

**TOWN OF PHILIPSTOWN CONSERVATION BOARD**

**Via Zoom**

**January 12th, 2021**

**Minutes**

The Conservation Board held its regular meeting on Tuesday, January 12th, 2021

**Present:**

Mark Galezo

Andy Galler

Jan Baker

Krystal Ford

MJ Martin

Robert Repetto

Max Garfinkle (Natural Resources Review Officer)

**Absent:**

Lew Kingsley

**PLEASE NOTE that these minutes were abstracted in summary from the meeting and a taped recording.**

**Mark Galezo opened the meeting at 7:30 pm**

Chairman Galezo asked Max Garfinkle to speak about the Desmond Fish Library project.

Max Garfinkle stated that the Conservation Board received a referral from the Planning Board directed to the Conservation Board regarding requirements for a wetland permit for the Desmond Fish Library project. Unknowing to Conservation they were not also concurrently going to the Planning Board during the time that they came before the Conservation Board to file for an application. The Conservation Board had conditionally approved a wetlands permit based on the application packets received in November 2020 and now that applicant is in front of the Planning Board that Mr. Gainer had reached out to Conservation just to ensure that they had the opportunity to review and comment and or enforce or administer a permit for the project. Mr. Garfinkle is going to reach back out to the Planning Board and just catch them up to speed on where they stand and then they should be good to go from there.

**Riverview Industries, 3012 Route 9, Cold Spring TM#27.20-1-12.1**

Glenn Watson stated that he thinks they left the last meeting pretty much with most issues resolved and they were going to wait to hear from Max Garfinkle with regard to what they've discussed. He does not have a lot to add but is hoping that they've solved the issues that they've talked about and can move forward.

Mr. Galezo stated that he had relayed to Max Garfinkle the best he could the discussions they had at the meeting and the questions that the board had that they wanted Mr. Garfinkle's input for a few reasons, the mitigation plan and then a continued discussion about the impervious versus pervious of the whole you know paving area. Mark Galezo stated that he's still concerned about that. He continued that he knows Mr. Watson addressed that and answered the question that they are putting down crushed up asphalt essentially.

Mr. Watson replied that he thinks it was Mr. Galler who said that his driveway was (inaudible) is the one that said that it is impervious from a technical point of view.

Mr. Galler stated that it is impervious but that's the one problem he has on his driveway is because it is impervious that it just causes water to cascade down. He continued that there's no ideal for this and thinks the biggest concern other than getting it right and he thinks Mr. Watson and his people have pretty much gotten it right is if there is going to be any leakage of oil or other petroleum-based fluids what's the best way to handle it? Should there be a certain part of the yard where any type of work that's done it's done there towards the front.

Mr. Galezo agreed. He added that his feeling is that if it's impervious it's a good thing and if they can sort of isolate the areas where the leaking transmissions and rear ends and hydraulic lines if they can somehow require that to be in one spot it's not scattered all over the surface and that spot is particularly well controlled with the oil separator. They wanted to see some sort of a maintenance program for it, a better understanding of what the filtration was in it. Is it actually just a box with you know a like a septic tank where it's got a barrier in it?

Glenn Watson replied yes, it's a barrier.

Mr. Galezo asked Max Garfinkle to remind the board exactly what some of the things were that they talked about.

Max Garfinkle stated that based on the meeting prior to December they had discussed creating an impervious surface that was sloped to some sort of a filtration system that could be maintained, potentially curbing or delineating the boundary of the parking area in a more permanent way with fencing or some sort of other material and then also tied in with this to rectify the violation was to put in a maintenance and monitoring plan for any sort of wetland restoration or wetland improvement work that would be done to further rectify the violation that the applicant has in front of them. He thinks those were the main items where we land and coming to some sort of a happy medium with all those things. He stated he would defer to the board in terms of what their decision would be on all that but those were the items that were discussed and had been conveyed to the Planning Board as well.

