

**TOWN OF PHILIPSTOWN CONSERVATION BOARD**

**Via Zoom**

**March 9th, 2021**

**Minutes**

The Conservation Board held its regular meeting on Tuesday, March 9th, 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**

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

Mark Galezo asked Mr. Watson to bring the group up to speed.

Mr. Watson noted that there were three things on the plan. They've identified the flood hazard boundary and this was taken from what's called shape files basically drawing files that you get from the government that's keyed to the same coordinate system that they use, the second thing the board wanted was the phragmites plan which they've outlined and then the third thing was the inlet protection plan that they outlined on the plan as well and those are the key elements of the plan. He noted that they had talked about a maintenance agreement and

they've looked quite diligently for the for the maintenance agreement for the catch basin that MJ. Martin had remembered about the Appalachian Market and didn't find it so what he's done is asked Luke Hilpert who is Mr. Reichard's lawyer to prepare a maintenance agreement so that they can distribute it to the board and the board could have one of the towns attorneys go over it and redline it and then he thinks they're done. He noted that there is a typo on the plan. It's noted that the maximum fine is up to 375,000 but it should be 37,500. There is an extra zero but the comma is in the right place. Mr. Watson continued that he's hoping that will that will satisfy the board and they can just send them back to the Planning Board so that they can finish the site plan review over there and with a report to them that an acceptable maintenance agreement for the catch basin should be in place before any approval is given or any building permit is given.

Mr. Galezo asked if anybody has any comments or thoughts.

Andy Galler stated that he just has a very minor thing on the control of phragmites. He stated that with the last sentence he would be far more comfortable if it said application rate shall be as recommended by manufacturer herbicide application professional and drop six pints per acre. It's both unclear if that six pints of concentrated rodeo or is that six pints? He doesn't think it's necessary it should just go.

Mr. Watson replied that they'll make that revision.

Mark Galezo asked if anybody else has a comment and he stated that they had agreed if the applicant could make these additions to the plan, we were all good with it.

Andy Galler stated that he's good with it and thinks they're ready to go and the only contingency is just an acceptable maintenance agreement but you know that would just be on the final issuing of the permit and he thinks they can vote on it all.

MJ Martin agreed with Mr. Galler.

Mark Galezo asked for a motion to give them a permit.

Andy Galler made the motion.

Glenn Watson noted that would be conditional on the satisfactory agreement and that the board can't really act to approve it until the SEQRA is passed by the Planning Board. He stated that they will have to come back to the Conservation Board but that he feels it's more appropriate to send a letter to the Planning Board saying they're prepared to do that when the SEQRA loop is closed.

MJ Martin clarified that they recommend proceeding conditional on a satisfactory maintenance agreement.

Jan Baker seconded the motion. The vote went as follows:

Andy Galler: Aye

Jan Baker: Aye

Robert Repetto: Aye

MJ Martin: Aye

Krystal Ford: Aye

Mark Galezo: Aye, unanimous

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

Margaret McManus stated that they submitted a package back to the Conservation Board and showed the continued use of the existing septic tank and then they have to add in a pump tank and are going to utilize the existing pipe that goes under the driveway so they don't have to disturb the driveway and that will go into these two Peat units which are sized according to the daily flow necessary for the two-bedroom house and then they're actually going to have the discharge to the drywell so the cleaned effluent that goes through the peat systems will go and recharge into the soil in the location that is best where the existing dry well is.

Andy Galler asked Ms. McManus of the two dry wells the one that they're using they feel is best.

Ms. McManus replied that the other existing dry well there is not enough room to put in the design system and get into this drywell and there is third dry well here but that just takes the laundry it's just the washing machine discharge so they know this dry well has adequate soil so that's where we'll discharge to.

Mr. Galler asked if anybody has any comments because it looks like everything, we've asked for has been addressed.

Robert Repetto asked about a maintenance agreement and treatment and stated that's something they'd wanted to look at in the past as well.

Margaret McManus stated that there really isn't much maintenance to be done to the Peat system you only have to replace the peat like every 10 years, like every other septic system you have to have your tank pumped every couple of years.

Robert Repetto stated that he thought it was more like five years with the last Peat system that we had I don't know if somebody remembers.

Andy Galler stated that it really depends how much it's being used, the climate and how everything works, in theory he'd like to think they'd get seven or ten years perhaps more from it.

