

**TOWN OF PHILIPSTOWN CONSERVATION BOARD
December 14th, 2021 Minutes
Virtually Via Zoom**

The Conservation Board held its regular meeting on Tuesday December 14th, 2021.

Present:

Mark Galezo
Jan Baker
Andy Galler
MJ Martin
Robert Repetto
Max Garfinkle (Natural Resources Review Officer)

Absent:

Krystal
Ford
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.

Surprise Lake Camp, 382 Lake Surprise Road, Cold Spring, NY 10516 TM#27.-1-1.1 WL#19-318

Sheryl Kirschenbaum stated that she went through Bradley's old notes and she's going to request that the Board could please keep the two issues separate with the work they need to do down by that culvert. Nothing was done and she wants to be honest about it and it's embarrassing because they got the letter from the Board in 2019, their caretaker has spoken to Nick Lisikatos who said that he would come in and help them do whatever needed to be done up there. Mr. Garfinkle said after they spoke to the Board tonight that he will come and look at the site and she's asking the Board to please help her separate the issues because there are things she needs to do to get the camp ready for the kids and they had a board meeting tonight, they realized they are going to have to be putting in trees or whatever the Conservation Board wants them to do. Minimally she is asking if they Board can come out and see what has to get done so she can present it to her board because she believes replanting trees is going to cost some money and whatever it is they have to do they are happy to do.

Chair Galezo asked if they can have some sort of guarantee in any way shape or form that that work is going be, if there's something that can be held back at the end. He stated he would separate the two issues with an eye toward making sure that something happens.

MJ Martin stated that maybe escrow would be a good way to kind of ensure that that their expectations are met this time around.

Ms. Kirschenbaum stated she will bring it back to her board after this if someone can tell her what exactly that entails.

Mr. Galler stated that he and Mr. Garfinkle walked the property two years ago now after a logger had brought in a buncher feller and the damage was very significant. He added that he's not against separating the two but there needs to be some repair of the wetland where the road went through, he doesn't think it's so much planting trees.

Mr. Garfinkle stated that when this all first came to fruition, they had put together a memo stating what they felt were the proper items to rectify the situation. He forwarded that letter in a letter that parks had wrote to the camp as well regarding easement violations pertaining to that work. What Ms. Kirschenbaum is referencing in terms of work being done to rectify the situation he believes is in reference to those letters. It was to essentially replace the trees that were removed threefold with at least a minimum of a three-inch diameter sapling. Protect those with deer fence and then come up with a restoration plan for the logging road that was developed on the parcel. Essentially restore any sort of areas that were eroded from the skidder that was brought in to pull the timber out. That's kind of where it was left off and then the only other stipulation was to satisfy any conditions that the state had put forth to the camp. He wanted the Board to weigh in and see if they still felt like they wanted for the camp to pursue that direction in terms of restoring the area and then also to separate the projects apart and see if the Board could permit the bridge work for camp operations to continue in the future.

Chair Galezo stated that the idea of transplanting existing trees in his experience with that is something of a three-inch caliper tree transplanting that from native rocky soil is going to be tough at best but what do the Board members think?

Mr. Grosshandler stated that he made that comment before he heard the comment about the three inches. Three inches won't transfer very well. Typically, when they do this and it's normally in reforestation when they're doing wetland reclamation or new entrances into subdivision type projects often in an effort to preserve the natural vegetation, they'll often transplant but it's typically in a much smaller diameter, much smaller a caliper.

Mr. Garfinkle stated that his only comment to that would be is if they did go with a smaller diameter that they would need to have assurances regarding survivability of the plants and potentially increase quantity. That letter laid out basic guidelines but he doesn't know if the Board would be in favor of coming up with a restoration plan instead of just an enforcement letter. He thinks that would be more valuable and maybe associate some sort of bonding with that plan that would be a good way to move things forward.

Andy Galler asked where did the three-inch diameter come from?

Mr. Garfinkle stated that he believes that was just a metric that the Board threw out. He thinks the Board wanted assurances since the mature healthy trees were removed that they were going to be reforesting with some sort of increased vigor.

Mr. Galler stated that he would be more comfortable, those trees might survive, they might not survive. It's a relatively healthy forest, we're at a point that they had a mas crop this year and they'll probably have another one in the next year or two. He thinks a forester needs to be employed by the camp, figure out how to do this, how to fence it and he doesn't know if the town allows it but he thinks what Mr. Garfinkle brought up makes a lot of sense is really a bonding rather than an escrow because he doesn't think they could ever ask for enough of an escrow and he's sure the camp would not really be

comfortable if the Board wanted a 50 or 100 thousand dollar escrow, that's a lot of money to put up but if they had to put that up as a bond that becomes a lot easier to do.

Mr. Grosshandler stated that if it pleases the Board, he would have recommended a bond in response to the escrow anyway, that is the appropriate way to do that.

MJ Martin stated that she just wanted something that would ensure that that that they stayed focused on this as a project going forward until the trees met the expectations.

Chair Galezo stated there's kind of two issues; there's the removal of the trees which obviously they're never going to replace 24-inch diameter trees, it's going to take 100 years so focusing just on the trees is great they should get some trees back in there but maybe a massive effort to improve the wetland itself maybe money is better spent there maybe they can make a really good wetland out of something that maybe was not so good before.

Mr. Galler stated that his memory is not perfect but being out there it's not a large wetland. It appeared to be healthy and relatively undisturbed other than the road going through it. In his mind he thinks they need to consult with somebody that's familiar with restoring wetlands but he doesn't think it's a huge amount of planting. It's more of okay a road went through it, how do they get material out, how do they try to get it back to what it was and he does think there's probably enough existing flora there that it'll come back and then working with a decent forester to allow the areas that have been cut to come back. He doesn't think they necessarily need to plant trees. It's possible if after a couple years if they're not seeing regeneration, they would do that but he thinks it's more fencing and making sure there's not unnecessary disruption or compaction of the soil that's taken place. He doesn't have a problem breaking the two things apart as long as there's a bonding mechanism to make sure this gets done.

Chair Galezo asked what the stipulations for what would cause the bond to be forfeited? They have to talk about what that would be and then let's move on.

Mr. Repetto stated failure to maintain the trees that they've planted so that they can continue to grow. It has to be a multi-year endeavor here that shows that this kind of damage is going to be monitored for years. It's unfortunate that it happened but this is the kind of thing that the Board really needs to let the applicants know that they take it seriously. This has been an ongoing thing for quite some time and the applicant disappeared for a while.