Mr. Galezo stated he thinks they dealt with the curbing idea with Mr. Watson. He had those big concrete blocks the board was good with that; he's contained it and they're accepting that the impervious is impervious and it's all draining towards that grease trap. He stated that MJ Martin had brought up the maintenance agreement at the Appalachian Markets and the board thought they could look at that and see if they can bring that into this.

MJ Martin stated that Mr. Watson was going to look back in his files for that.

Mr. Watson stated that he will do that.

Mark Galezo stated that the other the only thing that he had and Mr. Watson addressed it was that everything was draining to that very north corner it just didn't seem to him like that was the most efficient way to collect it all but Mr. Watson said if they collected in the middle where basically they're letting whatever pollutants there are go to the center instead of to the edges.

Mr. Watson stated that could be that could that is a potential problem but then Margaret McManus their engineer was on was the the call and she stated that they also had a grade problem to get enough flow of the water. If they put a pipe under the under the pavement and in the middle, they'd have too long a pipe to have positive flow towards the outflow. That's why it ended up in the corner. He continued that he thinks all of what was said is a correct review of what we talked about. He would add that they did have a requirement on the plan to work with Max Garfinkle to develop the plan, to the west of the parking lot there's the wetlands that has been invaded and needs to be restored and they had suggested a requirement to work with Mr. Garfinkle to develop a particular plan with regard to that restoration.

Max Garfinkle stated that his only hesitation about moving forward with that outside of the board would be that it's going to be a multi-year commitment and he doesn't know how unless they pass some sort of a resolution here it's going to be a multi-year financial commitment to the applicant and he doesn't want to walk away from this process before they can make that assurance that that happens just between Mr. Watson and Mr. Garfinkle or whoever he would be dealing with from Badey & Watson.

Chairman Galezo asked what the board members think.

Mr. Galler stated that he thinks they're almost there. To him the two things that are missing right now is restoration mitigation to the pocket wetland which is not a big deal but will take several years to maintain it and that sort of ties into a maintenance agreement because the maintenance agreement would cover that as well as the filtration for where the petroleum products might reach.

MJ Martin agreed with Mr. Galler.

Robert Repetto stated that he felt they did a great job putting that together. He continued that he agrees with the maintenance program. The only thing he thinks might be missing is if there's a spill, some type of mitigation program if there's a bigger spill than just something that the catch basin could handle. He stated that obviously the DEC has some guidance and things like that but wanted to know if there are procedures that could be put here.

Glenn Watson stated that there are spill kits that come in a big barrel and they are kept on site or can be kept on a truck or wherever. They come in various sizes and they certainly could put a couple on site. Assuming that they don't have to use them, they're going to be fine until you use them and then you replace them. He stated that he doesn't have any problem with the maintenance agreement at all and he'll get that out and thinks what they could do is make a deposit that would fund Mr. Garfinkle's annual inspection or semi-annual inspection for say five years or something like that.

Chairman Galezo stated that he doesn't feel like five years is enough but if they can add the spill kits as a written requirement.

Krystal Ford stated that she's fine as long as you know restoration plan is being worked out and asked if there was any sampling to see if there was any leakage over the years.

Glenn Watson stated that they didn't need to do any sampling.

Jan Baker stated that he thinks this all sounds right.

Mr. Watson stated that they need a wetlands permit

Max Garfinkle stated that they can make the permit conditional on the items that they have concerns about but he thinks the board should take a look at the maintenance agreement before they make a final decision. He continued that they've run into these situations before with other applicants where this is the piece that's lacking and can get thrown to the wayside pretty easily.

Mr. Galezo stated that they feel what happens is that the Planning Board says okay the wetlands board was fine with it we're going to issue the permit then it comes back to the Conservation Board and the applicant wants the permit but Conservation needed those three contingencies fulfilled and the applicant turns around and says well we've already got approval from the Planning Board. He added that with all due respect the question was asked at the last meeting if they can get the maintenance plan and all that information.

