – his home was built in 1930, and as – as – as it is, would be representative of a certain period of building, and they are preserving now and registering and preservation in other areas ranch homes that are in the 1950s. So this 1930 cottage style house is actually representative of a period, so we can't say that there is nothing there of any particular value.

When you take an area that is all treed and housed and it's well kept up and so forth, however, they're not one of these — they're not these castle houses that we're building in other areas of the Town, but it is representative of the center of Town and its — is this what we want? Do we want to tear everything out in a mass section and then put something new in and the trees go, the buildings go? And if you blink, all of a sudden it is just totally different than anything you ever remembered?

Well, maybe I'm getting too old to want to see everything new, but I like to see something that looks a little bit familiar.

I think that had the Town Board been careful enough to have put what we call EPODs on some of this areas at the time that they were designating areas for planned overlay, had they put EPODs on which -- which are Environmental Protection Overlay Developments, they could have overseen this kind of development that - sure it is zoned commercial, but it might have sold singly and each of these little parcels might have had an identity in the Town as a little bit for somebody. Now all of a sudden without EPODs put on this or North Chili or Chili Center, now somebody can come in and put a big conglomerate together and rip everything out. Well, hang onto your hats. It could happen to your area, as well.

I have lived here all my life. I really — I'm not great on change. I have seen a lot of it in my day. I kind of wonder how you will build on this parcel. I know that on my uncle's property from Chili Avenue to Paul Road there was a 20 foot fall in that property, the level of that property. I would not have wanted to live there because it is either uphill or downhill. I don't know how you will put anything on the level there unless you sculp it all out along Chili Avenue and they'll — we'll have another mess like we have at Union and Chili where they dug that bank way down, I imagine, about 20 feet down. And I called the State about putting a guard rail there. If somebody rolls over or skids off, that they will roll right over and probably right into the building. So this is another parcel that is like that. I don't know how you will put the parking in unless you sculp that property all out. I can't imagine it myself. To me, the property is not suitable for that. It's on a tilt, a 20 — a 20 foot fall from Chili Avenue to Paul Road.

This is what happens when you get somebody that wants to come in and oh, let's build. Never mind about the fall of the property or what's on it or anything. Let's just get it and you go along with it. I'm surprised we had – need other Walgreens store in Chili. I didn't know we were so desperate. Maybe once we get one on every four corners — maybe we're going through a phase like we did with the Mobil station where they wanted one on every corner. I think some of the corporations need to start paying their income taxes and not building to save money. We're paying the freight.

# JASON BECKER, 21 Creekview

MR. BECKER: Just kind of looking at the picture and listening to what you're saying because I have not seen the proposal much before. I was wondering what is Walgreens. I have been in a few of Walgreens down south, and it looks like they have a few food items. They have a few like I would say — a pharmacy-related goods, things like that, and maybe some soda and chips, stuff like that. And you brought up a good point that we would have a lot worse, a

100

convenience store. I seems like some of that was exactly what Walgreens' product line actually is. So I am kind of wondering, is it really going to be a pharmacy. If it is a pharmacy, I'm not so sure that they really need one against Wegmans, we need one with CVS a mile down the street. I'm kind of wondering if we're being surrounded by pharmacies, which I'm really sure that Walgreens isn't primarily pharmacy in that location. I agree that is a prime location for Walgreens, maybe, maybe not.

But I'm kind of also wondering what the other gentleman brought up about the grade. If you were to convenience shop inside of a Walgreens and get all your shopping done and walk outside and let go of your cart, I'm sure it's gonna wind up in Wegmans just looking at the – or my car if I park there or someone else's. I was kind of wondering, is there a plan for that? The grade – I mean, Wegmans is flat. You can still get a grocery cart in your car. What if you're on this side (indicating), kids are just having fun, I don't know. So I was kind of wondering about that.

And it looks like you are putting a convenience store in there. I understand Walgreens is known for pharmacy, but yet we seem to have ten or so in already close proximity.

#### SHIRLEY McGAVIN, 11 Grinnell Drive

MS. McGAVIN: I would like to know what you're going to do for like a buffer. Our backyard goes right down the property you're talking about. Audrey is here — Gaskin is here, too, and there are two other people to speak. What is behind us? We're worried about water coming down. We never get to see plans, because they're always up somewhere else and we can't see them.

Betsy Brugg showed her the plans.

MS. McGAVIN: What would buffer that from our place?

MR. DANAHER: A quick point. If we get the rezoning, if this Board were to grant it, there is going to be landscaping plans, there is going to be drainage plans, there is going to be more plans than anybody wants to see, but at this point, we're just — this is very conceptual, very basic. I would rather just focus on the two lots that we're trying to rezone. At the Planning Board, a lot of these concerns were raised. We understand them and they will be addressed appropriately at the site plan review process.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Thank you. I understand your concern about being off the subject, but under public hearings, everybody is allowed to —

MR. DANAHER: Sure. I just want to --

MS. SUPERVISOR: -- bring up what they want to bring up.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Supervisor, at Planning Board were there notifications that were sent out to the residents in the area?

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: As far as I know. I would have to ask the --

MS. BRUGG: There was a public hearing.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: There was a public hearing.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Okay.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: I know there was a public hearing.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: A lot of side bars going on.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Can I have some quiet in the audience, please?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: My question was was there notification sent out to the neighbors, and if so, was it the neighbors on the surrounding street? So many feet away.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: The residents of Grinnell, you received notices about the Planning Board meeting.

MS. McGAVIN: 500 feet, yes.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I just wanted to make sure they went out.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Notices don't go out for this public hearing for a Town Board, though.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: No. They went out for the Planning Board.

RICHARD BRONGO: Yes, they did go out for the Town Board.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: We have had residents ask us about that, which is why I raise that question.

And just another comment I would like to make. There has been a lot of discussion recently in the Town amongst a lot of the residents about having a Main Street feel, so when

we're asked to rezone and we have a public hearing like this, it's natural that those questions are going to come up in this setting along with the Planning Board, and I just -- just to let you know that the residents here really want to see that type of feel. And it stresses that. Even though we're not the Planning Board, it is pretty natural you will see a discussion like that occur at a public hearing.

MR. DANAHER: We appreciate that and understand that. Everyone's concerns, I want them to understand they will be addressed. It is just that they're – we're not there yet. We're very conceptual at this point. I just want them to understand, the public, that there is a process here that from our development perspective, we're just doing our steps, and I don't want – I don't want to say something incorrect when there is engineers and there is – there is people we engage that really get into the detail of those concepts. And I don't want to misrepresent to these people here tonight.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Exactly. But I would just like to raise that point, and -- I'm losing my train of thought here. Give me a minute. Um, there was another point I wanted to make. I will come back to it.

MR. DANAHER: Okay.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Well, I was going to close this part of the public hearing. COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: It's okay.

The Public Hearing was closed at 7:48.

The Public Hearing was closed at 7:48 p.m.

#### PUBLIC HEARING

A Public Hearing was held by the Chili Town Board on February 7, 2007 at the Chili Town Hall, 3333 Chili Avenue, Rochester, New York 14624 at 7:49 p.m. to discuss the Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

Attendance as previously noted in the 2/7/07 Chili Town Board meeting minutes.

Michael Curley and John Caruso were present to represent the Parks and Recreation Master Plan Public Hearing.

MICHAEL CURLEY: Supervisor Logel, Town Board members, good evening. For the record, my name is Mike Curley. I'm the Parks and Recreation Director here in the Town. This past May the Town started the process of updating its Parks and Recreation Master Plan. It's important for a town to have a Parks and Recreation Master Plan so the guideline exists for future projects, improvements and growth in the area of parks and recreation.

Additionally, many of the grant programs that are out there for funding for parks and recreation require that a town has a current and adopted Parks and Recreation Master Plan in order to receive funding.

The first thing that was done for this process was the creation of a Parks and Recreation Master Plan Update Committee by this Town Board. It was comprised of myself and eight Town residents who come from varying demographics, interests and backgrounds.

Over the past eight months, these members have volunteered an enormous amount of time. We had two to three meetings each month with each of these meetings lasting about two hours, so you can tell that is quite a substantial amount of time. Not only did they donate their time, volunteer their time for these meetings, but they did a lot of research and gathering of data outside of those meetings.

At this time, I would like to introduce the members of the Committee and publicly thank them for their dedication and hard work: James Powers, Pat Tindale, Gary Lawniczak, Jason Becker, Barbara Denigris, Keith Bozek, Dan Maffett. If you could all please stand real quick. (Applause.)

MICHAEL CURLEY: And we also had Linda Palmeri who is not present this evening. Also, I would like to thank Marcia Marks in the Recreation Department. She was given the responsibility of taking the minutes at all of our meetings and she did a very good job. It is a difficult task. If you came to a meeting, we had lot of rambling and a lot of talking over two

hours. She did a great job.

I also would like to thank Joe Carr, Commissioner of Public Works and Larry Crozier, our Parks Foreman, for additional assistance with this update.

From the beginning, the Committee felt that it was very important to have as much input and feedback from the committee's — excuse me, from the public as possible. Our regular meetings were posted, mentioned in the newspapers. We had two public meetings and the public input was documented and incorporated into the plan. We also had an e-mail account set up on the Town web page where the public could send in their thoughts via e-mail. There was a 14-day draft — 14-day review period for the draft document where the public could review that document and review the SEQR documents and then again provide us with feedback that — once we had that draft. Once that 14-day period had expired, we incorporated those thoughts into the final — final document. That leads us to tonight's public hearing, another opportunity for the public to speak.

Through a generous grant from Senator James Alessi, the Town was able to hire a professional consultant to assist us with this update. So at this time I would like to introduce John Caruso from Passero Associates who will discuss the role that he had in this whole process.

MR. CARUSO: Thank you, Michael (Curley).

Good evening, everybody. Just a — for public information purposes, we wanted to just describe what the Master Plan process was and what it is that we all, including the Committee, have done. Um, as Mike (Curley) had mentioned, the — the Committee had began their work in July, and when Passero was brought on in early August.

And with any good plan, it is always nice to have the foundation of another plan to work from, and in this case, we had the previous comprehens – not comprehensive, but the Parks and Recreation five-year plan. This plan was done without professionals, and it had an excellent foundation for us to work from. It was a nice document. It established a lot of – of the fundamentals and inventory. We give a lot of credit to those folks who had worked on this, and their efforts were not for naught. We used this to build, and even the methodology in this report, the evaluation and needs assessment, um, improvements, recommendations, is a very typical technical approach to reporting and we followed that methodology also in our report.