Margaret McManus noted that the way that the system is set up there is a little discharge where you can take part of the effluent and send it to out to be tested and I think they recommend you doing that every couple of years based on the results of that then it's whether or not you have to replace the peat but those are all within the installation guidelines and maintenance guidelines

Andy Galler noted that they recently approved one of these systems in Manitou and he believes one of the things that was provided was a pretty simple maintenance agreement and thinks that we should probably share that with Margaret so that we could have that as part of the permit. Mr. Galler asked the group if they all feel that they're ready to issue a permit just essentially on the contingency that there is a maintenance agreement and I assume (inaudible) place with the Board of Health.

Margaret McManus stated that they will have to get the Board of Health approval before this can be installed, she added a note saying that they have to get the Board of Health approval before they can get a building permit there's a note on the plan to that effect.

Andy Galler stated that they can vote on this with two contingencies one is Board of Health approval and the second is a maintenance agreement that is suitable that you know the board agrees to so if everybody is comfortable voting on this, does somebody want to make a motion with those two contingencies? Mr. Galler also asked Mr. Garfinkle if he had anything else.

Max Garfinkle replied that he has nothing else and that they can do a conditional permit based on those two contingencies that you just that you talked about as long as you're comfortable with that maintenance agreement being what you want to see in place here it seemed pretty standard.

Jan Baker stated that he has no objection to doing it on that basis and his recollection is similar to Mr. Galler's about the last maintenance agreement for the maintenance agreement for the Peat system before and regardless though he doesn't think we're bound by what we did or didn't ask for in that maintenance agreement but having a maintenance agreement is useful to let the homeowner know what he or she should expect and it's also protective with respect to the town though subject to those two conditions including a maintenance agreement satisfactory to the board and the Natural Resources Officer he's happy to make a motion to that effect.

Andy Galler asked for a second, MJ Martin seconded the motion.

Jan Baker: Aye

Robert Repetto: Aye

MJ Martin: Aye

Krystal Ford: Aye

Andy Galler: Aye

Margaret McManus thanked the board and stated she will be in touch about the maintenance agreement and they'll get started on the health department approval.

Robert Repetto thanked the applicant for following through on the Peat system and bringing up the standard.

**Betsey Haddad, 15 Lake Celeste, Garrison, NY TM#72.17-1-15 WL#21-336**

Manuel Quezada stated that they have existing property a one story and a half-finished basement and what we're trying to accomplish is we extending about of the property where we relocating some of the areas with where the bedrooms count to make it more suitable for the use the particular use that Ms. Haddad will have with her family.

Mark Galezo asked Mr. Quezada if he could focus the conversation as this board is concerned with the wetlands buffer.

Manuel Quezada stated that the setback requirements we will be met but they have the wetlands buffer on each side. On the rear of the property unfortunately the setback requirements that they need they don't have. They only have about 39 feet and they are proposing 39.19 feet, they are within a buffer area and are looking for a relief of the remaining of the 100 feet so that's what we are here for.

Mark Galezo stated that the board is trying to make it clear to applicants that anything at all within the buffer which is not ultimately absolutely essential to the home; septic, well, etc., is highly frowned upon. He continued that they would absolutely not allow any kind of an expansion of the home within the buffer which would impact the footprint, if they build on top of the house it's not a problem for this board but to increase the coverage the ground coverage within the buffer, they would have to show extreme need and an addition is not extreme need.

Mr. Quezada asked if he would be able to go through the floor plans maybe they'll be able to help clarify some of the intent. He continued that what they are trying to accomplish is the same number of bedrooms that they have right now because the small footprint of the existing house doesn't allow a renovation within itself so they will have to expand to make more room for this. So, while they are extending 10 feet back from the existing encroachment, they are trying to accommodate a master suite portion and that's pretty much in sort of redoing some of the existing layout that doesn't work and doesn't accommodate the purpose now because of Covid a lot of people tend to use their facilities a little bit more and try to rearrange some of the stuff that we have going on in here. What we have limits us to go up a second story up for this particular purpose so that's what we are looking for without the relief of the 10 feet within an adding to the existing encroachment we won't be able to accomplish the existing layout that we have here now.

Robert Repetto asked if they could add on in the other direction and go away from the wetlands. He continued that's the problem with a lot of the homes that were legacy that were put in a wetland basically that there's really no room to expand but maybe the front here where the stone walkway is maybe there's some way, they could go that way.