Mr. Watson agreed and added that the Conservation Board actually has permitting authority here and that permitting authority is just as important in its own sphere as the Planning Department's decision, so if they require a maintenance agreement and if they require a funding of inspection fees for some period of years that's enforceable under the Conservation Board's permit. He continued that he'll have an agreement for the board to look at and will share it with Mr. Garfinkle before turning it in. He asked if the board could direct Mr. Garfinkle to prepare a resolution to be considered at the next meeting.

Mr. Galezo stated that he's good with that and asked Mr. Garfinkle if he can follow through on his end.

Mr. Garfinkle replied yet, he's fine with that. He added if Mr. Watson wants to submit and go back and forth in terms of idea sharing regarding the plan, he's fine with doing that and as long as he can submit it before the next meeting so the rest of the board can take a look at it that's more comfortable in his mind.

Chairman Galezo thanked Mr. Watson for his patience.

**Chloe Swansen & Edward Murphy, 720 Route 301, Cold Spring, New York (Site Visit) WL-329 TM# 39.-2-5**

Chairman Galezo recused himself from this application.

Chloe Swansen stated that Margaret McManus will probably be the best one to explain everything that's happened.

Ms. McManus stated that after the last meeting they discussed Badey & Watson preparing a plan that showed the existing condition and the proposed condition of where they want to put the house. When this house burned down Badey & Watson came out to the site and did extensive soil testing to find a different location for the septic system that would have moved it away from the hundred-foot setback from the stream but unfortunately most of this area has

bedrock that is within two feet of the surface. A permit was issued for using the existing dry wells and upgrading the septic tank from a metal septic tank to a concrete septic tank and that actually was already accomplished. Chloe Swansen went to the health department and secured a renewal of that permit and that was issued in 2019 and is valid until July 2021. So, the septic system that exists is this concrete tank and these two dry wells. There's also an additional drywall that was approved by the health department in 2005 that picks up just gray water from the washing machine and that is the configuration that they are planning to use again in the future. The driveway has extensive walls that were built in order to get the proper grading and there's an existing concrete pad that does have to be removed to build the new house but it is the area where the old house was and basically it's going to be in the same location. The wetland permit would be for building the new house and for connecting from the house to the septic tank and then to this drywall. Ms. McManus stated that there is a pipe already existing and she's sure they can connect somewhere closer to the house and won't have to trench all the way to this drywall.

Andy Galler asked if there are leaching field for this septic system. And asked if it's a cesspool.

Ms. McManus replied, no because a cesspool would not have a septic tank. a The solids are separated out in a septic tank and then just the effluent goes to the dry wells which is similar to an older fashion system but it is approved by the health department and in the meantime staff went out and did a dye test, hooked up a hose from the well and ran water through the tank for over an hour so the somewhere between probably between 300- 600 gallons of water went through the system and there was no indication of dye on the surface they're confident that this system is in good working order.

Andy Galler stated that what troubles him is that essentially they're removing some solids but there's no anaerobic bacteria that's then breaking down the effluent like a leaching field would do.

Margaret McManus stated that no there's still a bacteria level at the bottom of the of the tank so there is still an anaerobic condition.

MJ Martin asked if what she was saying that it comes from the tank and in to the drywell.

Ms. McManus replied that the effluent goes from the tank into the drywell the drywell does similar to a fields the fields just distribute it over a larger area but it's still the same concept.

Andy Galler asked what is the diameter and the depth of the drywalls.

Ms. McManus stated that that she needs a minute to find that information.

Robert Repetto stated that he thinks the process is very different. Having a tank like drywall you know maybe you're getting some batch wise anaerobic breakdown but it's not the same type of continuous process that a field would be.

Margaret McManus stated that this is a system that is approved by the Putnam County Department of Health and it's their system and it's their approval.

Robert Repetto replied but it's in the wetland buffer.

Ms. McManus stated that it's an existing system, she's not asking to put it in. It exists.

Mr. Repetto replied yes but the house has to be built to use it.