Chair Galezo stated what the applicant is asking is for the Board to give a permit to or lift the stop work order so they can keep going with the other part of the project, does anybody have an objection to that. He then asked for a motion to lift the stop work order under Mr. Garfinkle's supervision?

Mr. Baker made the motion, Mr. Galler seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously to lift the stop work order.

Chair Galezo then asked Mr. Garfinkle if he could spearhead the bond and does he have to write an official document?

Mr. Garfinkle stated if the camp can come up with a restoration plan that focuses on a silvicultural approach and also a wetlands restoration approach then he thinks that document is something that the Board can hold in their hands that's backed by professionals that they can use and bond. It should have a timeline and a sequence of events for them to achieve certain metrics that the Board's comfortable

with. If they can get the ball rolling and present that to the Board, he thinks that that's a little bit less ambiguous than the letter stating replace in kind three times at X rate at X size. One of the big things if he's recalling correctly was that they didn't have a full understanding of how many trees were removed. If they can at least include that and try to quantify it in some way so they're not going above and beyond what was done that would be extremely helpful for both parties. Then they can go from there and can actually see something and critique something in hand.

Mr. Grosshandler stated that they want to make sure they're engaging either the proper foresting agent or an arborist or somebody that can come in and guide them properly. They will endeavor to have that for next month but in the event that they haven't found a consultant or the consultant's been engaged but hasn't had time to prepare a plan he doesn't want to come to the Board and have failed on their first step here. If it's possible he'd say tell them when the next meeting is but give them 60 days, he thinks they'll have a greater likelihood of success.

Mr. Baker stated he thinks that makes a lot of sense.

Mr. Galler stated that from the forestry standpoint what they need to do is find a New York State accredited consulting forester. They work on forest management and if somebody were to do a timber harvest, they're the ones that are working not for the timber companies. There's a certification process. He believes on the DEC website there is a directory where you can find them. Where they're going to have trouble is there's not a lot of people that work down here, so it's going to take a little bit of doing.

Mr. Grosshandler stated that with regard to the bond itself generally speaking there's usually a set of terms or conditions that would satisfy the bond. It's not so much a series of things that would cause default but rather the bond will stay in place until the following items have been satisfied. A replanting plan, a wetland regeneration plan, whatever those happen to be. When they engage the New York State accredited forester they'll make sure that they work with them on making some recommendations on what that plan might look like and then can submit it to the Board for approval and comment.

MJ Martin asked Mr. Garfinkle if are there metrics, goals that they want achieved through these plans that the Board can give them as guidelines because she would hate for them to find somebody and have them create a plan and then have the Board say well that's not exactly what we wanted.

Mr. Garfinkle stated the from his perspective he thinks the wetland restoration, the restoration of the woods is really important bearing that there are no invasive species that have been introduced or they have some sort of plan in place that is going to address any introductions that were caused through disturbance from the work and then he thinks where the other metric that they can rely on is getting a survey and an understanding of how many trees were removed and then take a look at quantities for restoration purposes based on that. He would start from there, get a sense of how many trees were felled and they can come up with a number for replacement and in regards to survivability from deer browse or if they succumb to natural conditions or survive. He thinks that's the most pragmatic way to go at it or they can do it more holistically and then from a forest restoration standpoint have a forester come in and say, look this is what was done, this was a violation, what would the Board propose to make this right and improve this area of forest that was selectively harvested and then coming back to the Board with that plan as well so they could evaluate. There's a couple of different approaches, he would rely on whoever they retain to provide something back to the Board.

Mr. Baker stated that Mr. Galler said he was more interested in fencing rather than replanting.

Mr. Galler stated that the area they went through the wetland aside, the rest of it planting trees in the mesic type of forest usually really doesn't work unless there was a clear cut and even then, it's not considered the best practice, the best practice is the forest will regenerate. It's three major things basically they're dealing with competition being from usually invasive species or unwanted species like beech trees, the second is deer. He's going to guess a forester is probably going to come up with a plan of fencing that will need to stay up for seven to ten years and he has a feeling the forest will regenerate itself. Is it going to be big trees? Absolutely not. It's going to be small trees but at a certain point within their management plan they're going to talk about culling two-thirds of the saplings and it will fill in and will be a forest again and it'll be healthy. He doesn't think they can go in and make a forest, he thinks they need here to let the forest make itself.

Mr. Baker stated that he's not a forester but that makes a lot of sense to him. He's seen people spend a ton of money trying to plant saplings in large quantities and a lot of the times it really doesn't work very well and if the forester says he thinks it can regenerate itself if it's properly fenced, supervised and maintained and culled.

Mr. Repetto stated that one of their guiding principles here has been to leave it better than it was. Here we talked about repairing damage that's going to take years for repair but we've got enough activity going on there that there's got to be some place there that when they bring in this forester, they could propose kind of a remediation area that could help to make it a little bit better than it was, especially since this is the kind of place that it's a learning activity. People that come to the camp as clients can learn from this and can understand what a remediation activities is and that would be a really good thing to do.

Mr. Baker stated that this is not in the least punitive, Camp Lake Surprise has been a long time, important non-profit here in Putnam County even the best of good citizens can make mistakes. The Board wants to work constructively with the camp to fix the damage because of the responsibilities the Board has they can't just say, well gee mistakes happen. He thinks if the camp is willing to work constructively and in good faith with the Town and the Board. The Board will certainly do the same he's sure with the camp.

Ms. Kirschenbaum stated that they have a learning center and they have a farmer at camp and they incorporate environmental stuff because they do overnights and hikes and things along those lines and they can put that in as a programmatic piece because we all need to be better stewards of the earth as we've proven by what we did. She added that she really appreciates the Board's time and understanding.

Ralph Koos, 80 Justin's Way, Garrison, NY 10524 TM# 49.-4-51.14

Jason Snyder from Badey & Watson filling in for Steve Marino. He stated that he did everything that they had asked. They relocated the sewer line and tanks out of the 20% regulated slopes here sort of a more circuitous route but it gets the job done that the Board wanted and they have a little area for maintenance here off this to the side of the driveway so that'll aid in maintenance of the tanks and sewer system and they also scooped the house off of the slopes in the back.

Mr. Galler stated that he has one question, right now the sewer line goes between the existing field and what would be the expansion field, true?