So having a good document to build from, um, we then attended a kick-off meeting with the Master Plan Committee which we called P & R Committee, and we got to know each other. We learned at that point what their goals and objectives were.

And then we set off to do our work. We researched some of the demographics. We were trying to find out what has Chili done in the last five years. Have they grown? And what ages of our children and school kids are growing?

Um, we interviewed some of the sports organizations. We wanted to find out what their enrollments were doing, increasing, declining, and what — what sort of growth did they project in the oncoming years. Um, at that point then we would go back and meet with the Committee, tell them of what we had just learned, and get comments and feedback from them. So we're integrating our work with them again. We went then back to work and started to assess some of the things that we found through the demographics, the needs assessment, and at that point we started making recommendations as to what sort of athletic fields and facilities do we need. We looked at improvements to our existing parks, and we — we documented them in what we call our draft report.

So the update was then in a draft form. We brought that back to the Committee, and let the Committee review that comment, and then we moved to the final report. And the final report is — we're pleased to present to you tonight. We have, um — as Mike (Curley) also mentioned, we had public meetings in which we had the public allowed here — let them hear some of the recommendations we made for improvements to the individual parks and our programs, and we also gave them a 14-day comment period in which they could write in, read the document. We placed it at the library, the Town Hall, Parks and Recreation offices, and with some very good input. It was even posted on our web. So we had really good public input like I never seen before, and we're proud of that.

With the help of Mr. Stowe, and Mr. Brongo, we were even — even able to initiate the SEQR process so that this whole update could be reviewed under the State's environmental conservation — or quality review.

So with that, that is our work. As we're done now, the next step in the process, then is implementation, and that will be back to Mike (Curley) and his committee to take these recommendations and move them forward. So at this point, I would like to introduce individual

members of the Committee to advise you of some of the recommendations that came out of our study.

And who are we going to bring up first, Mike (Curley)?

MR. POWERS: I'd like to take this moment to reiterate what Mike Curley said. I would like to congratulate Councilman Schulmerich and Mike (Curley) on the selection that they did make of this particular committee. And I'm going to detour from the agenda here so to speak for just a minute.

During my short tenure as a public officer here in the Town of Chili, I had the opportunity to work with many, many different committees, and without question, this is one of the finest committees I have had the opportunity to work with in a long time. They brought tremendous diversity and knowledge and sincerity to the task of updating the Parks and Recreation Master Plan, and it would behoove the Board to remember this group, because I'm sure along the way, as different things surface, projects come out of this Master Plan, you have a tremendous wealth of knowledge sitting right here this evening, and I'm sure that they would be very happy to volunteer to assist in any way they could.

In doing our many deliberations on revamping the parks and recreation aspect of the Town's Master Plan, there surfaced the subject of a possible need for a Chili Community Center. Through meeting with various sports organizations in the Town of Chili there came a desire to have an indoor sports facility that also encompassed all age groups from youth through seniors, and also through open public forums held by the Committee and Passero Associates' comments received from the public in attendance, the desire to some day build a Chili Community Center was expressed, and therefore, incorporated within the updated parks and recreation aspect of the Master Plan.

It was decided that a feasibility study be initiated to see when, where and how this might become a reality in the Town of Chili in the future some day.

MICHAEL CURLEY: As I mentioned earlier, Linda Palmeri is not here tonight, but I will read her comment. Um, the Committee recommends optimizing financing of the master plan through routine inclusion of work items in the Town capital improvement budget; pursuit of grants, donations, partnerships and through implementation of appropriate fees and charges.

This is so this document and all hard work this Committee has done does not just sit on a shelf. We would like to see this be a working document, be a vision for the Parks and Recreation future, and we feel the only way to do that is obviously through the appropriate funding.

PAT TINDALE: First I have to thank Jim (Powers) for the flattering statements, and I have to say that I really did enjoy working with this group of people and everybody had their own thoughts and thought differently, but we did well.

But I have got the trails. I'm a trail person. And I'm recommending through public participation that we link our Town lands, County lands and State lands all by a — through our creek — through a — a trail through the creek system. Excuse me. I'm goofing up here. Taking these lands, along with our creeks, Mill Creek, Black Creek, Little Black Creek, with a meandering trail system that eventually will go through private land and public land, maybe easements needed somewhere along the way, down to the Genesee River, and at that point we now have Greenway trails that can lead us down to Pennsylvania heading south. Heading south we can get into the canal ways. There is 100 miles one direction on the canal way. And we go 100 miles the other direction. There is the Lehigh Valley off the Greenway. There is all sorts of possibilities. I think we need to appreciate what we have here in our Town too, which is very nice parks and three nice creeks and maybe we'll get to appreciate it more through this trail system. Thank you.

GARY LAWNICZAK: We recommend a uniform sign design be established for all Chili parks. One should know when you're approaching a Chili park. One should know when you see a Chili park by the uniform sign design. I think that once you're inside the park, signs should direct you to — directly and quickly to the field area you're seeking.

We also recommend that the parking be improved. The safety and the access to all of those parks should be improved and the parking would help that and make that possible.

MR. BECKER: We spent a lot of time and great effort into developing this whole plan. One of the things that we noticed that hadn't been really formulated last time was that set of checks and balances almost. Come up every year, see where the plan is, process all of the information and see where you need to go. So we thought that if we actually implement a plan where it was reviewed annually and then at the five year, a bigger review.

KEITH BOZEK: looking forward, we recommend acquiring land for additional

community parks and athletics fields.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: That's succinct.

BARBARA DENIGRIS: We all recognize that our parks and designated lands are valuable and they're also visible assets of our Town. Passive, as well as active, recreation would be very limited without them and we want to continue to attract even more of our residents to use them and appreciate them. To protect these assets, we recommend developing higher standards of maintenance and to preparing maintenance plans to bring existing parks as well as those to be developed and expended in the future to meet these standards.

On page 43 of this revised Master Plan we recommended establishing a Parks & Facilities Advisory Committee which would oversee establishing and upholding these standards and plans for park maintenance. It will, of course, require adequate personnel and resources to maintain our parks, so we further recommend that the Parks & Facilities Advisory Committee establish and oversee as part of an ongoing maintenance plan an adopt-a-park program using the creativity and energy of community volunteers, both individuals, families and organizations, adding beauty and interest to an especially designated corner of a park as well as tending to its year-round appearance would encourage community ownership and responsibility for our parks.

MR. MAFFETT: My name is Dan Maffett. I also like to thank Dennis (Schulmerich) and Mike (Curley) for this opportunity to be on the Committee. This document is only going to be as good as its implementation. With that in mind, we recommend that an Annual Parks Improvement Study be conducted in order to evaluate progress made towards the Master Plan recommendation. This study would also allow the ability to make additional suggestions over the course of the plan's timetable. We intended this document to be proactive, not reactive with regard to the Town of Chili's parks and recreation future. Thank you.

MR. CARUSO: Just as we close out, we would like to give the Board just a sample of what Dan (Maffett) was referring to as a study individual of one of our parks, and one that we conducted as part of our services, is we took a look at Davis Park. So with that, um, what you have before you is an overlay of Davis Park, with some plan improvements and those improvements I will point with my pointer. At the main entrance here, we cleared up some of the shrubs and brush there so the sight distance coming in and out of that place needs to be improved. That is one way of us doing that. This is an area where we could also put new signage. There is new signage out on the roadway.

Coming into the park we have all new, um, drive aisles and parking here (indicating). This parking is designed to be of adequate width and depth and that way cars are parked appropriately back and not in the roadway, so it is not a one-way road. We want to make Davis Park a two-way roadway. We can do that by putting the right geometrics in there for parking here. We want to put delineation in there and get those rocks that are along the roadway there and put a rail, an appropriate guide rail system of -- of wood or such a material that it fits appropriate with the park. And that way we would have people being able to drive on to our fields and -- and some of the problems associated with that.

Continuing down through, we have a pavilion and a lodge that could be constructed at some point in time, and there is an appropriate parking lot for that. And it has a drop-off so when people go in and out, carrying food and such, you know, the — the parking lot is designed so people don't have to walk from the parking lot or drive up on our grasses.

As we continue down through here (indicating), if you have ever seen the parking lot in here, it is just pavement that was laid down and it needs to be organized and more geometrically correct, and that way people aren't banging their doors into each other or backing up unsafely.

As we continued down through, if you have ever been through this parking lot, you're not quite sure how to park in it. We just think it needs to be squared off and just touched up. You know, these are improvements that we're doing to our park. Down — you can see here this road doesn't exist (indicating). So this is sort of a future consideration how we might connect the two, so there are two ways of access into our park, and while we're down here, we put a little turnaround cul-de-sac. It's not a very big one, maybe 30 feet. That is maybe where we could stage and drop off some of our sound equipment for our residents to sit — we have a little amphitheater taking advantage of some of the grade we have on the side of the hill. In and around the park you will find that there are picnic benches and more grills and places for families to go. You know we can accommodate 10 or 20 families in separate places on this park in the same summer evening, enjoying a cook-out on a real charcoal grill and not on our own gas grills like we all do in our suburbia life. It is nice to go to the park and enjoy this.

We have also included in this a connection of the walkway system, and then it goes up and

around, and ties in. There is an expansion here of the walkway system, and we have expanded it from the roadway all of the way through out to the other roadway. So from Paul Road to the other side, we have got it -- got a connection and expansion of our walkway system.

Um, we have some restrooms that we will put in, just Portalets in here (indicating) down by the pavilion. Right now, there is no place for anyone to go. And you have to have something like that. There is a couple tennis courts that — in case anything happens at the old Town Hall where those tennis courts won't be there any more, we'll have an expansion area for them to exist here. Parking lot expansions again and appropriately sizing the roadways in and out. Possibly lighting. Um, and all sorts of other things that don't make this — make this list.

And this was an improvement plan that was put together with the Committee's input and the consultant's input. Here is to show you how it looks on a plan as an example what we might do with another park.