Andy Galler stated that he's thinking more of what was used at Manitou recently with the peat system would make sense here. He'd be comfortable with something like that but he's not really comfortable with just basically a dry well. We're taking stuff that's coming out of a septic tank and going into a dry well. It might not leak to the surface but knowing the lack of porosity of the ground in the entire town but in this area that's definitely steep and rocky. We're not only within a wetland buffer roughly 30 – 40 feet from the stream bed itself on the ladder of the two dry wells. He added that he doesn't know how everybody else feels but feels that they really need to think about some better alternative.

Margaret McManus stated that she has to disagree with the comments because the department of health has approved the system, they know where the water is, they know what the system does. This is not the board's determination on what septic system can be used for the house. The permit is on the house location.

Robert Repetto stated that if Ms. McManus is going to be argumentative without letting the board continue their train of thought and discussions then we can end this session.

Ms. McManus stated that she did not want to end it but does think that they're overstepping what they're allowed to approve.

Mr. Repetto stated that no we're not, they're responsible for the buffer. The septic system which is just a dry well which is 1950s technology is basically in the buffer and to use that system we have to give you a permit to build a house and his feeling is that in 2021 we can do some upgrades to this system design to improve the support of the wetlands here. He continued that if they follow Ms. McManus's train of thought whatever was approved in the 1920s by the health department would still be acceptable today but that's not okay. We have an obligation as a community to improve the wetland buffer and the streams around us and that's why we have a Conservation Board. If we didn't exist and didn't have volunteers spending their time doing this then anybody could do whatever they want as long as it met 1920 laws but that's not what were her for. We're here to mitigate it and to try and make it an improved process so that it's upgraded for the current situation and meets the needs of the other residents not just the homeowners and what the board of health says.

MJ Martin agreed with Mr. Repetto and asked Mr. Galler about a possible addition to the existing system that may make it a little more bearable.

Mr. Galler replied that what he was suggesting what they permitted recently at Manitou was using a peat system. Essentially, you're going from a septic tank to it's almost another septic tank that's filled with layers of specialized peat and this box acts as a compact miniaturized leaching field and the specs that they got on and they did approve it were very impressive. It does take a little more maintenance, yes but not a lot. It's not a system where you'd have to continually pump it out. You'd have to monitor it and we were told every 10 to 15 years replace the peat in it and he would suggest something more like that. It's something that he believes is affordable, would give the community the protections that it needs for the stream and it is up-to-date technology.

Ms. McManus stated that rather than a peat system there is an alternative treatment unit that would be put between the tank and the drywell that actually cleans the effluent so that the effluent that goes into the leaching field would be much cleaner than just separating it in the tank and that is an affordable alternative for a residential application.

Andy Galler stated that they would need to see the specs on that but that sounds to me what you're doing is it's removing more of the solids but you're not necessarily removing all of the contamination. It's either you're dealing with things that are microns or smaller in size.

Margaret McManus replied, yes, it's very small, she can provide you with the specifications on it.

Robert Repetto stated that the difference with the peat system is it does provide some bacterial breakdown that you wouldn't get with a sock filtration system so that's the difference.

Ms. McManus stated that she's not sure that there is an area that would hold an underground system that size but would have to look to see what's available on the site.

Mr. Galler stated that they weren't that big, it was something in the order of 8' by 12' it was small.

Ms. McManus asked how deep was it though.

Mr. Galler stated that he thought the depth was in total 5'.

Mr. Galezo asked if he could suggest if we can find the information from that application will happily share it was a minuscule system and it's like you know 50 feet from the river.

Mr. Galler added that he believes that was it was either a three- or four-bedroom house. In terms of occupation it's twice what this applicant needs.

Ms. McManus asked if they got approval for that use from the Putnam County Department of Health.

MJ Martin stated that she's just googling and looking at some plans for these systems online and also the costs and thinks for the homeowners this is an affordable more secure option for the location of their planned home considering how close it is to the stream.

Ms. McManus stated that she'll have to check with the board of health.

Mr. Galezo added that if we can get the information to Ms. McManus as quickly as we can that's easy enough to share and can we possibly share the name of the people that actually did the system you might be able to get the specifics about it.

