TOWN OF PATTERSON

PLANNING BOARD MEETING
February 15, 2005

AGENDA & MINUTES

		Page #	
1)	**Burdick Farms Subdivision**	1 – 36	Discussion with Paul Piazza, Code Enforcement & Dave Raines, Fire Inspector regarding boulevard concept, road width, water storage tanks

Planning Board
February 15, 2005 Meeting Minutes

Held at the Patterson Town Hall
1142 Route 311
Patterson, NY 12563

Present were: Chairman Schech and Board Member Mike Montesano, Board Member Dave Pierro, Board Member Maria Di Salvo, Board Member Shawn Rogan, Rich Williams, Town Planner and Ted Kozlowski, Town ECI.

Paul Piazza, Code Enforcement Officer and Dave Raines, Fire Inspector were present.

Meeting called to order at 7:38 p.m.

4 members in the audience

Chairman Schech stated we will wait for Mike Montesano to get here.

1) BURDICK FARMS SUBDIVISION

Ms. Kristina Burbank, Kellard Engineering was present representing the Applicant

Chairman Schech asked Ms. Burbank to put a plan up on the Board.

Ms. Burbank asked do you want the boulevard plan.

Chairman Schech replied that is fine.

Chairman Schech stated okay Paul you are on.

Paul Piazza stated the issue we have with this approach is the center divide, fifteen foot roadways on either side. With the traffic coming in if you take it strictly from the fire standpoint, one truck comes in hypothetical situation the third lot on the right as you come in you have a working structure fire there, the first truck comes in parks at the curb no other traffic can pass it. That is providing the road is cleaned to the curb and he parks his tires against the curb, given the width of the trucks the mirrors on either side traffic won't be able to pass it.

Board Member Pierro asked and this is the boulevard concept you are talking about.

Paul Piazza replied this is the boulevard concept.

Board Member Pierro asked and that is the two fifteen foot roadways with a eight foot median in the center.

Board Member Rogan stated isn't it like five, six, oh ten okay.

Paul Piazza stated in the same regard if you had a UPS truck parked at the curb another truck can't pass it, a highway truck for snow removal if they plow out, if they don't plow completely from curb to curb you are reducing the width that much more.

Dave Raines stated just accessibility you are talking almost I don't know the exact but two thousand feet you can't safely respond to any type of a emergency on the western side of the boulevard unless you go all the way down. You are going to have to make the whole loop to really come back. You can't make the turn on the boulevard with this type of radius.

Board Member Pierro stated well based on the construction of the median in all times of the year other than when there is snow piled on that median why couldn't is it not going to be possible to drive over the median to get to the westerly.

Dave Raines stated I (too many speaking at the same time unable to transcribe).

Rich Williams stated it is going to be a raised median with landscaping in it.

Dave Raines stated that is the way I understood it.

Ms. Burbank stated yes that was the original proposal.

Dave Raines stated I was concerned if you maintain the boulevard concept throughout the project that the size of the cross over's, turn isle's or whatever you want to call them would not allow you to make a U-turn for a hundred and eighty degree turn based on their width and the overall width of the road. Then forget about emergencies if there is any type of deliveries, during the construction process, if Lot 4 is being developed and Lot 10 is already developed you are going to have the potential to block access of fifty percent of your roadway which will cause all traffic to be on the west side of the median or the median on the east side. I just think that the overall I wouldn't have a problem if the boulevard ended prior to the first set of homes, aesthetically to have a boulevard here wouldn't be a big issue because then you could cross over after the first say two, three hundred feet but to extend the boulevard two thousand feet you are really eliminating your egress and your access,

Board Member Pierro asked what is the turning radius say of a hundred foot Sutphin, how much space in between those two medians would you need to turn that vehicle around do you recall.

Paul Piazza stated I don't remember.

Dave Raines replied the tower ladder needs sixty feet for the tower ladder that is the longest truck.