Mr. Snyder replied those are the distribution laterals from the distribution box so that's the feeder lateral that feed all the absorption trenches, correct.

Mr. Galler replied he's assuming it was done there versus on would be the right side so that it would be near the expansion area if it had ever needed to be used.

Mr. Snyder replied, yes usually they set up the distribution box so there's less work if they did have to use that reserve area, they wouldn't have to relocate the sewer and they can use the same box and all that stuff.

Mr. Galler stated that he'd prefer for it to have been on the other side but he's assuming that's why they put it there so if that's the reason he's fine.

Chari Galezo stated so if there aren't any other questions, are they giving a permit for this or just giving an approval, a thumbs up?

Mr. Repetto asked wasn't there one little section of the house that was still in the buffer?

Mr. Snyder said they rotated it and moved it so it's out of the buffer now.

Mr. Garfinkle stated that the only other item was the there was an entire mitigation plan that was associated with running the driveway through the regulated area on the top of the plan set there. He doesn't know if there are any updates to that or where the Board stands with what was proposed there.

Mr. Snyder stated that he went over this briefly with Mr. Marino and he's he seemed to think that they were all set with that with the mitigation.

Mr. Garfinkle asked if the Board recalls there was a planting plan and invasive species management plan that had been called out in some plan notes early on.

Mr. Galler stated that Mr. Garfinkle is correct but right now since it has to go back to the Board of Health, they wouldn't be issuing permit anyway, true?

Chair Galezo stated he was just telling Mr. Snyder they are good in general terms and then they'll go back to Health Department, get their approval and then if a client comes in and wants to build a house on this property, they're going to have to provide a full set of plans because the drawing that's shown for where this house is just a general idea of a footprint. As long as a new homeowner comes in there and puts a box on top of that hill it doesn't go into the slopes and they run the pipe where it's shown approved by the Health Department, they're good. Will they have to come before us? Actually, they won't because they won't be in the steep slopes. No, of course they will, it's the driveway. So, they'll be before the Board again at that time any of these you know the mitigation plan will have to be provided.

Mr. Snyder replied the current owner can build this driveway and septic system before somebody builds a house.

Chair Galezo stated to that extent then maybe Mr. Garfinkle is absolutely right that the mitigation plan even if it's something that already existed everybody seems to recall that there was a plan, can they just add that back into these quickly.

Mr. Galler stated that he thinks it was discussed that a plan needed to be put in place.

Mr. Baker stated that he thinks there was a conversation and Mr. Marino said there would be a mitigation plan, he'd have a proposal to go with but he doesn't think that ever has been presented and thinks they'd need to see the proposal.

Chair Galezo stated if they can produce that and give it to Mr. Garfinkle, he is really going to be the one who's going to look at that exact planting plan and decide if it's good enough. He can make that decision. He then asked what the other Board members think if they add it now, get the planting plan and get it to Mr. Garfinkle and then we're out.

MJ Martin stated well, we'll issue a permit contingent on the planting plan.

Chair Galezo replied, right but we're not actually issuing a permit now we're just saying to Mr. Snyder that he can if he adds the planting plan, shows Mr. Garfinkle.

Mr. Snyder stated that Mr. Koos said the Board has the plan, he said they have the mitigation plan since July.

Mr. Garfinkle stated that there is a plan, he thinks it's a call out on a plan set, he just wanted to reiterate that that is still okay.

Chair Galezo asked Mr. Snyder to share that plan page that everybody's talking about.

Mr. Snyder replied that he doesn't have the planting plan.

Chair Galezo replied that they're going to take Mr. Koo's word for it that the planting plan exists, show it to Mr. Garfinkle and if he's okay with it they're okay with it.

Mr. Snyder stated and then Mr. Garfinkle can issue the permit.

Chair Galezo asked Mr. Garfinkle if they are issuing any permits yet, just to just build the driveway is what he's saying. In that case the Board needs to vote now.

Mr. Repetto asked if the plan is to just build a driveway and then wait for a buyer?

Mr. Snyder replied that he would think that the owner wants to build the driveway so that they can show a prospective buyer a house site. His understanding is that they're building this they want to build this driveway and septic system.

Chair Galezo stated so they're applying for a permit for a driveway and the septic system which has to go to the Building Department and then the Building Department has to decline it and send it to the Wetlands Board, they have to vote on it and then issue the permit correct, isn't that the proper sequence?

Mr. Repetto stated that it seems like it's a disturbance that is unnecessary until there's a house to be built that's his opinion and then it's grandfathered as an existing septic system.

Chair Galezo stated honestly, he doesn't know. That's it's a good question, normally they would build the septic system after the house so it doesn't get disturbed. Build the house, do all the work and put the septic system in at the end so he doesn't know that they can (inaudible)

Mr. Repetto stated that they're creating a grandfathered situation, it's like the house burnt down and now there's a septic system in the ground so they have to build. But there's nothing there now and so there's no reason to put that in until there's a plan for to build a house in his opinion.

Chair Galezo stated the question is, is it within the law that one can apply for a permit to put in a septic system and a driveway without building a house? If there's no law that says you can't do that then they've got to actually file a building permit for the driveway and the septic and then it's good for a year they have to actually go ahead and build it but before the Building Department can issue it, the Conservation Board has to issue a wetlands permit.

Mr. Galler stated that he thinks Chair Galezo is correct. He thinks whether the Board likes it or not he thinks that they do as landowners have the right to prepare a site for building including a septic. What the Board can't do tonight is, he's not comfortable voting on the mitigation for where the driveway goes through a wetland. That needs to be done once they see the plans again and Mr. Garfinkle is comfortable with it.

Mr. Garfinkle stated just to bring the Board back up to speed he thinks initially Mr. Marino approached the Conservation Board with an application solely for the construction of a driveway and then the Board took pause at that and allowed them to do some rough clearing to get a machine up onto the buildable area to do the test holes for the septic system and so they could create this overall site plan to come back to the Board to give more of an assurance in terms of avoiding the situation that they're all concerned about. He thinks the mitigation component is closely tied to having this project be a success and thinks that that was one of the big things for the Board initially was if this is going to be sold who is going to be responsible five years from now to ensure that the mitigation plan is successful. That was a big part of the whole application and the Board's initial concern as well.

Chair Galezo asked if they want to sell that property, they've got to get a client up to the top so they can see what the view is they can see what the driveway is going to be like. Can the Board give a permit with the planting plan to put in a rough driveway, that's it, no septic just to allow them to get item four or whatever they're going to use so that they can drive up there and show clients.