MJ Martin suggested the applicant go to the Lake George Association their systems now actually have a page on their website if you just want to look to get of up to speed on this technology and how it's used it is pretty impressive.

Robert Repetto stated that maybe we could also provide the date that the meetings occurred and they can go back and watch the videos of the other prior applicant when we talked about the peat system.

Krystal Ford stated that she just dropped the peat filtration document from the University of Minnesota in to the chat that Mark had sent out back in October.

Margaret McManus asked if before we sign off can we agree that the house location is the best location for the house.

MJ Martin said, yeah let's talk about the house and see if there's anything else.

Margaret McManus stated that there's about half of the house concrete pad is still there but it is basically the same location that the house was since 1950. Moving farther up the hill would move the house out of the buffer area but it would create a lot more disturbance because they would have to disturb more of this steeper slope area to bring the driveway up and they'd have to flatten out an area so it seems that this is the most logical place to put the house that has the least amount of disturbance on the driveway and the bridge already exists the retaining walls already exist to hold up the driveway.

Max Garfinkle asked if there is an increase in total area of the house, is that what the golden box is showing?

Ms. McManus noted that that is a deck area so that just has posts.

Andy Galler asked if the deck area is bigger than the original footprint or is it the same?

Ms. McManus confirmed with the applicant that the footprint is larger.

Mr. Galler asked what are the board's thoughts on the deck itself meaning the deck which would be south which is within the wetland buffer versus other parts of the deck.

MJ Martin asked what's the drainage plan off the roof, how are they moving the water from the house site?

Ms. McManus replied that she would assume that we would collect the roof and leader drains and discharge it just down the hill with a rip-rap outlet so it would slow it down.

MJ Martin stated that she can't tell from this is the deck is elevated.

Ms. McManus stated that she will share the floor plan.

Chloe Swansen stated that she has an elevation view that shows it from a previous submittal showing how elevated the deck will be from the ground for the front and the side if that shows a little bit clearer.

Ms. McManus stated that basically the deck is elevated almost a story above the ground.

Robert Repetto stated that he thinks the water management off the roof and the deck will be important to point out how they're going to be managing that, what kind of systems they may be putting in place to try and direct that water flow so it doesn't create significant damage.

Margaret McManus noted that they'll show the collection of the leader drains to a discharge point and a rip-rap outlet. The runoff from the deck usually goes between the slats. She will talk to the Swansen's but if they put stone underneath the deck that would mitigate runoff. She then asked if there are any other comments on the house location?

Andy Galler asked if they are all okay with using the original site.

MJ Martin agreed.



Robert Repetto noted that he thinks we might want to look at the runoff on the driveway as well just how that flows so it's going in a controlled way. He doesn't remember what was on the sides of it but might want to mitigate some of that as well so that it's just not creating gullies along the sides of driveways and things like that.

Chairman Galezo asked if everybody has weighed in? He stated again that he's recusing himself and not trying to push any decisions in any direction but just wanted to keep moving the meeting moving.

Max Garfinkle asked Ms. McManus if she has a clear line forward in terms of what the board needs.

Ms. McManus replied yes and asked that Mrs. MacIntyre send her the documents.

Max Garfinkle stated just to reiterate from the board's perspective we just need a completed site plan with (inaudible) fencing and all obviously the basics for any sort of construction project, especially one occurring within the buffer so all of those details need to be included on the plan and any sort of environmental protections that she wants to include.

MJ Martin added if you can show the drainage.

Robert Repetto stated that when they've got projects that are either necessary or maybe not really necessary for a property owner that's working in the buffer and in this case regardless of what was grandfathered from 1950 if you're working in the buffer, they're going to be expecting some mitigations and new technology to be used to try and offset the damage or the potential risk and that's just a consistent message that this board has sent. He asked if that maybe the applicant look at back at that other meeting and you'll see a consistent response.

Ms. McManus stated that she knows they're going to disagree on that but that's this is your approval and she will look into whether or not the peat system is approvable at this location by the health department.