Board Member Rogan stated so in other words you can't turn one of those trucks around in any roadway that we have you have to do a couple of maneuvers.

Dave Raines stated yes.

Rich Williams stated I think our basic cul-de-sac is the minimum design for large vehicles like that.

Dave Raines stated without having a second access road which I understand is not doable with the wetlands and what not you know you have this single egress and access and it makes it difficult. I think that the boulevard concept would work if we had another way in and out of the subdivision which from what I understand isn't really possible.

Chairman Schech stated we are trying to get away with that away from the wetlands and the trouble is if we widen up the boulevard the way you want it we are clearly increasing the impervious surface so we consulted with the Town of Kent and came up with a brilliant idea on this. We put in a drive lane, a grass drive lane next to a twenty-four foot wide entrance road.

Board Member Rogan asked when did that come up.

Board Member Pierro stated this past week.

Chairman Schech stated we think once in awhile.

Board Member Pierro stated I wasn't aware that we conferred with the Town of Kent where did that come from. I thought Maria, Rich and I came up with that.

Chairman Schech stated this is for Mr. Dumont.

Rich Williams stated and after our conversation Dave I mentioned it to Herb.

Board Member DiSalvo asked and you consulted with Kent.

Rich Williams replied I guess.

Chairman Schech stated well he suggested that we confer with Kent all the time put them on the Board. All this stuff is totally beyond us what we do here is beyond us.

Mr. Dumont stated that is another project.

A Board Member stated I get the joke now.
(Too many speaking at the same time unable to transcribe)

Chairman Schech asked Dave Raines and Paul Piazza what do you think of that.

Dave Raines stated what is the maintainability of it as far as having that easement there and not,
(too many talking at the same time unable to transcribe)

Board Member Rogan asked can you guys explain that a little more I am not sure I understand.

Board Member Pierro stated it is not necessarily a drive lane.

Rich Williams stated right what we were talking about is going back to a standard twenty-four foot wide road and then doing an engineered, Board Member Pierro stated like a grass paver or, Rich Williams stated something I mentioned it to Kristine I don't know if she came up with any concept that she wants to talk about but recognizing the total length of this is an issue there might be some consideration of putting an extra drive lane that would support vehicles.

Board Member Pierro stated in an emergency situation if you had a fire truck in the street and you had to get an ambulance around.

Paul Piazza asked who is going to maintain it.

(Too many speaking at the same time unable to transcribe).

Rich Williams asked if the Planning Board decided to go with a twenty-four foot wide road from beginning to end would that meet your requirements.

Dave Raines asked without a boulevard.

Board Member Pierro stated without a boulevard.

Dave Raines stated absolutely.

Rich Williams stated anything you do extra then is up to you.

Dave Raines stated I would be in favor of having the boulevard for the first say I don't know the distances here but prior to Lot 1 and Lot 37 terminating the boulevard heading in a northern direction if you want the aesthetic.

Rich Williams stated but at that point it is an aesthetic issue like you said.

Dave Raines stated right if that is something I don't know what the Planning Board is looking at.

Board Member Pierro stated we were looking at fire safety issues we weren't looking at the boulevard concept for aesthetics. I quite frankly don't think coming from a public safety mindset I don't think a boulevard up in the front really makes much sense except for a little bit of a beautification thing I don't think so. I would rather not see the boulevard up in the front. I would rather see the twenty-four foot road with the ability to utilize that side road either has both a drainage swale that Rich and I had talked about maybe a place to put snow or having the ability to get a fire truck to go around another emergency vehicle that was stopped in the street.

Ms. Burbank stated the only issue that we have with an open drainage system is that it truly impacts our layout of our building lots and it really encumbers us further, right now it is already a jigsaw puzzle and the setbacks from an open system are,

Board Member Pierro stated maybe I misspoke but I am talking about a swale that would be a place where drainage runoff could flow into your fixed drainage system into your culverts and also something that was compacted with engineered soil or stone or something where vehicles could travel on it in an emergency. I don't really mean about a,

Board Member Rogan stated can I jump in here a second, if we ask the Applicant to provide twenty-four foot or more if we even went originally we had spoken at the last meeting about thirty foot wide full town specs paved we have already met your criteria so there is no need to add the extra drive isle.