Betsy Haddad stated that this house was built many years ago as a summer bungalow and she lives there full time and wanted to make it to accommodate it for full time and for her family. She stated that she could possibly build up but it would be less in keeping with the neighborhood, she feels it's a historical community of the summer bungalows and would like to preserve that look and prefer not to go up. She continued that she doesn't think they're making a really big ask, the front part where the stone walkway is pretty small and the narrowest part is the front where the stone walkway is so it would definitely be harder to go out front there and would make it very close to the other house.

Manuel Quezada stated that they have already have been in front of the Zoning Board which referred them to the Conservation Board and if they were to go in the front it will definitely encroach even more towards the front setback if we were to add something there. He continued that he would appreciate the boards consideration on this case

Robert Repetto asked why can't they move the bedroom out there, they already have another addition in the front.

Mark Galezo stated that in a lot of other municipalities any increase in the non-conformity in terms of even volume is considered a no-go in this particular municipality he thinks they're actually pretty lenient and that they even allow a volume in if for us for the wetlands anyway a

volume non-conformity as opposed to a footprint non-conformity so they're already dealing with a somewhat lenient board. He continued that this is not something that is essential, they're not concerned with the attractiveness of the house or the proximity to the property lines. What they are concerned with is the environment, with protecting the water quality which to his mind is more important than how close they are to the property line. That's something which the Zoning Board may deem to be something that is negotiable so he thinks this is a no-go in his opinion and the rest of the board has an equal vote but this is a no-go and the Zoning Board is a more likely path to acceptance.

Andy Galler stated that he agrees with Mark that the Zoning Board would be more lenient and would listen to us where we're uncomfortable with encroaching on the wetland buffer.

Mark Galezo stated that they would be happy to go look so they're familiar with the property but quite honestly thinks it's a no.

Robert Repetto asked why this is coming to us after the Planning Board right so we're trying to get ahead of this so that applicants spend less money. They're in a wetland buffer so clearly it should have come to the Conservation Board first.

Manuel Quezada stated that when they made the application it was for the Zoning Board. First, they did the application with the Building Department and they gave them the rejection letter and the first step was to go in front of the Zoning Board because they needed some variances. This is our first formal presentation of this project to any of the board.

Betsy Haddad stated that she respects the board's opinion and they really tried when we did this design to keep the any expansion away from the stream and they thought it was a modest ask but definitely they were trying to keep it away from the stream as much as possible and she wants to respect the environment too.

Mark Galezo stated that he'd be willing to go look at it and there are situations topographically that it's clear that there is no impact to the wetland you know in a very rare case where it's very clear to everyone that there this makes no there's no consequence then they could have a discussion but he thinks the rules that we're working with as a board is that anything within 100 feet is not allowed period. He stated that they are reasonable and would be happy to take a look at it but thinks they would be best served by looking at other options.

Mr. Quezada stated that he will have a conversation with his client and see what direction they may be able to go from here but if it's possible for any of the board members to visit the site maybe there's a different perspective.

Mr. Galezo stated again that they will happily look at but feels the consensus is going to be that we would vote no.

Mr. Quezada asked if they would need to come back to the Conservation Board with a different plan.

Mr. Galezo stated that if they are not increasing the footprint they will still have to come before us but their response is going to be much more favorable.

Mr. Galezo stated that if they go up with the addition what they're dealing with is the same amount of in infraction on the on the wetland if they then improve the effects on the wetland by

say taking the run off from the roof and the runoff from the impervious surfaces and put it into a drywell so that the water is not just running off an asphalt-based roof going into the stream then you are actually improving the situation so if they will have to come back to the board because they are within the hundred foot buffer but present something which is clearly not a problem they're very likely to get an approval in his opinion.

Mr. Quezada stated that they actually are proposing a green garden and all the runoff they are going to be containing within the site that's something that is part of their site plan itself even with this proposed plan right now they have that in the drawings that is part of their explanation of the exhibitions as well so he asked is if they decide to rearrange some of the design and make it work with our existing footprint is the board going to have more concerns of us know having a green a green garden having mitigations of the runoff within our own site you know improving all those things again is it something else that this board may be looking for that we would like to satisfy their concerns.

Max Garfinkle stated that the mitigatory measures beyond the rain garden is something that we can look at on the site by having a site visit and thinks that'll still be important but if the footprint of the house is going to change essentially the site visit is going to be important to gather information as to how the property could be improved if a permit is going to be granted in the future by the board, if there's additions that the homeowner is willing to make you to further enhance the quality and benefit of the protected resource on the property that is a major component of the wetlands code in Philipstown.