Mark Galezo stated that he just wanted to point out to Ms. McManus that it's something that's sort of an ongoing problem they've had with the health department and that they will approve things which then come to the board which are utterly not approvable so that is why they are being a little bit obstinate here. Just because the health department approved it does not mean it is acceptable so he thinks that that's something to keep in her head going forward.

Max Garfinkle added just to build off of those points the town does have illicit discharge ordinances that they administer and ultimately these types of protections are put in place to help the homeowner in the future. They don't want to put somebody in a situation where the fines or consequences could outweigh. Just taking a harder look at an improvement at the time. That's where this is all coming from sentiment-wise from the board.

### 2020 Natural Resources Inventory

Roberto stated that he and Max Garfinkle just wanted to announce that they completed the 2020 natural resources inventory and presented it to the Town Board on Thursday. The

inventory as well as all of the maps are available via the [climatesmartphilipstown.org](http://climatesmartphilipstown.org) website and they're going to put it up on the Philipstown website underneath the town code and plans section since the 2007 natural resource open space protection plan is there as well. In addition to that they'll put out some press releases to the local newspapers just to let them know that the town is officially releasing this report and that essentially leaves the next steps of the online interactive tool that they talked about back in October. He added that now listening to different property owners talking about issues he ends up thinking about so many different resources that could be impacted by these decisions and is incredibly grateful that we have a Conservation Board to protect a lot of life forms and ecosystems that would be overlooked otherwise. They received a lot of input from the Hudson Highlands Land Trust and also the New York State DEC Hudson River Estuary program and they both provided really helpful comments on maps and the narrative sections as well for the report and also throughout the process he would check in with both of them at different points and they had resources they could give to us but also just recommendations on different guides to use so when the town eventually has to update this NRI, he thinks the recommendation is to do it every 10 years. So, in 2030 if the land trust and the DEC Estuary program are still in existence, they're definitely a good resource.

Mark Galezo stated that just wanted to say they're grateful for all his hard work.

Roberto stated that the last item was to just quickly discuss next steps for developing the online version of the maps. It's available through ESRI ARCGIS, their online tool and it allows you to select any of the layers in the inventory and put them on top of each other. Included are tax parcels so it's a really useful tool as you're looking at what's happening on a specific property especially maybe for this education sense where during a meeting you could even show a property owner this is why we're doing this, these are the different resources that could be impacted and also the idea is to make it available to the public and the Climate Smart Task Force will definitely push to get the information out there or what's adaptation part of the campaign. Last we left off we were focusing on the report and the pdf maps. Once all that is finished all that essentially it'll take uploading some more layers but then it can be anyone who's interested helping out to possibly make some choices about different colors for layers and ways to make it as presentable as possible.

Max Garfinkle stated that he a few more items just to include so that the data sets complete online and then will be able to do a soft release to this group so they have a URL that they can go and log in and it'll be something similar to the natural resource mapper that DEC has available now but with a little bit more of added detail and what information is available that's Philipstown specific. So, any suggestions on user clarity would probably be the best next step just so kind of ease of access, what should be displayed initially when you open the website up, things like that are going to be really helpful. Those are some of the things that having a few more people involved because it's somewhat subjective may help give a better end product. That being said a lot of this stuff could change that's the beauty of using these online tools is so it could always be something that's added or improved upon as more information or new information comes out so it'll probably be kind of a beta form in the beginning and then eventually as people get to use it and understand it more something that's a permanent fixture when people are doing development review in the town.

Roberto asked if is everyone familiar with the Hudson Valley Natural Resource Mapper from the DEC? He added that he has found it incredibly helpful as a complementary tool to writing the sections of the NRI in part because they kind of clean up some of the metadata for the files that

go into the maps and give really nice summaries of each of the data layers and also when you click on a polygon or a point on some of the maps it'll bring up a window with further information and links to additional resources it's really well designed. It most likely well beyond what we can put together in the short run but it may kind of give an idea of what to shoot for. Some of the layers that they have duplicate with our maps even though we've gone further and included other layers as well so it may give ideas of you know different colors to use and so on and so forth.