MJ Martin stated that based on the current plan that Mr. Snyder just showed them the only thing they need a permit for is the driveway, they don't need permit from for any of the other elements, is that right?

Chair Galezo stated well the only thing they needed from the Board for the septic was they had to change the way the piping went.

MJ Martin stated but they've changed that. So, now it's just the driveway and as Chair Galezo said, if you're the landowner you're allowed to prep a site for sale right, as buildable. She thinks this plan has to come back from the county and they have to see the mitigation plan and then just vote on whether they think that that suffices as mitigation for the disturbance.

Mr. Garfinkle stated that he thinks many years ago there were a few iterations of the driveway layout itself, he looked back at the building files and thinks the layout was determined to be in this scheme but maybe the Board needs a refresher to understand why this is the best possible layout for that portion of the driveway and why a mitigation plan is necessary. Maybe that's part of that discussion to help the Board vote and make an appropriate decision.

Chair Galezo added yes, he's feeling like they're a little stuck here.

Mr. Galler stated that he thinks Mr. Snyder should be happy and his client that essentially the Board is happy with the potential home site where the septic system is going. They've done whatever the Board has asked. Right now, it's really only a part of the driveway which they don't have a full plan, which is not Mr. Snyder's fault. It would be a wetland scientist for the mitigation and he thinks should be brought to the next meeting and they'll vote on it.

Mr. Garfinkle stated, yeah and he believes that it's there is just needs to be discussed. They had provided it months ago like they stated he just doesn't think Mr. Marino ever got into the details of that plan and the Board never hashed out the requirements. He thinks the main talking point was okay why would we provide a permit solely for access to the property, he thinks they wanted to see some sort of holistic approach to the property to move forward with permitting.

Chair Galezo stated that this is a strange one because the client is not coming in for a permit to build the house. It's not a whole project. He's just finishing a house right now where the client bought a piece of property that supposedly had a driveway and septic but the Health Department had no record of it. They ended up doing a bunch of test holes and found the septic, it was there. Things can be done this way.

Mr. Repetto stated no it can't be done this way it's a disaster. The Board shouldn't perpetuate it. It's a turnkey package, Mr. Snyder did his job the plans are available and that part of its done and it's ready to go when someone is ready to take the next step. There are ways to get into the property without putting down gravel as a road when maybe it's going to be 10 years before somebody builds into it. The sites that we've got in this town are getting so few and far between that this is the kind of thing the Board has got to think about pushing back on he believes.

Chair Galezo stated the truth is once they cut a road up through there if they don't finish it, don't put in the proper drainage it's going to become a muddy silty erosion mess.

Mr. Repetto stated there's been properties near him that he's seen that have been cut for years and years and years and you think they're unbuildable then suddenly somebody puts up the house and eventually it happens but it's been that way for years.

Chair Galezo stated if they were to give a permit at some point for this road to be built it's not just a flattened spot that you can drive a jeep up. It's whatever this plan shows as the finished road that's what's got to be built before they would get it would be a finalized, is that what Mr. Koo's is thinking of doing?

Mr. Snyder stated that it was his understanding was the house construction wasn't part of the wetland permit because they don't need a wetland permit to build the house. That's just an administrative difference.

Chair Galezo stated that's absolutely right since they moved the house out of the steep slope it's out of their purview but the only thing that is in their purview is that that wetland and he's asking the Board to give a permit on the crossing of the wetland and they haven't given the Board any of the mitigation which is the only thing that they're interested in.

Mr. Snyder stated that is unfortunate, it was his understanding that the last pieces of this puzzle were the sewer and the tanks and the house in the steep slopes and then once they did that, they could get a permit and the owner could sell it with a wetland permit. They don't want to sell this property with a permit still needing to be issued other than a building permit. Nobody wants to tell a prospective buyer that they have this wetland permit to build the driveway but then they're going to have to go back later so that they can continue to drive through.

MJ Martin stated no that's not it.

Mr. Angell stated that it sounds like the there was a mitigation plan given to the Conservation Board they just don't have it in front of them to look at.

Mr. Garfinkle stated it's a small call out on a survey sheet, it's not a long multi-page document. It's essentially just a polygon with planting notes in it and whatever the code requires, he thinks it's a one-to-one point five replanting ratio based on the amount of fill that they're putting the buffer and the wetland that Mr. Marino put together. Mr. Snyder makes a point about if this property sold and the Board issues a conditional permit that that wetland mitigation portion of the project is required and we cite this site plan that's put in front of us with that plan and the owner while a sale is pending if the Board approves all those documents and no construction happens until that sale occurs and the owner keeps those documents current those plans are cited as what the Board has approved. So, if any sort of deviation is made from what was cited on the permit, then it's null and void it has to start over again. If they're all comfortable with that mitigation plan and the layout of the proposed building area and the layout septic system and looking at it from that perspective he thinks if they have that discussion, he thinks they could vote on a permit. When they come in for a building permit and they have that permit in hand they keep it valid and they renew it annually and they don't deviate from what they've presented to this Board they can move forward.

Chair Galezo stated that he strongly feels like there are two different permits here. They're going to issue a permit to cross the wetland and that's all they're given permission for. They don't have the right to give them permission to do anything else.

Mr. Garfinkle said, they can. From a perspective from the SEQRA they're looking at it more of a whole project capacity, he thinks that's why that's important, that's why this is different.

Chair Galezo stated that he's just suggesting that if they were to issue a permit now, he could see his way clear issuing a permit to cross the wetland and that's it. So, the work around the wetland is done with the full mitigation. Anything else has nothing to do with the Conservation Board so they can run the road up to the top, they can do whatever they want to get up there but somehow, it's got to be set in cement that that what this Board said they are okay with up on top; the house being out of the steep slope, the septic being set up exactly like it is there, anything has changed with those two aspects which the Board has reviewed it's null and void. The Board shouldn't grandfather this site in, give a permit to go do work that they're not going to do what is on this plan guaranteed. They're not going to do what's there. An architect's going to go up on top and come up with some creative new design and they're going to build whatever they want up there.

Mr. Repetto stated and then there'll be a hardship story that they bought this property because of X whatever and we've seen this step wise approach before.

MJ Martin stated that they can't speculate on what somebody's going to do.