Mr. Galezo stated that he hopes they have left some doors open for the homeowner, he thinks if they can come up with a plan that's acceptable to the homeowner that does not increase the footprint that's the best, if you come up with something that increases the footprint away from the stream completely it's probably not going to get approved because just the increase in the footprint is just not a bad thing but as Max said if you counter that with a tremendous amount of mitigation you know it's certainly something that would be in discussion so if Max wants to set up a site visit they'll happily do that.

Mr. Quezada stated he will set up a site visit regardless of which direction and have a conversation with the client and go from there.

**ONLS LLC Natalie Diggins, 55 Country Hill Lane, Cold Spring, NY TM#38.-2-41.2 WL#21-337**

Thomas Lewis explained the project which is invasive plant removal project which occurs within the 100-foot buffer and partially into the wetland and he referred to a couple of photos in the application, he stated it's not a very dense infestation so they won't be broadcast spraying it will be targeted applications with herbicides that are approved for aquatic applications.

Andy Galler stated that he has some questions on the herbicides that they've picked. He asked if Fenoxaprop will be used for the stiltgrass.

Mr. Lewis stated that's not actually in this this section so this management plan is for the entire management of the area but not in that area.

Mr. Galler stated the red flag for him is the Pathfinder II and is for right-of-way uses; power lines, railroads etc. it's really not a particularly environmentally friendly formulation.

Mr. Lewis state that he agrees with him in a lot of respects with that and is okay not using it in the buffer. He continued that they use it a lot when they do a brush cutting treatment and then treat afterwards because a lot of times the regrowth that you get from the plants is kind of spindly and it doesn't have a lot of leaf material to accept a foliar application and so they'll use Pathfinder which provides a very targeted treatment but it is labeled for use where there's no water so they could avoid using it in this area there isn't a lot of work in there. It could be done with cut stem treatments and then if the foliar is sufficient.

Mr. Galler stated that what's within the buffer area, the woody plants they're looking at is the Barberry and the Bittersweet could be cut stem treated but the Barberry is a tough one to get rid of.

Mr. Lewis agreed and stated that there's kind of different areas. From the house down it's a moderate slope and that's an area where he envisioned using the Pathfinder on the regrowth and then you get down to a rock wall where the wetland proper starts and there's land that's a little bit higher and there's a stand of Barberry and he figured that would be cut stem with either Rodeo or Vastlan.

Mr. Galler stated that the problems with oil based is that unfortunately it since it is a semi-volatile herbicide it can do some damage to the overstory so his question is how would they protect the overstory.

Mr. Lewis replied that they have two different methods of doing it. It's either with a backpack sprayer or with a small pump bottle and the backpack sprayer is outfitted with a low volume with a low-pressure constant flow valve so not getting splash, you're not getting small particles that'll actually drift and then maybe land on a rock and start to volatilize. So, the foliar stuff that we'd be doing there would be with Vastlan which is similar to Garlon 3A so it mixes with water it's approved for even aquatic applications.

Mr. Galler stated that he's assuming most of this is spot treatment.

Mr. Lewis replied that yes that's the priority of the entire management plan is to maintain those natives there and then bring them in not ornamental natives but the real the stuff that actually went there.

Krystal Ford asked if there are plans once the invasive are removed to immediately plant with the good stuff so that it's not just a resurgence of the stuff that was there in the first place.

Mr. Lewis stated it's important to note they are not broadcasting spraying so it's not like a bare earth. The owner wants to replant and reclaim what's going if you look north to the state parks land that's what she wants to mimic. He continued that they don't have a written plan, he believes she's been searching for a landscape designer to kind of help with around the house. He stated that generally the way that he approaches doing this work if they're doing restoration, they actually do seed collection from the area and then kind of start building that in after maybe two years of control work. It gives you an opportunity to kind of see what's going on see the response. They don't want to put a bunch of nice plants in there and then all of a sudden there's a bloom of the invasive plants that they wouldn't have been able to take care of with those nice plants planted there.

Mr. Galezo asked Mr. Garfinkle and Mr. Galler if they feel this is this something they can permit right now.