Chairman Galezo stated that he just googled and added that it's so much information and it's in their best interest to start perusing it.

Roberto added that what on the Philipstown Climate Smart website it's the first thing you'll see if you go to [climatesmartphilipstown.org](http://climatesmartphilipstown.org) and there's a link to another page that has more info on it but he emphasized just start with the thing that you want to nerd out about the most and then dive into other sections because it does have so much information and it's kind of overwhelming in some ways because it's so rich. He definitely encourages folks to just look at the table of contents and it's the type of report where you can start at whatever chapter and still get a lot out of it.

Mr. Galezo added that yeah with any other resource like that you really have to start playing with it and just see what's there, the more you play with it the better. He then asked if there was anything else.

Max Garfinkle stated that the only storm water update is that they're going to be starting to draft the annual report that will be due in March so Mike Leonard sent Carl Frisenda and Mr. Garfinkle an email coordinating a date to kind of get together and discuss next steps on that. He added that he knows Mike Leonard wanted the NRI to be highlighted in that annual report too so it's something they're going to look at and see what sections can get incorporated.

Mike Leonard added that'll be an excellent plus for especially if they get a DEC audit. He thinks between that and the comprehensive plan changes the report's going look pretty good this year. He thanked Roberto and Max for their work and added it's going to be very helpful going forward because as they see here it seems like every month they're having to deal with these properties that are just not fitting with the overall plan and that's because there's not a lot of properties left to build on and so these properties that somebody would pass on a while ago are now ending up in front of us and these maps will help as people get more educated and the Building Inspector as well. We really need to try to see if we can start to learn how to nip these in the bud so that people get told right away coming in. He added that when he was Chairman of the Planning Board they would have administrative meetings with applicants when they walk in the door and it's really a major plus because you get to go over things with them there and go back and forth a little before they even come before the board so it was really beneficial and maybe we can get something like that in a way created for Conservation.

Robert Repetto stated that if engineering groups like the last several that we've had want to basically put an antiquated system back in the buffer and said that it was grandfathered as a repair. He added that they've seen this several times if these companies are going to continue to do that and then use the Putnam County Health Department's approval as a shield to say we can build in the wetland buffer it doesn't make this board feel good make me feel good to have

to argue with an engineer that these people hired about what is our responsibility which is to protect the wetland buffer and put better technology in there. He thinks the Town Board could really look at this and try and see if there's some way that they could have some outreach with the health department to at least discuss this and maybe get the buffers to match up so they're not saying 50 foot and we have 100 foot and we have some letter of agreement that they don't approve something until the applicant has a wetland permit.

Mike Leonard stated that in his experiences with them in the field have not been very positive overall. He doesn't understand why they don't look at the big picture. Carmel itself in his opinion having gone through different trainings is not very environmentally conscious like our town, so that does impact them to some degree but we have the two standards and it isn't just enough to just walk in here and tell us that the Board of Health said it's okay. As Bob pointed out their standards are less than ours so that's the kind of discussions he'd like to have but at the end of the day if they're not going to change then at least we're going to make it convey to them that it isn't just them. The applicants got to come in also and satisfy the board because we're not doing this to be tough, we're doing it because this is about science and affecting our waterways our wetlands. These buffers are very important. In some ways 100 feet even isn't the greatest but we try to come up with at least something reasonable. Our town is much different in my opinion than Carmel so we have to be more fanatical in some ways about the environment because of the over half the town steep slopes if we're not diligent and have a very good Conservation Board watching these things then things could go very bad for in a short period of time.

Mr. Galezo then asked for a motion to adjourn. MJ Martin motioned to adjourn. Andy Galler seconded. The vote went as follows:

Jan Baker: Aye  
Krystal Ford: Aye  
Andy Galler: Aye  
MJ Martin: Aye  
Robert Repetto: Aye  
Mark Galezo: Aye

The board was unanimous to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 8:37 pm

Date Approved: 5/11/21

Respectfully submitted by:  
  
Cheryl Rockett  
Board Secretary