Mr. Snyder stated that if they do the work to cross the wetlands and Mr. Garfinkle signs off on it, they can then close out the permit. When somebody goes in for a building permit Mr. Garfinkle is going to have another eye on it because Greg Wunner is going to refer it to the Board again.

MJ Martin stated that's the point she wanted to make if there's a way that the Board can create a jacket for this property, like some sort of a pop-up window or something so that on these properties when somebody tries to pull a building permit and all of the information from this conversation and the permit as it was issued and the mitigation plan all come up and if they're not meeting the criteria that permit then they get dinged. The homeowner actually has access to this information so they don't come up with the crazy plan because it won't fly.

Chair Galezo stated that the mitigation plan does exist it was on the May meeting and he's looking at it, it's on the Town website. It includes the maps which the Board will recall which had three or four different colors. There was proposed wetlands disturbance area those wetland buffer encroachment the wetland buffer restoration area and so on and it has a big rectangle which includes invasive species monitoring control program. It lists all invasive species and then it lists plant species choices for wetland buffer enhancement restoration it shows the quantity the type. It doesn't show any locations, do we need more detail than this?

Mr. Repetto stated yes, this is a new plan, we need all the information in front of us. Come back with a mitigation plan that's proper and complete when they're going to have a discussion, not reference notes from five months ago.

Mr. Galler stated it's not complete.

Chair Galezo stated everyone seems to be in agreement.

Mr. Snyder stated that Mr. Marino needs to prepare a detailed planting plan and he needs to get the Health Department permit approved.

MJ Martin stated but the really good news is that the Board is really happy with the way that the house and the septic is being sited.

Mr. Garfinkle stated that he thinks if there could a discussion about why the road was sited into the area it was is going to be helpful because he reviewed the building file and there were many iterations that they have plan sets for that never came to fruition from years ago showing the center line for that road going into different areas of the property to gain access to the buildable locations.

Mr. Snyder stated that what he could see from what they have on the septic plan it looks like they're going through the narrowest little section, there's like a little arm of the wetlands maybe that's like a seep or something but they're going through the narrowest part of the of the wetlands and also squeezing that in between this area of steep slope.

Chair Galezo stated that's exactly what Mr. Marino was trying to do, that's what he's explained to them but the rest of the road was never really discussed so it's still something to be talked about.

Arnaud & Santelises, 5 Juniper Hill Road, Garrison, NY 10524 TM#81.-1-11

Mr. Snyder stated that basically they have an existing house towards the back where this terrace and dining room portion of the of the new house is, they have a cesspit in this area which they want to abandon. The entire existing cottage is going to be demoed, a portion of that is in the buffer. The cesspit is in the buffer which they want to abandon and reclaim this area here which is like a little lawn area and then they also have a portion of new driveway at the end of the existing gravel drive which they're also going to provide some mitigation for in the way of some pervious pavers. There were also some comments regarding providing some erosion control along the gravel driveway during construction and also protection of the existing stream crossing culvert. There's a three-sided culvert and they are proposing to preserve that and protect that during construction. They have a planting plan for reclamation of the lawn and existing sewage disposal area. Some mitigation for some new impervious area in front of the garage and also the temporary erosion and sediment control during construction.

Mr. Galler stated that he was pretty fine with it. They're right on the edge of the buffer but out of it. He thinks everything that they asked for in terms of protections is there.

Mr. Garfinkle stated that he thinks the only thing if they could try to include some deer fencing around the planting area that would be ideal but from a wetland's perspective, he doesn't see any real conflicts here or any red flags.

MJ Martin asked Mr. Snyder where he's referring to a cesspit was that's being reclaimed you keep saying that it's being reclaimed as lawn.

Mr. Snyder replied it is lawn now, it's like a little open space. They're going to plant it with layering of native shrubs so it's no longer going to be lawn.

Mr. Repetto asked when he says reclaim, does that mean dig it out and move it away or just bury it where it is?

Mr. Snyder stated that the actual cesspit is a steel drum so it will be excavated and disposed of at the appropriate facility and backfilled with run of bank sand and gravel and then whatever layers of soil need to be at the top for the plantings the surface will be treated appropriately for that. He added that they have a public hearing on scheduled for this Thursday 12/16/21 with the Planning Board.

Chair Galezo stated that if everybody else is comfortable with it he doesn't have any comments.

Mr. Galler stated that pretty much what they asked for was done so he's fine.

Mr. Garfinkle stated that they can issue a conditional permit, they wouldn't be able to issue the permit until the Planning Board made the determination of significance on the project.

Chair Galezo stated he doesn't know if there's any rush to issue the permit at this point should they just wait till it comes back?

Mr. Garfinkle stated that he doesn't think it would come back before this Board. If they were comfortable with what they've laid out unless there's major changes to the site plan that would move the building into the wetland buffer.

Chair Galezo stated what that's ringing in my ears is they look at it, it goes back to the Planning Board, they change it radically like remove a horse farm in the middle and they say no it doesn't have to go back to the Conservation Board.

Mr. Snyder stated that he doesn't know that that a permit is ever actually issued before Planning Board approval.

Mr. Repetto stated that's the right process so maybe we should just wait.

Mr. Snyder asked if they can get something written so they have something?

Mr. Garfinkle replied, yes and he will cite this plan set then and then say that they're comfortable issuing a permit based on this plan set so if that changes then they'll have some grounds to stand on.

Johnson & Rinderman, Mountain Brook Drive, Cold Spring, NY 10516 TM#16.-1-34 & 56

Chair Galezo asked if this was a referral also from Planning Board.

Mr. Snyder replied, correct and they are also scheduled for a public hearing on Thursday 12/16/21.

Mr. Galler stated that he, Mr. Garfinkle and Mr. Baker went out to this one. His concern is the driveway goes further than it needs to. He asked Mr. Snyder to share the plan on screen.

Mr. Snyder stated that the driveway ends, there's like a traveled way that kind of ends at this where this kind of like the bulge in the in the proposed driveway is so it kind of ends here and then they are continuing it to approach the house from the northwest side.

Mr. Galler asked Mr. Snyder what's the distance from the northern edge of the road to the pond?

Mr. Snyder stated that it's about 75 feet.

Mr. Galler stated that the issue he was having is why continue the road, why not have an entrance at he'll call it the front of the house or in between the septic field because they are doing what he believes is an unnecessary intrusion into the wetland buffer.