Mr. Garfinkle stated that they have used Tom and his company on multiple projects in Philipstown and thinks the essence of his organization is restoration ultimately and responsible use of herbicides to accomplish that goal and that they've provided permits in the past for projects and we've repeatedly renewed those to continue restoration at multiple properties in Philipstown. He continued that he doesn't see Mr. Lewis' application wavering from any sort of methodology that he's used in the past on other properties and would advocate that if the board wanted to take a look at the site that's great otherwise, he wouldn't have any hesitations issuing the permits for this work and think his credentials and portfolio speak for themselves.

MJ Martin asked Mr. Garfinkle if he's been to the site.

Mr. Garfinkle stated that he's been very close and has worked pretty intimately on the state park lands just north of the property so it's very similar to that location. He stated that Mr. Lewis and he have talked about the plan and the project application on the phone as well and gone over it looking at aerial imagery.

Mr. Repetto asked what the timing is for the work.

Mr. Lewis stated that the cutting they'd like to do before April 15th which is like kind of a cut off for impacting nesting birds and then the treatments would occur kind of the cut stem could happen you know it'd all kind of be like as the regrowth happens. The herbicide work would actually happen probably later in the summer and then some of the cut stem would happen when we're doing the cutting like on the vines so we can release the trees so they can grow as they open up in spring and they don't get any regrowth so they'd want to apply when we actually do that that first cut you can't cut it and then wait until later because it'll heal.

Mark Galezo asked for a motion to offer a permit.

Mr. Galler stated that he's comfortable with the answers that have been provided in the methodology and if the board is in agreement, he's willing to make a motion.

Krystal Ford asked if Mr. Lewis knows what impact the herbicide might have on soil microbes that are directly in the vicinity of the plant because that impacts carbon sequestration.

Mr. Lewis stated that a lot of these herbicides really have very minimal if any impact on other fauna but the biota does become impacted in that immediate area.

Mr. Galezo asked for a motion to issue the permit.

Andy Galler made the motion. Jan Baker seconded the motion. The vote went as follows"

Jan Baker: Aye

Robert Repetto: Aye

MJ Martin: Aye

Krystal Ford: Aye

Andy Galler: Aye

Mark Galezo: Aye

The vote was unanimous.

Mr. Galezo stated that at next month's meeting they will approve any outstanding minutes. He asked Max Garfinkle if he has anything on storm water.

Mr. Garfinkle stated that they're working on the annual report so that'll be drafted and then presented to the Town Board in June for adoption for this year but the other two items that he wanted to bring up is that we had two outstanding site visits from last meeting based on the improvement of weather. He'd like to include those when they try to get out to the Lake Celeste property, the Old Albany post Road property and also the property in Continental Village regarding creating some sort of a small retention pond in the homeowner's backyard. He would like to schedule those within the next couple weeks because he thinks we'll have the snow off the ground and things will start to get warm after this the end of this week.

Mr. Galezo suggested that Mr. Garfinkle send an email with some dates.

Robert Repetto asked if the group was going to review the permit language.

Mr. Galezo stated that he thought Jan's verbiage was excellent

MJ Martin agreed and said she liked Bob's addition too.

Jan Baker agreed that Bob's addition was very appropriate because it may well be that a condition as we've discussed earlier tonight a decision to grant a hardship waiver may well need to be conditioned on requiring some additional mitigation. He added that while he doesn't know that we need to include that in this language he thinks it's very helpful to sort of put applicants and more importantly their engineers and architects and designers on notice as soon as possible so that we don't have applicants spending a bunch of money preparing very elaborate detailed plans that are really very unlikely to go anywhere because they just are highly unlikely to be approved by the board. He thinks the more notice we can give both the applicants and their professional advisors that this is a pretty tough sell given the rules that are in place in Philipstown the better for everybody.

The board members agreed.

Mr. Baker asked Mr. Galezo how to get this moving forward, should he send a note to Mike Leonard or should he draft a note that Mr. Galezo could send to Mr. Leonard with this language and ask him to present it for approval.

Mr. Galezo stated he would be happy to forward along.

Mr. Baker stated that he doesn't think any of us like the kind of situation we had earlier tonight where someone has done an awful lot of work unfortunately just going in the wrong direction.

MJ Martin asked if it make sense for us to put in the record that we all recommend the language that Jan has drafted for this and that we are we're all in support of it.

Mr. Galezo stated that it certainly wouldn't hurt.