So with that, we would like to say on behalf of the Committee and the Director, thank you very much for allowing us to work for you, and we're available to answer any questions the Board and public might have.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I will listen to some of the other comments first.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: I don't think I need to ask anything. I'm familiar.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: I just want to say thank you very much for all of the time and effort you put into this. I did have a couple -- I'm trying to find it. I wrote it in here. One of them had to do with -- you don't think that the Recreation Committee would be available -- Advisory Committee would be able to take on the capacity of the parks component and give that an additional responsibility to them? You want a separate committee then?

MICHAEL CURLEY: I can answer that one. The feeling of the Committee was that we have the Recreation Committee in place, and if we're going to go route of the Parks Committee, it would be something trying to bring in members who might have a background with maintenance or engineering, more than just a regular resident who has an interest in recreation, trying to find some members who actually have some experience and background and some knowledge that could help and assist with the development for any improvements that we'll make down the road. That doesn't mean that the Recreation Advisory could not take on this role. It was just the feeling of this Committee that it would be best served if it was two separate committees.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Do you envision them meeting on a monthly basis then? Like how our Recreation Committee — or would that be bi-monthly?

MICHAEL CURLEY: I think monthly. You know, obviously to keep this plan in motion, to keep things moving in the right direction, I think a monthly meeting would be the best way to take management of it. It doesn't mean you have to meet every month, but very similar to our Recreation Advisory Committee that meets monthly and that seems to be working very well. The same setup would be true.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Page 38 you have a recommendation to create a Recreation Advisory Board to monitor and develop priorities for improvements. Is that the same people on the Recreation Advisory? Because we already have one, don't we? So why do we need to create something that already exists? It is the bottom of the last paragraph.

MICHAEL CURLEY: That most likely is a typo. It should reads "Parks Advisory." COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: I think there is also an element to -- for the Town Board to consider as we move through this year going into next, and that is the element of what do we expect the Recreation Advisory Board to be, based on what it has been over the past years, and essentially they have been a -- a group that assists with activities in the Town. They provide some level of advice to what is going on in the Recreation Department, but more often than not, they're volunteering to support activities. If we want to enliven the Master Plan and create opportunities for this Master Plan to be monitored and driven forward in conjunction with the work of the Town Board, you have an opportunity to reshape and redefine what the -- what the Recreation Advisory Board is and that would take off-line discussion for it. I don't mean off-line behind closed doors. I mean not tonight. Off-line discussion around what the intention is for the Recreation Advisory Board might be and then the question is what type of people you have staffing that Board versus who is on it now. I don't believe the intention of the Committee is to proliferate creating other committees. I think we need to be as efficient as we can be in terms of the number of committees we have supporting Recreation, and it may mean rather than creating additional committees, we reshape the definitions of the ones we have.

Is that fairly stated, Mr. Curley?

MICHAEL CURLEY: Very accurate.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I have to concur with what Councilman Schulmerich just stated. I believe a Recreation Advisory Committee is set up so it is not limited to a certain number of people and can be expanded. So that would really be something to consider.

I think that you have done an excellent job on this, and the meeting that we had last fall—I'm trying to remember the date of that meeting where we—we met in the library room and we discussed the fact that we wanted to go for a grant, but that we really didn't want to do it piecemeal. We spent quite a bit of time as a Board listening to input and discussing this. And I can't—I can't think any other way that—that was the perfect way to handle this, and I appreciate all of the effort and time we have put into this, and hopefully once this is—has been signed off on and we move forward to approaching—searching for grants to try to fund some of the ideas that you propose in this, that we'll be successful, so I appreciate all of your efforts. Thank you very much.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: If I could make one final comment. As liaison to the Board, I perceive my role to be one of support to Mr. Curley. And I want to say that in — in the identification of the Committee, I think you have done an exceptional job. You came in with a broad range of interests. You came in with a — strong opinions, which I think is wonderful. You shared your opinions and you listened to each other, and the last part of that is very important. It is not unusual to find people that have strong opinions. What takes — what takes the effort is the time to listen to each other, and you did that, and you did that well and you should be proud of that work, and we thank you for that.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I would like to echo that. After reading this document, being involved with the first Master Plan that was created, going back, re-reading the old Master Plan, reading this one a number of times, you folks did a great job. Excellent job.

I have some questions and comments, so please do not think that is a big "but."

Um, actually if I could go through and — John (Caruso) and Michael (Curley), on page 3, um, one of the things that stuck out was the — it would be under population, second paragraph. Availability of large areas of undeveloped land. My — just thinking about that, and looking at, um, our parks and what we have now, I — I guess I want to reference the gentleman that bought a very large piece of land of — I forgot how many acres it was and then put a house in the middle of it. And I think that is in South Chili. And I'm concerned with the amount of land that is available when you talk about purchasing additional land and what is actually available. There isn't a lot out there. And so that — so that is a concern that I have.

Under the geographic distribution, the 2001 Parks and Rec Master Plan contributed to that a lack of utilities south of Black Creek. Do you still feel that that is an issue with your plan?

MR. CARUSO: I guess I will answer the question. The development area will continue to grow in the area where infrastructure is in general, and yes, I do think it is still an impairment to development in Chili. We will continue to grow in the southern areas, but they will be the bigger parcels, maybe the gentleman who buys 30 acres and puts his house in the middle of it.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I think it was like 100. I think that is a problem that we ran into with the Baker Park, if I will go through your wording, how you changed it throughout the document. That is a problem we have there for the septic and so forth, having utilities and infrastructure there.

MR. CARUSO: It is us, Mendon, Penfield, Pittsford. Their rural areas, south of there, slow growth, small growth, big stuff.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: If I could take off on that Baker Park, if it is going to be designated such as a park, maybe we want to consider a Chili Lions Park? Or the people we bought it from. I don't know if we want to name it that, if we want to think about a different name. The Pfrengle property, they donated land so it makes sense in terms of the parkland. This was a purchase. Perhaps it might even be — just a thought, a name idea.

MR. CARUSO: We have a button on our computer that changes it from "park" to "property" depending on which day it is. (Laughter.)

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Just a thought for the future, we might want to consider a different name other than who we bought it from.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Especially if we are to take Barbara (Denigris)'s adopt-a-park idea, it would be nice to have a -- something that maybe fit into that scheme. I think that adopt-a-park idea is a real good one.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: You're also looking at generating revenue, and you might

look at this as an opportunity to do that. If I may be so bold to suggest.

MR. CARUSO: Passero Park?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Caruso Park.

(Laughter.)

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: My next comment would be on page 4, the final paragraph the age group 5 to 19, the paragraph that starts that way. My question, concern, number 1, there -- halfway there it's got -- which of the population of 6,305 or 2.8 percent. I believe that is supposed to be 22.8 percent.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Which -- where are you?

MICHAEL CURLEY: You lost me.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Last paragraph. The age group 5 through 19, and then halfway through that paragraph, it states 2.8 percent of the Town's population.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Oh.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I believe that is supposed to be 22.8. When you did the transcript from the old book to the new book, when you modified this --

MR. CARUSO: We took some of that out of - out of the document.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: That changes some of my comments that I had, but I caught something. Sorry, John (Caruso).

My comment in regards to this is we have a Senior Center which many of the activities are for 16.1 percent of our population or 4,408 seniors, but our youth 5 to 19 years of age is 22.8 percent of our population, which is 6,305. And we have an outdated four-classroom old schoolhouse at the Community Center with a review of the existing programs done for all ages. Because that is a concern I have, and with — with twin daughters that are almost 15 now, and just watching our programs that we have, we — we have to be careful we don't want to duplicate services, with the Continuing Ed, with the school districts. But at the same time, we need to provide them with activities, and I think that is one thing that we need to look at. Was that part of this program? It mentions programs a little bit. But there wasn't that much detail in regards to the programs we had. It talked about facilities and what we should have and so forth, but what activities are we actually going to have there?

So I think that is a concern I have. We need to have more activities for our youth. This week, with the cold weather that we have had, City schools opened up their recreation centers for the kids. You know, I mean, we have a population that we have to, you know, take care of people. You know, vote for school budgets because they are all about our children. We need programs, activities for them. So I think that needs to be looked at, as well. When you look at the amount of seniors we have, and the programs that they're involved with, gosh, they have some great programs at the Senior Center. And Michael (Curley) as you're associated with them, they do a fine job up there. Maryanne does a great job.

MICHAEL CURLEY: If I could answer that Michael (Slattery). In terms of feasibility study for the Community Center, I think that would be the point where we look at youth programs, how we could generate revenue, offset the cost of a Community Center. So when we're going through this process, the conversation did come up. We had some talk about, well, if we had a Community Center, we could do youth basketball, we could do adult basketball, we could do volleyball leagues. We could have summer programs, recess activities. Some suggestions came up, but we really stayed focused on the task of what are we worried about now. That was more of a conversation that would come up if we have a feasibility study for a new Community Center.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: And — I know Councilman Schulmerich at the time I was liaison to the Youth Recreation Center Task Force and — Councilman Schulmerich at that time was on that committee. You know there was a talk and we were working towards it. I think having the community involved, you know, you guys did a great job. If we could continue that gro — I think would it be a great asset to the community. When you look at the articles in the paper regarding the YMCAs, how people are going to them, business is good. You know, you create a user fee that will help pay for that, I think it is a wonderful thing with grant money that is out there.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: Can we anticipate that if the Master Plan is adopted by the Town Board as recommended by the Committee, that we would expect to see you, Mr. Curley, in front of the Town Board in short order to pursue the commencement of the feasibility study?

MICHAEL CURLEY: Um, at that point I think we would -- I would defer back to the

Committee before we disband and try to come up with a time line or a list of the recommendations that we would like to prioritize. But I definitely feel -- my capacity as Recreation Director, that Community Center is one of the top, if not the top.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: I'm assuming it is priority somewhere on the list of the top 20.

MR. CARUSO: You know Denny (Schulmerich), it came up in the original document for 2001. It came out again in — it — it — it is something that is there. And everybody is looking for it. They're looking for a place to go. Unfortunately, having our Parks and Recreation offices and Town Hall and our Community Center ten miles away, there is this disjointed — they need to be together and some of the other communities that we happen to be fortunate enough to be working in, um, on their community centers, such as Webster right now, um, they're — they're putting them all together. Senior Centers, Parks and Recreation offices, and the Community Center. That way they can manage the space. Their programs — the space is designed to offer more programs and it's almost as — if they build it, they will come. And that is what is happening. We have the recipe in our environment already from our census, we have 10 percent more population. Even though we have stable growth rates in our age groups, we have 10 percent more. Kids are more active. The people in Chili are of a higher class where their kids are involved in all of these programs. So it is easier to use the square footage.

COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: John (Caruso), you mentioned the combining of a Senior Center with the Recreation Center. I would think that would be something you're exploring when we're doing the Benderson proposal right now before us, is that possibility being thrown into the mix?

MR. CARUSO: Yes, you're right. Yes, you're right.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: On page 8. Additional athletic fields. Did you -- did the sports organizations, not-for-profits, did you take a look at their numbers? You know, past five years and see where they are on a growth chart. Are they going up or are they going down?

Also, did you include lacrosse, which is a booming sport? So — a lot of kids are going to that.

MR. CARUSO: Yeah. The answer to both your questions is yes. Yes. We did interview the -- and look at their enrollment. We gave them a questionnaire to fill out. We looked at their statistics and made phone calls and spoke to them. The lacrosse program is run here by the Town. So we had direct input from Mike (Curley) on the lacrosse demands.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Staying on page 8, you mentioned under soccer, two additional fields. It is the third paragraph. Unusable fields, allow rotation of fields. I think that is outstanding suggestion. We talked about that when I was involved.

I used to be the liaison to the Recreation Advisory Committee, as well, and worked closely with them. Also being involved with Chili Soccer. That is — and football, they have the same problem. I know the school districts, with lacrosse, lacrosse tears up the fields and that is a major issue, concern. Finding enough space and room. Do you see that we have fields that are unusable at this point, or is it just a matter of time?

MICHAEL CURLEY: Well, especially --

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Besides Yolanda.

MICHAEL CURLEY: Yolanda is a very wet field and the dimensions don't allow for regulation football or soccer or even lacrosse for that matter. Given the wet fall we had, Merante and Davis are going to come into question for this spring. You know, I bring that — Mr. Carr into this conversation, as well. We just had an extremely wet spring. We do not have the fields right now that allow us to rest and rotate. We try to do the best we can but unfortunately, we go from soccer, right into football season, and football, we're fortunate here in Town that the Chili Lions has a very successful football program, and they have been making the play-offs year after year and hosting the play-offs. So that is an additional burden that we can't tell a community of kids, "Hey, sorry, you can't play here." But if this keeps up, we may get to the point and say you have can your three or four home games and that is it. That's something we would hate to do.

But again, right now we may have some fields in unplayable condition come spring. Especially with the wet spring we had, the water didn't have enough time to disappear, plus we have all of the snow now.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Wet fall you mean?

MICHAEL CURLEY: I meant --

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: We're only February. I don't know where you're going with spring.

MR. CARUSO: Well, hopefully some of the improvements that I didn't talk about, were drainage to places like Davis Park, cleaning up some of the over-groan swales to allow them to drain off a little bit, but there is no replacing having an optional field to rotate to. As part of our consultant -- subconsultant to Passero, we had Tony Conton (phonetic) Associates, and Tony had Ken Zeller (phonetic) who was with Perinton for years, and Ken (Zeller) just brought 30 or 40 years of real world experience that we're able to get into the document and -- and he talks about the power of rotating the fields. It is a luxury to have them.

家的特別的學生

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Certainly is.

I'm on page 9. The second paragraph. We talked about the third line, second paragraph. The Town-run lacrosse program. Um, what you have is -- as you know, three organizations, non-for-profits, Chili Baseball, Chili Football, Chili Soccer all run by volunteers who donate, dedicate time, resources, financial. And does the Town-run lacrosse program - do you see the lacrosse program going non-for-profit, or do you see that staying amongst the Town?

MICHAEL CURLEY: That is a tough answer right now. Because obviously I would hate to give up some of my programs that we run ourselves. It a very successful program. It has been growing over the years. It brings in revenue for the Town. But more importantly, it provides a service to a number of kids. But there may be a point where that program, if it takes off like the east side, we're looking at, you know, 150, 200 kids in the program, that would require probably 20 hours a week of youth sports. That is why a lot of Towns let the youth sports become separate organizations because you have to have a full-time staff member who deals just with youth sports themselves. So at this point, it is a tough question to answer because I would hate to give it up, but if the growth does continue and the trend of this fortunately, especially regionally, does boom in the next five to six years, it may be a program that we say good luck and go on your own.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I know people are competing for fields and so -- so when you look at the amount of volunteers that are with those other organizations, if they were on Town payroll, there is no way we would be - we would be able to afford that. I see if lacrosse numbers keep going, I see this becoming a non-for profit, somebody taking that, who has a heart

and a passion for that.

There was a discussion off the record.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Page 11, disk golf. Um, reading, this I'm in the third paragraph, the -- the -- the third sentence. "However, the course is under utilized with limited day -- day play from the community. It may also serve special interest groups, team leagues that are not Town-sanctioned."

My question, comment with that is, what about our tennis courts? I guess I am going to play the Devil's advocate. Tennis courts, basketball courts. Um, how do we know that those aren't Town residents? I guess my concern is that disk golf has done -- they have held major tournaments there, and I guess I -- I'm doing a comparison. That -- that concerns me. I mean, Chili Soccer, Chili Baseball, Chili Football are special interest groups. We're all special interest groups. And my concern is how we're labeling them and getting feedback from some of their members that participate there.

MICHAEL CURLEY: That is a very fair assessment.

MR. CARUSO: You know, Mike (Slattery), it's a statement. It's not an opinion. There is no opinion there. We're reporting what we found. And it might say we -- we might take the position, well, hey, we like special interest groups, and that's -- but at least the Board is informed, the Committee is informed this is what we found and you can make a decision from there.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: How do we know it is under utilized? Is that opinion or fact?

MICHAEL CURLEY: We have a log that has been kept out there for a number of years. COUNCILWOMAN IGNATOWSKI: Not everybody signs that. The people are not that are regularly attending, I know a lot of them that go there on a daily basis do not bother to sign in. I drive by that course almost every day. It is right around the corner from me. I see cars there all of the time. Maybe not in the wintertime. More so than I see on basketball courts and tennis courts. I think that is a really viable opportunity that we have for Chili residents. I know that log is there, but I know people do not sign it that are there every day. They have the impression it is to see who is from out of town. I have talked with them. "Oh, we thought that was just, you know, kind of gauge what" -- the interesting people that come around -- around the world to play on that course, so they don't bother signing in on a regular basis. I know I see people there all of

the time. I think it is more utilized than the tennis courts, maybe more.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Not to interrupt, but I can add one more comment to that and let you weigh in Mike (Curley). I believe in the discussion that we held when we discussed this whole — the possibility of doing this update was the fact that this is — disk golf was not really supported and promoted by the Town. No attempt has been made recently that I can think of by our Town to take this jewel in the rough and go out and really promote it. It's all gone the other way. And I really believe that this is something we need to utilize and promote. I mean there's a lot that don't understand what disk golf is. It did the get some play because of the amount of press that was done about the disk golf not being — tournament not being held there, that one year. But I believe there is a whole bunch of people that might find it a lot of fun but have not ever been introduced to it.

It could be one of your programs that you could utilize summer playground with. I could think of a dozen different ideas of ways we could promote that and use that as a recreational facility for the Town. But that is just my comments.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I know that the Chestnut Ridge Elementary School, they have a program in their gym classes, they would take field trips there. My daughters participated in that. So I guess that is a concern that I have, and one comment there, it says "parking is undersized." Well, for tournaments, yes, I can agree with you. I see that it is undersized. I will compare it to an LPGA. There is not enough parking there. Um, you know, it — there is a lot of comparisons that you can do to the Town's Chil-E Fest. In our Town — Town event we don't have enough parking. So when you look at putting on that event —

Chili Soccer. When I looked at what you talked about for Davis Park, I tell you what, you guys, I applaud you. There are a lot of great ideas. They're in this document. For Chili Soccer, they have tournaments there, they park on the lawn area, up by where you wanted to put the theater. So that is a concern, you know, your event, what are you holding? Sure anything can be under utilized. So I just — I just — not nitpicking, but those — just some things that pop out, which I saw.

MICHAEL CURLEY: If I can jump in there regarding disk golf. I will reiterate what John (Caruso) said; this is just a statement. All along the feeling of this Committee has been to take a look at Baker and establish or determine what is going to be the best use of that land that is going to best serve the residents of this Town. If it is disk golf, great, we'll keep it, promote it, make it happen. But if it comes to the fact that maybe we scale down to nine holes and put a couple pavilions and walking paths out there, that's the way we go. That's been the intent. I don't want to get caught up on the whole disk golf issue.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Without a doubt, I agree with you. It's what's best for our residents and I agree with you 100 percent.

Page 12, Ballantyne Park. Another comment, there is unlimited parking. Do you know -- is there an agreement with ARC of Monroe County? Do you know? For parking. I -- I almost want to say I thought there was something that was a -- you -- maybe not a written agreement, but there was some type of an agreement.

MICHAEL CURLEY: What you may be thinking of, is — is before they did the expansion of the parking lot, we had access to part of their park — excuse me, part of the grassed area where we used it for lacrosse. Now that they have expanded and they have the parking lot there and the fences there, that might be what you're thinking about, but you can't — I can't answer that.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: They didn't frown on us parking there. I took a tour of the facility. One of the concerns they have is security. Because now with that -- you -- you're driving right into Chili. What do you get to see? The monster walls. So they have a concern there with, you know, security. Because now they got two of their roads -- or two of their sides of the building hidden. So I know that, I went and met with them. We talked a little bit about the parking for the park and so forth. And, you know, they didn't seem -- they thought it would be fine for us to park there, and I thought -- I'm not sure if Joe Carr has any additional knowledge in regards to that.

JOSEPH CARR: I do somewhat. During the process of the design and construction of the Ballantyne Road bridge and the highway expansions and the Town Hall and all of that, there was a large impact on not only the ARC school but also the Town park. And there were a couple of different times when they talked about putting a fence along the common property line between the Town property and the school property. And in the end, it was felt it was better not to have that fence, that it gave good access where people at the school could use the park land, and also to allow parking in that area. There's — the State did construct four parallel parking spots on

Black Creek Road, but that is all the room that was available, and we didn't want to build a parking lot on the small land that we have. So the common agreement was to allow public use of that parking area in off hours, not to put a fence up, and not to really indicate a division between ownership, but to promote a more common use, a shared use. Those were the discussions that took place.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Thank you, Joe (Carr).