Mr. Snyder stated that one of the points is they're coming completely outside of the buffer and there's not going to be any turnouts here. It's just a lot to try to get in and then turn 90 degrees up into the house site. It does make it a little bit more difficult with the proximity to the septic. If they could keep the area between the house and the septic without vehicular traffic. The other issue is they have this graded at about ten percent so this area alongside the house, it's just tight and this affords them an area for turning around it's just tighter that's all.

Mr. Snyder continued that they have about a 1400-foot driveway and he knows that it is extra but it's only another 100 feet to continue on they don't have a lot of tree clearing here. There's a couple of dead maples here at the very edge of the wetland buffer and they're not in great condition. The area of the proposed driveway through the area that they're referring to is generally cleared. They have provided a mitigation plan here, they can replant, they can make it better than what it is now. There's a lot of dead ash in here so he thinks it is an opportunity to make this buffer area better is the general idea.

MJ Martin stated that unfortunately she didn't go on the site visit, does the intended driveway go underneath the lap pool?

Mr. Snyder replied, correct. The entry to the north wing of the house is generally under this area here, there's a deck here and a pool that goes across to the south wing but yes you drive underneath the lap pool and then the garage is right here and the south wing of the house is here.

Chair Galezo asked where the property line is?

Mr. Snyder pointed out the property line. It goes along here and then like that so there's actually a pen out there right here that's staked in the field.

Chair Galezo stated that the house is obviously stunning and building a house like this they want to take full advantage of the property and the views of the lake and everything else but the driveway is just flying in the face of what the Board normally likes to see. It's an essential thing obviously, they have to have a driveway to a house but if the house wasn't this big, they'd have more room for driveway. It's as though the limitations of the site are sort of being dodged. If this is what really desperately what the client wants to build then maybe this is another one of those opportunities like the pool in in the buffer where they spent a lot of time and effort coming up with a mitigation plan that made the site better than it is now.

Mr. Snyder stated that they own about 50 acres contiguous of land and this is literally this this patch here is the only thing that they have. This is the only patch that's of land that's buildable.

Chair Galezo asked what are the constrictions, why is the rest unbuildable?

Mr. Snyder pointed out that they've got the ravine over on this side, they're not crossing that and then this area they've got to cross this stream. They've got the pond over here and the rest of it is the across the pond.

MJ Martin stated it's an ecologically challenging property, but because of that the design needs to suit the site rather than the other way around.

Mr. Repetto stated just because it's challenging doesn't mean that it has to be built on, it's the only spot that they possibly could build but it's a huge place and it's a huge driveway.

Mr. Galler asked who owns the land to the south?

Mr. Snyder replied Scenic Hudson.

Mr. Galler stated it would require a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals but to have a non-conforming setback so that they could pull the road out of the buffer and then they do pretty much same thing. What is it 30 feet? Which he thinks they have but would just be non-conforming.

MJ Martin stated that it's still not going to pull it all out if you look at where the wetland buffer is.

Mr. Galler replied that Ms. Martin is probably right he might be underestimating.

MJ Martin stated that she likes Mr. Galler's very pragmatic solution it just brings the driveway around the other side of the house to the garage.

Mr. Snyder stated that it's just not going to work with the separation distances they're going to need some formal drainage, they're not going to meet the separation distances to the to the septic system.

Mr. Baker stated that he's been on the site twice and it's about as challenging a site as you can imagine. The owners seem very environmentally responsible, they also want to enjoy the site. If they want to do this kind of stuff which he understands why they want to do it, it really is an opportunity for them not just to plant a few shrubs and a tree or two but to do something more meaningful and significant in the same way that Chair Galezo referred to when the Board worked out the swimming pool mitigation.

Mr. Snyder stated that the owners are certainly willing to provide an extensive wetland mitigation plan.

Mr. Snyder pointed out another stream a much bigger stream further to the left to the left yeah right that's the main inlet to the pond, that's a Class A DEC stream that's a little bit more significant than this is more of an intermittent stream that runs alongside of the house site. That's the regular inlet to the pond.

Chair Galezo stated there's also that stream across to the right is that on that goes seems to go down into the gorge?

Mr. Snyder replied this is the outlet to the to the pond.

Chair Galezo pointed out that there are a few wetlands on the property. Those are three big opportunities that maybe they can make those areas better, they don't necessarily just have to plant or improve the area between the house site and the pond, they've got all these other wetlands that potentially could benefit.

Mr. Snyder replied, sure they're going to provide mitigation all along this stretch here and they can even do something in this stream because it's eroding and it's not great, they can do something in there as well. They can make the whole site better.

Chair Galezo asked Mr. Garfinkle if he has any particular thoughts on these other streams. Is it something that could warrant if there was mitigation there might offset the entire driveway being in the buffer?

Mr. Garfinkle stated yes, he thinks there's a really good opportunity for improving the other portions of the property that would be regulated under Chapter 93. In terms of what's in front of them now, he thinks they want to evaluate the site design so that they can give the Planning Board some sort of sense on which way this Board is leaning and then in terms of configuration he'd love to see all these plans that Mr. Snyder's showing now fleshed out for the entire project area and so that when this Board is coming up with their permits, they really look in in detail view it at what they would want to impose before they develop.

Chair Galezo stated he thinks if they write a letter to the Planning Board it should be clear that they are not happy with the driveway being completely in the wetlands and the first step would be change it radically and get everything out of the buffer, but if that's not something that's tenable then treat it like the pool and let the client come up with an extensive series of plans to show the benefit with a list of the benefits. Remember what we did on the pool? They actually presented not only a drawing of what they're going to do but the benefits of each approach.

Jason Angell stated that at some point he thinks having some sort of a special work session to have this conversation about what the menu of mitigations involves and whether or not as Philipstown faces more and more development in tougher and tougher ecological spaces does mitigation include down the line heating and cooling systems, does it include solar, does it include things that really do reduce the carbon footprint of the building? He stated he knows that has not been done on the Conservation Board in the past but he thinks they're all dancing around this topic to make these sorts of tough decisions. What is all the mitigation benefits and what and how extensive is that menu to make those trade-offs and he thinks that they should have some sort of a session devoted to that.

Mr. Repetto stated that one concept he'd like to make sure they discuss -mitigations that are fit for purpose. That the mitigation is really designed for that site, for that particular situation because he gets nervous when he hears a menu of items, then it's just a laundry list, oh I put green roof on it and I can get whatever I want in the wetlands. That shouldn't be the way it is because the damage that can be done to one small stream in an area is different than another area that might have a larger stream or less of an impact for the same type of encroachment into the wetlands. He just really wants to make sure that they don't start going down road where it's just a bartering system, putting a heat pump that basically doesn't do anything for the wetlands but maybe does something for carbon footprint but it's not really the same goals.