Mr. Baker stated that he will draft an email for Mr. Galezo and the board that the board has become increasingly concerned about the topic where we need to do a better job of giving the

residents of Philipstown advance notice. Many of them either don't know about the rules at all or don't understand that we've been directed to apply those rules and that it's not a perfunctory thing to file an application and they'll immediately get a waiver that in fact applications are hard to get and you have to meet the criteria for them. He feels that kind of explanation and a note that the board unanimously approved the attached language which represented input from the entire board for Mr. Galezo to be able send the language to Mr. Leonard and ask him to present it for approval would be the right way to go.

Max Garfinkle asked if Mr. Baker thinks this could open up a bigger discussion in regards to including this into or amending the chapter 93 code. Mr. Baker replied absolutely. Mr. Garfinkle stated that is probably something they should do.

MJ Martin stated that will be the next step.

Max Garfinkle stated that he thinks the changes to the permit itself are pretty easy. He continued that when Greg Wunner (Building Inspector) came on he was able to change building permit applications and their fee schedules just going through the town attorney and then having them adopted by the town board. He thinks having it solidified in the code will help even more and build off of that there's a lot of a lot of discussion in the code regarding mitigation and the use of mitigation to for us to approve permits or the board to approve permits so adding that language would help clarify that even further.

MJ Martin asked when the Conservation Board is going to see Hudson Valley Shakespeare.

Mr. Galezo stated that yes there's view sheds, there's ridgeline, there maybe wetlands and deep slopes.

Mr. Garfinkle stated that there's wetland permitting too for that project he thinks it came to us as a referral so he will reach out to Ron Gainer and see where they're at but eventually they're going to need to come before the Conservation Board for permitting. He stated that usually they would get a site visit going at this point but doesn't know how far along they are in the process.

Mr. Galezo stated that they are going to need some guidance and I almost feel like we may want to get some consultation in all the different aspects that we're going to be asked to look at.

Andy Galler stated that he feels the sponsor or their agents needs to present to the Conservation Board. They're breaking it into four parcels, one of the parcels there's going to be a residence, one the golf course, the campus but there's another parcel. He thinks they need to get a big view of this because it is something that the Planning Board may or may not want to make a positive declaration under SEQRA and if that's the case either way it still needs to be reviewed as a single project not in stages so somebody needs to present to them.

Krystal Ford stated we're also we're also trying to get the natural resources inventory into law which could affect also how we even look at this project. She continued that Max and Roberto spent months putting together this whole natural resources inventory for us to use to make these big decisions.

Jan Baker stated that it's a huge project and thinks before it's finally resolved whatever happens it's going to be fairly bitterly contested. He's been told that there are a number of people who play golf there who are bitterly unhappy at the proposed cutback of the size of the golf course are supposedly hiring lawyers. His understanding is HVSF wants to rewild a lot of the land that

is now part of the golf course and turn it back to nature and just doing that in and of itself is a huge project but when you've got a lot of unhappy locals who if they in fact carry through and mobilize this thing, he's not sure anything could go on as long or be as bitter as the horse farm but thinks this thing has the potential to be much more controversial and divisive perhaps than we had all assumed it would be.

Max Garfinkle asked if Mr. Galezo wants him to draft a memo to Neal Zuckerman regarding this and just reiterate the concerns that were brought up and that we would like to be kept apprised of everything and if appropriate have representatives present to the Conservation Board.

Jan Baker stated that he thinks it would be helpful if all of the town boards that are ultimately going to be asked to weigh in on this got notice any time the Shakespeare group or their agents are making presentations to any of the town boards because speaking for himself this is so complicated and seems like such a big project and it's going to take a while to get his head around it understand what they're doing what all the implications are and the more opportunities to hear from the people who are designing the project and can explain it the more helpful it would be.

MJ Martin agreed with Mr. Baker and thinks the other value to that is that the sponsors of the project and the and the engineers that are working on it if we can get all the boards to hear the same presentation at the same time then there is a unity of message that sometimes gets broken down because we hear what sometimes what a sponsor makes or you know an engineer thinks or an architect thinks we want to hear and then they tell you know that the story is slightly different when it goes to the Planning Board that is a great all being together would be wonderful.

Max Garfinkle asked Ms. Rockett if it would be possible to notify this board of any applications, meetings, documents with Hudson Valley Shakespeare Festival project and any time they come in front of any of the boards.

Ms. Rockett replied yes, she can notify them and also send any documents digitally regarding HVSF project as they come.

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 8:58pm

Date Approved: 4/13/21

Respectfully submitted by:



Cheryl Rockett  
Board Secretary