Anybody else have a question? Want to chime in?

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: You're doing fine.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: I think you covered just about every sentence on the first 12 pages, so no, I don't have --

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Well, that is why --

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: But you're doing good.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: That's what we're -- that's what we're supposed to do.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: That's why we're here. Absolutely.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Page 13, the Community Center. One thing that concerns me when -- when I read this first paragraph. "However, the facility does not meet the guidelines established the Americans with Disabilities Act for handicapped accessability of fire code."

Supervisor, as our ADA Coordinator, does this concern you?

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Yes, it concerns me. We have done as much as we can there. We got the lift. We have access to the main floor. And we have the lift. That's about all that the building can stand for modification. We all know that that's a prehistoric dinosaur that probably would be better served in a different purpose. But for now, it's our Community Center. It is our only building. And to make it more ADA compliant, as I understand it, Mr. Carr, would be very cost ineffective.

JOSEPH CARR: Well, I think -- yes. I think some of our previous discussions have been how much do we want to invest in that old building? What are we going to use that for, or how long are we going to be there? Part of the discussion is, it's too small for our needs. It would be best served by a new facility. So how do you make the decision as to how much to invest in that? The issue came up, with the roofing. We decide to manage what we have, as to opposed to trying to improve it.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: The same with the windows. You know, we tried to do it as best we could to meet the requirements. But there is a lift to get to the second floor, and there is an access to the first floor by a roll-in. That meets just about all of the ADA requirements. I don't know the statements, why these statements are being made that they don't meet the basic guidelines for ADA, because it does allow access.

MR. CARUSO: I guess the statement was in a general for all ADA. We did an ADA investigation or study on the place. The bathrooms aren't --

MS. SUPERVISOR: No.

MR. CARUSO: -- aren't ADA.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: There's many restaurants, there's many facilities -- my husband is in a wheelchair, you all know. So I think I can speak to the fact that many things are not up to par on that.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: We do have an ADA bathroom there.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Do we?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Yes, we do. That is why I am concerned.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Joe (Carr) -- where is it?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Top of the handicapped ramp.

MICHAEL CURLEY: The lift.

MR. CARUSO: We can modify the statement. I guess it was a general statement. It wasn't specific to access. Just — just didn't meet all of the ADA requirements. I guess we're all saying the same thing, that the building is antiquated. We don't suggest you spend any money on it that you didn't have to, and if you're looking for some reasons, there is several of them.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: And I agree with you. But I'm also going to look to our insurance counsel who -- counselor who has some concerns with those statements, and then I'm looking at our Town Attorney with liability issues.

RICHARD STOWE: Your Town Attorney has noted the fact that he attended kindergarten there and now he is a dinosaur.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: I'm sorry.

RICHARD STOWE: Okay.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: Actually, I believe prehistoric is before dinosaurs. RICHARD STOWE: Every hour, I feel a lot older.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: So I was looking from a liability end, John (Caruso). When there is something in writing, we just got a report recently, that — I don't need to go there, but it concerns me when somebody puts something in writing, and I see it here, and then there is always somebody out there looking to make a quick buck and — so. I — I guess I'm concerned when it says it does not meet.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Did you look at that ADA bathroom?

MR. CARUSO: I guess we didn't see it.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I'm concerned about the word "fire code."

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: What about the fire codes? Did you have Fire Marshals with you to tell — because our Fire Marshals are very aware of that building.

MR. CARUSO: The building is not sprinklered.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Well, neither --

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: But it is grand fathered in. So I think our Fire Marshals, he has to visit once a year and sign off on it.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: And he wouldn't file it because it is not sprinklered.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: So — so essentially, my take-away from this discussion is we all generally acknowledge the fact that the building is more than a couple years old.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: 1937, I believe it is.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: But we also acknowledge the fact that it may well be in compliance with all requisite laws enabling it to be a safe and publicly accessible building.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Can you not find that?

MR. CARUSO: Absolutely.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Second line from the bottom, "walkway in front of the building in disrepair." Joe (Carr), can we take a look at that, so we can modify that statement as well?

MR. CARUSO: Maybe I can modify the statement. The walkway in front of the building is in need of repair.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Thank you.

MR. CARUSO: That will save Joe (Carr) from having to get to it.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Davis Park, page 14. We talked -- you talk about the paragraph starts, "Extensive paved walkway system. Sight visibility problem exiting onto Chestnut Ridge. I know the Town's parks crew was up there not too long ago and they did some work. I know the sight distance coming out of there so the south, you know, there was some concerns because of the bridge and so forth. You're limited on what you can do. So I know they did do some -- some work up there. Um, the inventory of the fields, or the recreation facilities, there is a basketball court there. That's a question.

MICHAEL CURLEY: I will say paved area that used to be a basketball court. There is no basketball rim there, but it is still — one could be installed, and therefore, have a basketball court there.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Okay. And the one thing, we have adult softball fields at those locations, as well.

Chestnut Ridge Road, I'll get to it later, but on the information that was provided, I believe it stated that that was a Town road. Both of those are County roads. I know that is a petty thing, but I just happened to see that.

That is sort of close to my heart.

MR. CARUSO: Where did you see that?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: On the -- Appendix A, in the back.

Um, I will -- let me just go through this real quick. If there is anything that sticks out, I -- will you just touch on it if anybody else wants to hop in there.

Or I can go through the whole thing. Dennis (Schulmerich) said I'm hitting line by line, so I want to make sure I'm accurate.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: That was not intended to be a criticism. I was referencing your thoroughness.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Well, this is close to my heart. So that is -

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: I know it is.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Don't take it wrong. Jim (Powers) is falling asleep. I'm

112

sorry, Jim (Powers).

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: It is impressive that you have taken the time to be as thorough as you have. It is not a criticism in any way, shape or form.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: You guys did a great job. Just little things like this -people watching it on tape are probably getting bored, but you know one thing that concerns me
with -- you know we talked about Memorial Park. Um, having a recreation -- page 16. Having a
recreation office, we talk about the vehicles that are driving through there. Well, you know what
bothers me even more than that, is having our Town courts right there. With the individuals that
are coming in there, having our summer playground program in and out of that building during
the day, never know what is going to take place. That concerns me. There was a proposal before
to relocate them. There have been a couple different suggestions. I love to see them out of there.
Um, you know, there's -- there's other alternatives that we have, and I would love to see us move
forward with that. Because I know that's -- why do the ladies in the courts now have the glass
put up with the little holes so they can speak through? Because of the clientele that is coming in
there. But we don't think about it when it comes to our youths that we want to protect. I think
that is a very serious concern.

The storage building that is on — that Memorial Park. Chili Lions Football I know paid for and put in a — some labor, and Joe (Carr)'s crews helped out with that a little bit, as well, for the storage building on that site. So there was — you know, that is just demonstrating how some of the not-for-profits are giving back and helping out building wise and doing distinct things. I know they helped with the concessions. There has been some donations down there for that, as well. One thing I would look at with the concessions is the sanitary sewer and how functional that is. That was a concern a few years ago, and the water service that goes there.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Nature trail. Who loves the nature trails, Pat (Tindale)? Jim (Powers). Jim (Powers), you would get lost back there with the brush. That is a beautiful area that I think is under-utilized. When you look at the old Master Plan, one of the recommendations we made was create an access off of Stottle Road. I think that I would be fabulous, allow people — no.

PAT TINDALE: We want a bridge over the creek.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: I agree with you Pat (Tindale). You and I are in the same boat. COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: And we discussed that, as well. You know, having the trail go along there and getting the easements. That—I tell you, you came up with some great ideas, but we need to follow through with it. Blow the dust off this bad boy and get it going.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: I think you should follow through on the bridge idea from Union Park, because I think that is the key to making that really viable. Because behind those apartments is never going to change. The apartments are going to stay there no matter what we do, and it will be lost to everybody no matter how much signage you have out front. But if there is anyway we can get the Army Corps to let us to do a bridge over Black Creek to connect those two parks, then we have got a tremendous opportunity there, because then we can connect all of the trail along the creek. Maybe we should start pursuing that.

MR. BRIXNER: Madam Supervisor, excuse me.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: You wanted to speak to this?

MR. BRIXNER: Do you intend to go to the public tonight?

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Yes. Eventually.

MR. BRIXNER: Thank you.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: If they want to hop in, I can take a break.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: You want to take a break?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Just one thing on page 24, Home Trends. We haven't played softball in years and that field is overgrown. I don't think it is even — we couldn't even get in there if we wanted to. I'm not sure what the agreement is with them any longer.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: 24. Top of 24.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: We used to hold a program there. When they sold it to Home Trends, they -- we -- there was a period of time where we couldn't utilize that field, and then Mr. Bacon ended up getting permission for the short term. So -- if you want to go to the audience.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Are you done? COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Am I done?

MR. BRIXNER: They have done a marvelous job. There is no question about that, in my opinion.

I submitted a report to Michael Curley, Chairman of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan Committee, on January the 3rd. Let me briefly go through here, and then I have a couple of other comments.

Um, the names of the four individuals, was provided to me who worked with John, Mr. Caruso, and I would like to complement their work and their efforts with the group.

I could not secure any minutes of a December 11th, 2006 public meeting as of December 27th, 2006. As to whether or not the meetings of the Chili Parks and Recreation Master Plan Committee were open, under the Open Meetings Law, the early — the earlier ones were. I believe the one that was conducted after January 3rd was not open to the public.

As to the Town Board approval to set up the committee, most of it came from the 20,000 -- as I understand it, came from a \$20,000 grant from Senator James Alessi.

It seems to me, as a suggestion, that the period of time allotted for public input off of the December, early December meeting between December 18, 2006 to January 3, 2007 is a very short time, and since it was over a holiday observation period, I would suggest that a longer time would have permitted more public input be provided. After all, any person wishing to participate had to run either to the Town Hall or Recreation Department to get a final draft before even being able to comment on the draft.