Mr. Angell stated he definitely agrees with Mr. Repetto and doesn't want to derail this meeting because they never have time for it but he thinks just creating place for a more expansive conversation not shoe-horning but he agrees.

Mr. Baker stated that he doesn't know what the right format is but they should definitely get that on the calendar in the new year as a special meeting with no particular projects to consider.

Mr. Garfinkle stated that in his letter to the Planning Board he will reiterate the point that they all made earlier that while they're not fully comfortable with the spur of the driveway towards the house there is the potential to look at the entire project area in regards to mitigation to improve and make the landscape better than it was from a natural resources management standpoint and they can consider that. Unless the Board have other glaring changes that they'd like to see to the layout of the site plan? When the Planning Board evaluates how they're moving forward with this when they come back for permits this Board at least will be able to entertain that discussion.

Chair Galezo stated that he thinks that the letter should very strongly state that the driveway is a big problem and it's up to the client to try to offer a lot of mitigation try change the plan slightly but that in indicating that this Board is flexible and that they have all these different things they're trying to consider to Mr. Snyder's point about the alternatives, to Mr. Repetto's point about it not being a menu and being like the one that was down on the river. There was nothing left for him to do, there was no way, he was either eliminate the pool or and the all the other things when you look at the whole picture it's what's there now is doing more damage to the environment than those two houses burning oil for heat and with a lawn next to the river is doing more damage to the environment than what's the house that's going to be built is going to do. He added that's his two cents. So, what do they do, they're not voting on this? Mr. Garfinkle is going to write a letter and they're going to move on.

Mr. Snyder stated this driveway is about 1400 feet long and about 1200 feet is in the buffer and about 1100 feet of that there's absolutely no way to get it out of the buffer. Any house that they build is going to require this driveway.

MJ Martin stated that she thinks they recognize that but they could minimize the amount by shortening it.

Mr. Snyder stated it could be 100 feet shorter.

Chair Galezo stated the point is if it's a smaller house it's also a smaller septic or it gives you more room to put the septic. There are things that can be done if that's their primary goal, but that's not the goal, clearly the design is to maximize this gorgeous house.

Mr. Snyder replied that it's to maximize the small amount of land that they have available relative to the amount of land that that they own.

Chair Galezo stated you could build a two-bedroom house there that's 30 by 30 and put a small septic and bring the driveway and they wouldn't go anywhere near the buffer but that's not what the client wants.

Mr. Johnson stated he's client and also the architect and he really appreciates all the time and this conversation is really terrific and he appreciates everyone who came to the site. It's a very special site and they've been working on this for years trying to figure out the best way to access the site the best way to approach the house. It's an existing road that's been there for many years and one of the initial ideas was just let's just use that existing road as much as possible because they don't want to disturb the site, they wanted to serve the site as little as possible. One of the first ideas was just to put a new road all the way down the property line and his conversation with Mr. Snyder goes on two and a half years about how do they move that road so they can do as little disturbance to the site as possible and by that he means use the existing road and so the existing road just happens to be in the buffer. There's really no way they can get to the house without going through the buffer and without coming to the Board to have this kind of vigorous discussion. He thinks what's tripping everybody up is the site visit that just happened in the realization that the extra hundred feet to get to approach the house because of the position of the septic system that extra hundred feet is triggering this conversation. To the comment about building a smaller house and having a smaller septic system, it's for a three-bedroom house. If they wanted to make it a two-bedroom house maybe they would get a slightly smaller septic system but they can't build a two-bedroom house that's just not possible, they have too many kids and hopefully grandchildren soon. The other thing is he's thinking about this just from a design point of view. If you have a 1400-foot driveway you don't want to just suddenly make an abrupt turn and go dead end it into a garage. It has to be kind of a graceful approach and that's why they extended that around and then underneath that lap pool so they could have a real architectural approach to this house. He just wants to emphasize that they're really working hard on this, they've been banging their heads against the wall for a very long time and talked to Mr. Garfinkle before they even bought the property trying to come up with a really sensitive solution to this. They engaged Susan Jainchill to come up with the mitigation plan that's part of this current package. They are negotiating with New York State to sell a lot of these 50 acres back to New York State because they want to create as much parkland as possible. They're very conservation sensitive and not trying to pull any wool over on anyone's eyes. They've also done a lot of studying on how the sun moves to the site the location of every single room is based on how the sun will

hit it throughout the day and also the wind studies and how to protect the wind which comes basically from behind the house. It's not a big selfish house. If they go to this site, they'll see it's a very special place and there's very little room to build and then you have all these different environmental features of the site from the hills to the pond to the gorge that just really impact every little decision that they've made.

Mr. Garfinkle stated if everyone comfortable with that messaging to the Planning Board and then they'll be able to delve deeper into mitigation for the project if this goes through the Planning Board and they make the decisions to grant special permits.

The Board members agreed.

Jonathan & Anna-Maria Pierce, Lot 3 Rockwald Road, Cold Spring, NY 10516 TM#38.-3-9 WL#21-348