I want to talk about the category called Chili Parks and Recreation site infrastructure very briefly, and I have three prime areas. Memorial Park, there is a second entrance to the park via the old Chili Center Coldwater Road. The reference to this park as a Memorial Park is the presence of a memorial to World War II veterans, dedicated in honor of those brave men of the Town of Chili who gave their lives to preserve the ideals of their country. 1996.

Under the category of lighting at Memorial Park, I did not see a reference to the main diamond number one. This is a hard ball diamond with 90 foot bases, dug-outs and score boards. This field is used by interleague boys, probably 16 years and older and also by the women's softball league with the smaller bases. A picture I had included on the following page.

Yolanda Park, it's my personal feeling that this park should remain as it is. The drainage only has specific limited wet periods of year, probably three to five weeks a year. I believe it should stay as a soccer field for smaller children and also remain as a neighborhood park because there should be more open spaces and residential areas in Chili. In my opinion, we have not provided open play areas in a residential areas.

Finally, as to an event called the First Annual Great Chili Cook-out at the Baker Park disk golf course April 23, 2005. Approximately 75 to 90 men and women participated. I met individuals coming from as far away as Toronto, Canada and from Central Pennsylvania. Unfortunately, in my opinion, when I left at 2 p.m., I had not seen one individual Chili Town Board member in attendance. In conclusion, I picked up my final report, thanks to Mike (Slattery), and I appreciate that, on Friday, from Mr. Brongo's office, February the 2<sup>nd</sup>. Without doing page-by-page review of this document, I would conclude that this Committee has done a marvelous job. Thank you very much.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Michael (Slattery), are you finished?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: No.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: Could I ask a question in reference to Mr. Brixner's comment?

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Yes. Would you clarify the statement about the --

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: Would you mind?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Go ahead.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: I'm confused about the reference to the fact that there was a meeting that was not open to the public. Could we get a comment on that?

MICHAEL CURLEY: All our meetings were open to the public. However, not all our meetings were published due to — if we had to cancel a meeting or a last-minute scheduling. Not all of our meetings were published, but if people came to the meeting, it was open. We never locked the doors. So...

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: If you had to cancel and re-establish, did you put up signs or notes --

MICHAEL CURLEY: Yes.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: -- on the bulletin boards?

MICHAEL CURLEY: Yes. I think it only happened once or twice that we had to

reschedule.

MR. BRIXNER: Thank you, Councilman Schulmerich. Obviously this had to be a meeting after the date of January the 3rd. I would — I was told that it was to be held on a coming Tuesday, forthcoming Tuesday. Um, I went to Dick (Brongo)'s office, Mr. Brongo's office and he couldn't find a listing of a meeting after January 3rd. And just — observation would tell you, that a committee needed to have something to put the final touches onto — to a — to a document to use tonight.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: Okay. I just wanted to assure — insure there was no situation where a member of the public was prevented from participating, because it was our understanding they would all be open, so if there was confusion — I understand now. I just wanted to clarify.

MR. BRIXNER: Thank you for the question.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Michael (Curley), John (Caruso), what was the -- for a normal attendance, from people from the community, at your meetings?

MICHAEL CURLEY: Generally we -- it was just the committee members.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: There wasn't a lot of community residents coming out to your meetings?

MICHAEL CURLEY: No. But as I mentioned earlier in the introduction, we had the two public feedback meetings. We had the public review period. We also had the e-mail account set up on line. We felt that we had gone above and beyond to give people in the public the opportunity to give their feedback, and there were exceptions, and it leads us here to tonight. Obviously we had 14-day review period, but any comments that are brought up tonight, if they need to be incorporated into this Master Plan — this is a final (indicating), but it has not been approved obviously, so we can go back and we can incorporate any suggestions made tonight into this document if the Committee feels that they need to be incorporated.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: One of the comments, reading the other draft, and then comparing it with this draft, one thing that was removed was continuing to use Black Creek. Um, I know that was removed. That was taken out. Is there still an agreement with Monroe County that we have to sign annually?

MICHAEL CURLEY: In the clarification on that, we removed that because that is business as usual. We're -- we're using the -- the Black Creek Park as -- to make a recommendation to continue doing it, really it didn't make a lot of sense. Why would we recommend continue using Davis Park? So it was a comment that really we didn't feel warranted being in there, but we still have that agreement.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Because it is a County park and Davis Park is a Town park. But we do have that agreement for Monroe County?

MICHAEL CURLEY: That's correct.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Um --

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Plus I asked them to incorporate, Michael (Slattery), the fact that there will be two new soccer fields built down on Morgan Road, so they need -- they're -- this Committee is well aware of that.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: Has it been decided that they are going to be soccer -- SUPERVISOR LOGEL: They're multipurpose.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: There was a choice.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: They could be for baseball, softball or two soccer depending how they want to utilize them.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I was just wondering if a decision had been made. Just before, Mike (Slattery), you move on, I wanted to go back to the one point about the 14-day period. I believe the Committee was doing what we charged them as a Board to do, by this update, because we gave them parameters as to when we wanted to have this done. Because of the time frame, that was necessary for us to complete this enabling us to -- to look for grants. It was a time frame that was discussed when we first put this all together, and I think that is why we're trying to do it in this time frame so we can get to that point.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Considering the holidays that were in between and the amount of scheduling it takes to get that group together.

Page 27, you talk about develop maintenance standards and maintenance plan. Do you know if our Parks Department has that now?

MICHAEL CURLEY: They do have maintenance standards, but what -- this -- what this replies to - I guess more of a broader term, that if -- if the trash cans need to be painted. Or if

there is vandalism, how timely of a fashion that vandalism or those repairs are done. Being consistent. If we have a brown building in one park, do we continue that throughout all of the parks? It's kind of in line with also the signs, have the uniformity, maintenance standard. And not a slight on any of our Parks or Highway Department employees. Now it is just meaning let's set some guidelines so that there is consistency throughout the parks.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Then they need to go before the Architectural Review Committee.

(Laughter.)

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I know that was an issue with the -- when the Chili Football built the building. You know, there were standards, there was an existing building, they added onto it. You know, follow the flow.

One thing I found very interesting was pursue State, federal and other sources of financial assistance. Is that along the grant line? Is that where you were going with that?

MICHAEL CURLEY: That's correct.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: And who would be pursuing something like that? Who has the time from the Town to do that?

MICHAEL CURLEY: That would fall under my responsibilities, which is like last year, trying to find that -- I would hope in the future the Town will have a grant writer, but that is obviously not my decision. That is not my forte. I have written grants, but I have also seen a number of municipalities that have or school districts that have a good success with grants, additional funding, it is because they have either a consultant or a full-time staff who does that do that.

But to answer your question, that would fall back on me until the day comes when we have a professional person to do that.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: And you can also work with the consultant.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: On page 28, John (Caruso), you got me, Buddy. Memorial Park you had 11.5. At the end you had 11.6. (Laughter.)

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: You changed it to 11.5.

Just trying to be thorough.

MR. CARUSO: What would you like it to be, Mike (Slattery)?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I would like it to be 45 point --

On page 28 you mentioned a -- a community park as 10 acres. Many towns similar to Chili have achieved exceeded goals of ten or more acres of community park land per thousand population. I see that we're off on that number. And looking at what we have, and where we want to go, and I -- I go back to the -- to do that -- what land is out there, and then the cost of that land. I'm sorry, Pat (Tindale), go ahead.

PAT TINDALE: I said there is some good land.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Because didn't you take into consideration the fact that Black Creek -- I realize it is not Town-owned, but it is also -- but it is 1500 acres of park land in the Town of Chili utilized by -- heavily by Chili residents.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: That was one of my comments I was going to get to in a little bit. When you look at the university, we have Roberts Wesleyan for facilities, track, pool and so forth, the schools. When you look at the amount of land that the schools have, Gates-Chili, Churchville-Chili, um, Wheatland-Chili, I don't believe they have anything in town.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Paul Road has --

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Gates-Chili and Churchville-Chili. Does that -- do those encompass that 10,000 -- you know, ten per thousand?

MICHAEL CURLEY: It does not. The decision was made, because those facilities are not accessible all of the time to the public, very similar to some of the other developments around here that have walking paths throughout the development, they say for residents only. The schools, Roberts Wesleyan, they're open to the public, but if there is a function going on -- on, or if there is an event planned, and -- and given the fact that we, or the -- or the sports groups have to get permission to use those, we made a decision that we're going to focus mainly on the Town land.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: But the Black Creek is open to the public at all times. Just the same as our parks, and we have access because we have a dollar-a-year agreement to be able to use those in any way we want. So I think it — it — I really don't think it gives you an accurate picture of land available within the boundaries of Chili if you do not incorporate Black Creek

Park into your figures.

COUNCILWOMAN SPERR: I think one of the things that affects the amount of property available is the considerable amount of wetlands that Chili has. So we do have a lot of open space. It is probably just unusable open space.

MR. CARUSO: The stat that is used in the document is — is, you know, ten acres per thousand, and it is usually compared, but sort of followed and compared apples to apples how the — how the standard, if you will, is applied. So that is why we only accounted for Town-owned parks and not County-owned parks. If we included the — and we — we don't disagree with you at all. But if we included the County land, then we couldn't look at whatever the answer is, we couldn't compare it to ten per thousand because then we would have to go back where that stat came from, and it is usually comparing just Town-owned property. For some reason you think you want it struck from the document, we can strike it.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: My only concern, and Pat (Tindale) knows my concern with the open space index. You have to consider Black Creek as a park, as open space, and as green space, and it is not -- nothing is going to happen to it. I think the other thing is what about our Genesee Valley Land Trust. I mean we have huge pieces of property out there. Chili is not hurting for green space. There is no question about it, we're not. So if that doesn't get incorporated, under those trusts -- and you can tell me I am out of line to ask this question, but under those Genesee Valley Land Trusts are those pieces of land open to people being able to say walk in there and watch wood ducks, walk in there and watch the migration of the fowl as it moves? I mean there is nothing that says we can't go into those facilities, is there?

PAT TINDALE: No, there's not. I think my concern is, I wonder like Mendon – is Mendon Ponds Parks considered, I don't think so. I think we were just trying to compare apples to apples. When Mendon does that, they're not including that park either.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: We don't know that. We need to ask that question.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Page 30, you talk about towns, professionally designed. Union Station is a fairly new park. Did you review the design of that park, and what is there, and what is still yet to come? And do you feel that that was, you know, a good design?

MR. CARUSO: Well, we did review it, and I don't think it is -- our opinion matters whether it is a good design. But we did review it. And we did see what the future holds. I think of we acknowledged what remains to be done.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Okay. Um, farmers market. Do we really need to go there? Just kidding. (Laughter.)

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Some of the Davis Park, on page 31, correct sight visibility. Touched on that a little bit on Chestnut Ridge. Drainage problems. I know I saw the Drainage Committee's reports that Joe Carr submitted. They did some drainage work out there. There are some other drainage issues that Joe (Carr) will be taking care of at our parks. So if this is going to be modified -- I'm not sure what your goal is. Maybe you can touch base with Joe (Carr). Maybe some of the actions, some of the recommendations are already completed. So maybe that won't have to be in the document.

I don't know. You know, Memorial Park, on page 32, we talk about replace tennis courts. My concern up there, and — I know Joe (Carr)'s crew did some work on those tennis courts, as well, because I believe Michael (Curley) held his lacrosse program there, that the drainage issue was corrected. There was some fabric, I believe, that was in the way that was cut back, and now those tennis courts, they do drain properly in — is it still a concern?

JOSEPH CARR: No. They drain out fairly well.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Better than what they were in the past. Because I know that was a serious issue before. Another concern was the pine needles for the sand bags and so forth.

JOSEPH CARR: It's an issue.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Chili Nature Trail. We talked about improving the trail, trail signage. I know that is a security issue, because of the limited access, and the vandalism that takes place. And then also from the flooding standpoint, from — when Black Creek rises, there is some issues there, as well as Union Station Park, the nature trail that is there.

So I walked it -- I was -- actually, I go over there quite a bit. There isn't really a defined trail. There was at one point, but because of the amount of wash out -- Union Station. Is that what I said?

PAT TINDALE: You also mentioned the Nature Trail.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: At Union Station, the nature trail that is there, back by the soccer fields. So I know -- I know there is a drainage issue there, as well. Because it is in a flood zone.

IRENE BRIXNER: I have a question, I just don't want to interfere.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Go ahead.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I'm willing to take a break.

MS. BRIXNER: What I'm wondering is the comment that Jerry (Brixner) made to me a while ago. You know, it's wonderful to use the internet to get points of view, how do people feel, but there is nothing like being invited to a meeting and allowing people to at least, you know -- when you go to a meeting and you can't talk, to allow the people to have what you have in your hands so they can at least follow through. You know, I attended a meeting for the code, the change of code, and I sat there like a dummy, didn't know what they were talking about because nothing was provided to me. How can you expect people to be interested, Mike (Slattery), if -- if, you know, this kind of thing doesn't happen? I don't think we should rely on that internet that much. Because it's not everybody who has a computer. And tell you the truth, you won't get me on a computer unless I am in dire straits, I really need an answer for something. Otherwise, I don't go to the computer. And I taught computer in school with the children.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Was this available through the library?

MICHAEL CURLEY: Yes, it was. At the Library, the Town Hall and also the Recreation Office.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Okay, thanks.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: You mentioned on page 37, the Community Center. The last line. You don't have to go there. It's going to be quick. Glad to see it is mentioned it could fit on the Town Hall site because I was told time and time again when we had our Task Force that it couldn't fit.

MICHAEL CURLEY: Yes. The top of it.

(Laughter.)

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: It can fit. If somebody has a will, there is a way.

Skateboard park, glad to see that. That has been an issue that has been out there for a while. I know, John (Caruso), you want to get out there skateboarding. You and I will do it together. I will catch you you when you fall.

On page 39, the last paragraph, the Town should examine the fees and charges which reflect actual costs. Um, maintenance and programs as means of maintaining and enhancing quality of facilities and programs. Are we looking to charge the not-for-profits for the use of our fields and structures? I mean, I know we charge them now for meeting room usage. Are we looking to charge them for our fields?

MICHAEL CURLEY: We didn't come up with a decision one way or another. It was just a recommendation to look at the promote ability. And that can encompass rentals for say Aquinas when they had to come in and use Davis Park. Youth sports groups. When we had private groups that want to come in and have a family softball game. So it encompasses all rental fees or charges that may be associated with using the parks.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I guess I would caution, I would be careful going there. We have a lacrosse program that the Town is running. If this is going to happen, I see that those not-for-profits would just — they could walk away, and then we won't have those programs for our youth. And then the Town, what would we do then? So I —

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Where are they going to walk to? That is the question that Michael (Curley) -- that his group needs to ask.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: The volunteers would stop volunteering.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: But are the other towns charging, is the question I would like to ask.

MR. CARUSO: They are charging. It is a bigger, more philosophical question than this meeting, but you're right, there are both sides of the sword that need to be evaluated. Our consultant works in 13 different communities between here and Syracuse and he sees some that charge and some that don't.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I know some around here do.

MR. CARUSO: So we put it in. We put it in for us to be able -- we already had people approach, "Are you going to charge us or not?" I didn't say "we," but it is appropriate to have it in this document.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: One of the comments I hear, why can't we use the school

facilities? Michael (Curley) you want to use them?

MICHAEL CURLEY: You get charged.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: He gets charged. That is it. If you're using the interior of a building and so forth, lighting, there is a cost. If you're using the grass, the cost, our tax dollars paid for that. Why are we paying again? So that is a concern that I have. We're going to maintain the lawn. We're going to cut it, were going to trim it, we're going to do what we got to do.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: The only thing I think was an issue this year was when we got into it with Chili Lions Football because Mike (Curley) came to me and said, "The field has been destroyed. We can't let them play on it." It is solid mud, and we're now in a position now where it probably may not be back in time for spring.

So those are the hard calls.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: And we were justifiable because it was in — I think they played until the end of November, if I'm not — and the time of year that they're out there, the wet, they're beating up the field. So it only makes sense. We — we have an investment. Because then you also have a liability. If somebody puts a rut in the ground with their cleat, now it freezes, now all of a sudden you have that indentation, somebody steps in that and breaks an ankle, so it is a liability issue. So I can understand that.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: What I would like to point out, too, this is a guideline. This is a suggestion. There is nothing -- you can follow it as close as you can, but I think they need to put in things, even though they know they might be pie in the sky and not happen now, they should be in there so that they're at least a part of the proposal, if it should take place, and it needs to be --

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Page 43, first paragraph, third line, "However, lack of shared overall vision, sometimes unclear division of responsibilities.

Supervisor, do we have staff meetings amongst our -- the people involved here? I mean it concerns me when I see that --

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: You mean between Joe (Carr) and Michael (Curley)?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Joe (Carr) and Michael (Curley) or --

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Joe (Carr) and Michael (Curley).

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I mean that concerns me when I -- I think -- you know, or Town staff meetings.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: We have staff meetings for different — depending on the issue that we're discussing, but we wouldn't have the whole Town staff here for a meeting between Joe (Carr) and Michael (Curley).

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I'm not saying we should. I'm -- staff meetings can be three people. It can be 12 people. So --

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: We have -- Joe (Carr) and I and Michael (Curley) have met to discuss, you know, trying to implement --

MICHAEL CURLEY: If I can comment on that. Joe (Carr) and I have met when a situation has come up. But obviously we both have other responsibilities and sometimes things have fallen through.

This statement is more a reflection on, I guess, if I as the Parks and Recreation Director thought of new projects saying, "Hey, I think we need to do this, I would like to see a new walkway," but then Joe (Carr) is in the responsibility of making it happen, it is how do we get my vision and his vision to meld, and that is where this statement, I think, is a reflection of that. Maybe that goes to Joe (Carr), but Joe (Carr) will make it happen his way. It is not really a reflection on the fact there is a lack of communication or we don't work together well. It is just more of a fact you go from one person to the next, and naturally there will be some changes.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: When I say lack of shared overall vision --

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: I think you need to change that. I don't think that is a very — by putting that in, you're sending a message that is not positive. I think Joe (Carr) shares an image to rebuild and to build things, too. He comes at it from a practical standpoint of labor, money and how we're going to make it happen, and if it is a priority right now, that I have got to build a highway because there is only sun shining and it is dry between May and August, and Michael (Curley) wants this sidewalk — you see what I am saying? We have to work it so it all works out and the priorities are a little different, but I don't think you want to say it quite that way.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: I think you're talking about alignment of vision, really, as opposed to the fact that they're not coordinated.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: On page 43, under the planning and oversight, first bullet is it is recommended that responsibility of the Recreation Committee be increased to address program needs and priorities.

Counsel, do we have -- I know we had to pass something under Town Law to form the

Committee, and you know -- the guidelines.

Do we have to review that if they change their duties? We want to see the duties changed. Is that something we have to visit from a Town Law standpoint?

RICHARD STOWE: Which committee are we speaking of?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Recreation Advisory Committee. Well, it says Recreation Committee.

RICHARD STOWE: That is my question. You're talking about the Advisory Committee. COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: John (Caruso) and Mike (Curley).

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: What do you mean by that statement? You need to clarify that statement

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: How are you defining Recreation Committee? Are you thinking of it as the current Recreation Advisory Committee, or are you thinking of --

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: What do you mean by "responsibilities"?

RICHARD STOWE: To answer your questions directly, if we're talking about the duties of the current Recreation Advisory Committee and realigning those, the answer is probably yes, we have to revisit that here.

If you're talking about a new entity, that we have heard characterized and bantered about, that would involve that entity, the answer is still yes, but it might still be creating a new entity to incorporate that and redo that which would also involve this Board. Either way I think the answer is probably yes, this Board would be involved.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: That is -- can you clarify what you wrote here?

MR. CARUSO: The first bullet under B?

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Uh-huh. COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Yes.

MR. CARUSO: I think what we found was that the Committee was — it didn't have the responsibility or the power to make suggestions and prioritize — you know, much like the Drainage Committee will look at some of the calls that come in, helps prioritize it for Joe Carr's drainage group and then they will work from that.

I guess that, you know, through our consultants, they felt that having seen that done in other community and — other communities, that we could do that better here. And maybe by a little more empowerment to a point that we're comfortable.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: But aren't they -- excuse me, but aren't they empowered equally now, the two committees?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: You mean Drainage and Recreation?