Vinny Sickles of River Architects stated this is an existing lot that was approved in a 1976 as an ODA subdivision. This is the intersection of 9 and a 301 here and this is where Rockwald road comes in. The existing site was a lot three. They are trying to reuse an existing traveled way that travels through the site down off of Rockwald road. There's some existing culvert pipe put in as a part of that access way and part of the issue that they're trying to address with the approach to the site is working around the existing steep slopes and the storm water that they were receiving from Rockwald Road. At the top of the site there's four culvert pipes that's directing water across the site and trying to find the least invasive approach to the lot or the building site they're proposing. They're trying to reuse the existing traveled access way to not avoid disturbing any of the steep slopes. Mr. Garfinkle was out there and flagged the wetlands and this drawing is based on a draft of his markups. Mr. Snyder's team is currently in the process of surveying that and finalizing that for them. The wetlands that are being formed at the top of the driveway as the water that's coming out of this existing culvert pipe and sheet flowing across the top of the driveway here and then there's an existing culvert that crosses the driveway at this turn which is capturing some more this runoff down here and then as they come down the site downhill from Rockwald Road they come down the hill falling the axis way and then they're trying to put the house on this rise here in the middle of the site. It's the flattest portion of the property and out of the steep slopes and takes up most of the northwest side of the lot and the current issue they're looking at trying to address is crossing the wetlands area that Mr. Garfinkle had flagged at the top of the driveway and then restoring and replacing this culvert that was put in when this access way was built which is cutting off the natural flow of the water down this hill here and this culvert has become silted over and is now blocked an this flagged area here is due to the water being redirected around this culvert and raised area for the driveway and it's washing out and eroding into this this flat area to the north . Their proposed plan is to restore the access way into the new driveway, redirect the culvert at the top of the access way around to Rockwald Road, the protective outflow and probably a swale of some kind of direct water around the driveway and then same thing at the bottom. They'd be creating a more protected inflow and outflow of a replace culvert pipe and allowing that water to continue down the hill into the existing wetlands area. One of the ideas was redirecting this water back into the kind of flagged wetlands area would allow this existing portion of the site to dry back out as the water won't be washing out in this area anymore and that would allow them to locate the septic field outside of the steep slope and allow access of the house on this rise in the middle of the site to allow them to direct any of the leader drains and footing drains any kind of water coming off this house would be directed on the opposite side of this rise in the middle of the site and those will be directed to a protective outflows away from the steep slopes on the back side of the house. Currently they're looking at a footprint for

the house that is just under 2600 square feet and then they're also looking at just under a 1000 square foot for a two-car garage for this project. The design this house is pursuing a passive house certification for the residents which would be a three bedroom and due to the setting of the house they're also looking to utilize the roof of the garage to house the solar array. Any clearing that's done for the house and the garage would allow the garage roof to maximize its southern exposure across the cleared part of the site and maximize any kind of PV solar generation that they can generate off of the roof of the garage.

Chair Galezo asked Mr. Garfinkle as the road the driveway comes in and goes through that first sort of oval wetland and then cuts through the top edge of that next one down how significant are those wetlands?

Mr. Garfinkle stated that he thinks the majority of what's closest to Rockwald Road are intermittent water courses. Everything that's closer to the house site on the southwest portion of the property is what they'd consider a wetland in proper terms. A lot of it like Mr. Sickles was saying is a factor of drainage off of the hillside there from storm water and probably (inaudible) of groundwater as well. What you're seeing in front of you is a draft of what he went out and flagged that's still yet to be located via a survey or Mr. Snyder's team to refine those boundaries a little bit more.

Chair Galezo stated that his general thinking is if they are highly functional wetlands, they look at it one way. If they are not extremely important wetlands and the wetlands down below are more important and the ones below are being completely avoided if they trade off the incursion into those two smaller wetlands with more mitigation to the more important one down below and the new culverts and so on is already going in that direction. If they continue down that path that's their normal line of thinking.

Mr. Garfinkle stated that he would defer to the Board but thinks that one of the main components of this is ensuring that the hydrology of the site is functioning correctly to feed into that larger wetland area to the southeast of the house because that event that does connect into a larger water course that runs towards Route 9. The biggest thing that sticks out to him is the proposed septic area is currently where the termination of a lot of these intermittent water courses are and looking at the site from that permit perspective of whether or not they move some things around on the site plan to accommodate removing the septic from that area if these changes to the intermittent water courses can't be made, he thinks they just need to evaluate that in the future too when they look at this again or get out there.

MJ Martin asked if Mr. Snyder can share what the grade is on the driveway?

Mr. Snyder replied that it's going to be 14 percent, it is going to be the maximum.

Chair Galezo stated that Mr. Garfinkle will reach out to schedule a site visit before the next meeting.

Mr. Snyder stated that the field work for locating those flags was complete today he believes but when they have that site meeting, they should have a definitive map.

Other Business

Chair Galezo stated that he's going to say goodbye tonight and was hoping the Board could all talk about potential new members. He thinks there are a few people being considered.

MJ Martin stated that someone mentioned that Grace Kennedy had interest in possibly joining. She is a gardener, she's lived here for 25, 30 years, lives in Garrison. She has a good business as a local gardener. She's very eco-conscious. Ms. Martin added that she knows her from working with her over the years. She's obviously come before this Board many times for clients and that may be an issue. That may be a con to her nomination to the Board. But she is a smart, thoughtful, experienced person. She understands the town, she understands the goals of the Conservation Board so she would endorse her nomination. She added that she does understand that some people think that the fact that she may she may have to recuse herself regularly might be difficult.

Chair Galezo stated that she emailed him and expressed interest. He thinks she'd be great. There might be some concern if she has to recuse herself very often but better to have her and have to recuse herself every once in a while, and then not have her.

Ms. Martin added that she has to recuse herself regularly between the jobs that she's held over the years. There have been projects that she hasn't been able to or at least had to disclose that even if it's not a conflict that there might be an appearance of a conflict so the Board has navigated that before.

Mr. Baker stated that the other potential candidate is Scott Silver the director of the Constitution Marsh. Scott has deep roots in Phillipstown, has lived here a long time and obviously has a deep background in wildlife and wildlife ecology habitat and management. He added that he thinks they've got two very interesting candidates with deep ties to Phillipstown and deep quality backgrounds and expertise for the town to consider.

Mr. Galler stated that he agrees with Mr. Baker and thinks they're both good candidates.

Chair Galezo stated that it's been a pleasure to have worked with everyone for all these years. It's been like a PHD education, he hopes he's contributed in some ways and consider all of the Board members to be his friends. So, thank you.

Mr. Baker stated that he's one of the newer members of this Board but he has always thought Chair Galezo provided great leadership and guidance as the chair. He has a vast pool of knowledge about construction, design, all of the technical issues that that he himself knows very little about and he took great comfort from that expertise as well as that of the other Board members. He added that Chair Galezo also had a great temperament for the job. On the one hand they have a really important environmental duty and responsibility from the town and on the other hand these are real people's lives who are coming before the Board. Many times, they've spent a lot of money, they haven't always known what they were getting into and while they can't operate as a sympathy board, he's just been impressed that Chair Galezo always tried to the extent possible the right thing for the applicant while protecting the interests of Phillipstown and the environment and that's a tough line to walk sometimes so they are going to miss you him lot.

Chair Galezo then asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Andy Galler made a motion, MJ Martin seconded the motion. The board voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 9:19 pm.

Date Approved: 5/10/22

Respectfully submitted by


Cheryl Rockett
Conservation Board Secretary