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Yes. They're both advisory. Both can make recommendations. Your concern is you need to address the advisory committee and make them aware that — I have been there as liaison, so I can relate to this. They basically come, they listen, they leave. And I'm not sure whether it is the makeup or they feel the decision has been made for them, which I have gotten it from a couple of people, that with all of the decisions being made for them, they have no reason to come up with any creative ideas because the decisions have already been made. And so I think there might be — it might be simply a case of addressing that committee and giving them a little more ability to be heard and, you know, meet with some subcommittees. I'm wondering if that is not the problem.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I think when I was liaison, the committee, they came up with ideas for programs. They talked about the different things that they could do and so forth. So I wouldn't say they — when I was involved, they wouldn't just go to a meeting, Michael (Curley) dictated what was going to take place and they left. It was people coming together. They volunteer. They come up with suggestions to — to make a program, you know, better. You know.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Have we heard that recently? We haven't heard it much recently. COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I have been out of the loop.

MICHAEL CURLEY: It all depends on the time of the year, the conversation. Sometimes we get some feedback. Other times it would defer to, I guess, my opinion.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: I guess it should read you need to utilize the Recreation Advisory Committee more. That's how it should read.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I know you have some new people on that committee. So

they're a resource.

Page 44, the second bullet is need for additional full-time recreation program. I guess, you know, that -- I'm excited to hear that and see that. When I look at our Community Center, as we all know, the four-room schoolhouse with a small gym. We have clerical staff running it. It would be good if we could do more, utilize it more, have capable, knowledgeable people in the recreation field, you know, get programs moving.

Would you believe it, I am almost done.

MR. BRIXNER: Yeah.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: Well, if I didn't do my job, then Mr. Brixner, you would criticize me for that.

In looking at the number — one of the general questions I have, the number of fields does not reference the number of temporary fields constructed on a needed basis, such as for tournaments, fall usage, fall leagues and so forth, five-v-five programs, tournaments and so forth. So — at times there are more fields, you know, but then again the impact it is going to have on our, you know, other sports, it is going to take away from it, because they won't be able to utilize it.

One thing that -- it wasn't mentioned in here, but I would like to see if we can go back to it was the co-op that we used to get from Brockport, utilizing - you know, helping out with the activities and so forth. It relieves the amount of pressure on Michael (Curley) with the programming and so forth. I think we - if we can tap into that resource. Brockport is a very good school. They have knowledgeable, capable students there. If we can go that route.

MR. CARUSO: That is a good one to put back in, is to maybe invite or somehow make --

see if we could get a co-op.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I will end by saying this: I'm sorry for taking so much of your time. I know you folks did a great job. There was just some of the things that I wanted to touch on that I felt I needed to touch on. I did go to your one public information meeting. I did start asking questions, but I stopped, and I felt there was a time and place I could ask, and tonight would be that time. But I just want to say you did an excellent job. I'm very pleased, and I know the comments from the Town Board, that you guys did a great job. So thank you for putting up with my questions tonight.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Any other questions from the public?

#### DOROTHY BORGUS, 31 Stuart Road

MS. BORGUS: I have at home a copy of the plan, the finished plan for Union Station Park that was submitted at the time the grant application was made to get the funding that we already received. In this draft, plan, has any — have all of those facilities been taken into account with needs? In other words, is — as far as needs go, in this plan, have they counted the things that are already in that plan as being a fact? Or are — or have they disregarded those?

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Michael (Curley).

MICHAEL CURLEY: Those have been taken into consideration. The only things that have not been completed at Davis Park -- excuse me, at Union Station are the tennis courts and the basketball courts and that doesn't come into play with a lot of the evaluation we included in here which is for the athletic fields. The athletics fields are already in line now and have been used for a couple of years.

MS. BORGUS: Are they all done out there that are going to be done?

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: With the exception of --

MICHAEL CURLEY: Athletic fields, yes. Basketball court and tennis court are still remaining to be done.

MS. BORGUS: Because as I look at that plan, there are a lot of facilities there that I don't see at Union Station Park.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I believe the plan was modified, if I can go to Joe (Carr). That plan was modified.

MS. BORGUS: Simplified. Certainly must have been. There were bocce courts and a lot of -- just not mainstream soccer courts and -- and tennis courts, but there were a lot of smaller types of activities, many, many, included in the original plan. Those aren't to be done?

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: I don't know. I didn't see the original plan. That was before my time.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: The -- what is the date on the plan?

MS. BORGUS: I don't have it in hand. I don't remember. It was the one that went in with the grant application. I am assuming that is why we received the size grant we did, because it was so all encompassing.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Michael (Curley), Joe (Carr), between the two of you, is there something that we got the grant for on that plan that — other than what Michael mentioned, those two facilities, that is on there, that you don't — what she is talking about?

JOSEPH CARR: I would agree with the statement that the concept plan that was developed by the consultant that was used for the application of the grant did include things like bocce ball and horseshoe and a couple other things. When the final design was prepared and went to drawings, those things were set aside. They're not included in their current plan of — of construction of the park. That doesn't mean that they can't be added, but they were not a part of the final design and construction activity. And those things need to be looked at overtime, but you also need to keep in mind that there is a flood zone there, and I don't know that that information was available or was utilized when they developed that concept plan back in — I think it was 1990. Now that we have developed the park and have lived with it for a few years, we know what the reactions in the springtime are. We need to take that into consideration, when you consider additional development in that area.

MS. BORGUS: I would hope then that in — in this plan, this current plan, somewhere we allow for some of those amenities that were taken out of the plan for Union Station, because they're good ideas.

SUPERVISOR LOGEL: Yes. I think the bocce court and the — the horse shoes shouldn't — I mean — when you look at the park there, to the right of — and east of the lodge itself, is just open field, that certainly the horseshoe facilities would not take a tremendous amount of effort to put in nor would they take a tremendous amount of maintenance. And the bocce basically is just a mowed field. I mean — I think we could definitely take a look at those two, don't you think?

MS. BORGUS: My suggestion would be before this Committee disbands that they search out that map. I could come up with mine if they need to have — if they need to find one easily, and take a look at some of these things, before we put this thing into its final — absolutely final form. Thank you.

MR. CARUSO: Well, if I could, one of the things that was recommended was to look at individual parks, pick one a year and do some of the things that we did like we did to Davis Park, as an example. Some specific improvements. This is a visionary document. We're — here is where we're going, standards and — and the quality of care and — you know, it wasn't a document for us to say we need to paint the garbage cans. We need signs, not what should be on the signs. Yeah, we need ball fields and this many, but not how we should stripe them. So well, I do not disagree with what was said. It just — this may not be the document to try to stuff every little thing in, otherwise we would have never got out of committee.

When this Committee got together, their juices were flowing. We wrestled and we can all smile now, but we wrestled with being very tactical, with being visionary. We were trying to do a Master Plan and not the Davis Park improvements plan.

COUNCILMAN SLATTERY: One thing to touch on with Dorothy (Borgus), though, that was a grant, a matching grant, so there -- you know, the funds, we have to review the funds as well and the costs associated with building the fields and so forth and how much we spent so far, as well

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: It is probably not inappropriate, though, to capture the thought in the final document that when considering how to update the Union Station Park, that we acknowledge the existence and utilize the concept document from the grant. It doesn't necessarily mean -- doesn't necessarily indicate that we're, in fact, going to build what that concept document has in it, but when we're doing the pick-a-park-a-year model, acknowledge the fact that that concept document exists.

MICHAEL CURLEY: I also think it is important to add a lot of the conversation has been revolving around athletic fields. As I mentioned earlier in the introduction, this Committee is made up of members from all walks of life and experiences and backgrounds. There was a tremendous amount of conversation that revolved around passive recreation, passive opportunities and that's something that I feel is just as important, if not a little bit more important than the athletic fields because we have a number of athletic fields here in Town, and yes, we do need more, but I have heard a lot of people say this Town has catered to the special interest groups, catered to the sports groups and they're a large population, but at the same time there is a larger population that is not utilizing the parks for athletic reasons, and we need to capture what

they want, which is the walking paths, the picnic areas. So I just want to make sure that that goes on record, that this Committee was very diligent about discussing passive recreation. as well.

COUNCILMAN SCHULMERICH: I hear you're promoting a balance, which I think is very appropriate.

The Public Hearing was closed at 9:40 p.m.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING**

A Public Hearing was held by the Chili Town Board on February 7, 2007 at the Chili Town Hall, 3333 Chili Avenue, Rochester, New York 14624 at 9:40 p.m. to consider extension of Chili Consolidated Drainage District to serve the Marchioni property, tax map no. 146.03-1-5, 100 Old Scottsville-Chili Road property.

Attendance as previously noted in the 2/7/07 Chili Town Board meeting minutes.

No one was present to represent the property located at 100 Old Scottsville-Chili Road property.

COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE AUDIENCE: -

DOROTHY BORGUS, 31 Stuart Road.

MS. BORGUS: When these things come, drainage district additions and so forth come before the Board, it is usually because there is some kind of a plan in place or there is something being contemplated for that property. Can you tell me if this is the plan here? I don't imagine that Mr. Marchioni is looking for more -- a bigger tax bill. There has got to be a reason why this is being brought up at this point.

RICHARD BRONGO: It's on here because he was asked by the Planning Board to apply to go into the drainage district. What the Planning Board has looked at, I have no idea. I don't know if he is looking to build a home on this property. I don't know if he is looking to build an addition to something that already exists. That information doesn't come forward. All I get is a letter that states that he is — been asked to apply to go into a drainage district.

MS. BORGUS: I see. I haven't read this in its entirety. Is there an acreage mentioned -- it says, "Property description on file in the Town Clerk's Office." I was just wondering how many acres we're talking about here.

RICHARD BRONGO: I have that in the Town Clerk's Office. I don't have it here. I don't know how large a piece of property it is.

MS. BORGUS: Is this where Mr. Marchioni lives?

RICHARD BRONGO: I don't believe so. I think it is a piece of property that is co-owned with his daughter-in-law. Because Rita is not his wife.

MS. BORGUS: The number would be fairly close to his home, though. If it isn't, it must be adjacent.

RICHARD BRONGO: Could be. I don't know.

MS. BORGUS: Thank you.

The Public Hearing was closed at 9:42 p.m.

The next meeting of the Chili Town Board is scheduled for Wednesday, March 7, 2007 at 7:00 p.m. at the Chili Town Hall meeting room.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.