Dave Raines stated absolutely.

Board Member Rogan stated the part about the entrance not having a boulevard I would agree with Dave from the standpoint that I see what happens with people with their school children and they all drive their kids down to the bus stop and wait and so if you have a boulevard you are going to now be blocking everything all up. They are going to be parked on each side and you are going to ruin that. If we provide anywhere from twenty-four to thirty foot wide for the full length to the point of the junction where now we go into the loop and then go back to that minimum twenty-four I think we have got it in terms of public safety.

Dave Raines stated absolutely I mean that is, Board Member Rogan stated and that meets your needs because that is what we really are running ourselves ragged over is trying to meet your requirements.

Dave Raines stated it was just a restriction of having the boulevard and limiting yourself to really a single access on either side.

Board Member Pierro stated but even on a twenty-four foot wide road you are going to need, it would nice to be able to have a place or at least have the road, the side of the road contoured in a way where we could put snow during the winter time because with a twenty-four foot wide road if we get a really intense snow storm that road is going to shrink down during the winter time.

Rich Williams stated we are going to do that anyway. We are going to design the road so that there is a snow shelf but the issue comes back to we are creating a road that exceeds the town standards and whether any additional design standards are warranted to mitigate that issue.

Board Member Rogan stated and then there is the concern of promoting off street parking which we spoke about. You make a road a little wider now you promote people even though these are houses but people come in, maintenance workers whatever they all park out in the road if you create the area they use it. Does that mean you create a situation where it is more likely to use it or do you leave it standard and they use it anyway and we create a problem I don't know it is a balancing act.

Board Member Pierro stated right because there is a maintenance problem with that too.

Board Member Rogan stated people tend to park out on the road. I don't mean the people, the residents I think it is the workers.

Board Member Rogan of course through the homeowner's association they can create no off street parking for even the help because they all have perfectly accessible driveways so that is something that you can try to tackle rather than again making more impervious surface, increasing our stormwater that would be

required we do what is a standard approvable roadway twenty-four foot wide and then those issues are addressed by the homeowner's association in some format.

Chairman Schech asked Kristine you would have a problem with that additional eight foot drivable grass along side.

Ms. Burbank stated we perceive that as a problem for maintenance. (unable to hear). It just seems as though it is creating a problem for maintenance. Our honest opinion was that we were better off just having two fifteen foot wide lanes if that was needed to achieve (hard to hear).

Chairman Schech stated but that is going to give us a problem with our impervious surface you know we could squeeze it together make it thirty foot but we are increasing the impervious surface which we are trying not to do.

Ms. Burbank stated I would love a twenty-four foot wide road.

Board Member Montesano arrived at the meeting at this time.

Board Member Pierro stated let's give Mike (Board Member Montesano) a chance to digest this.

Board Member Montesano stated go ahead.

Board Member Pierro stated it seems that we are moving away from the boulevard concept Mike and going with a straight twenty-four foot wide roadway because of the fire department people and our Fire Inspector feel that there are certain inherent dangers of having the inability to turn around at the segments in the roadway with the boulevard concept and it would be a problem trying to get vehicles to pass each other on that road so we are more inclined to go with a twenty-four foot wide roadway which would limit our impervious surface from the two fifteens or the one single thirty foot wide. We are discussing whether or not we would use a shelf on the sides of the roads with some sort of engineered soil or grass pavers to have a place where cars could in an emergency go around vehicles on the blacktop. The Applicant is concerned about the maintenance of those after they are out of there and what kind of pressure that would put on the homeowner's association as well.

Chairman Schech stated I think you are going to need them in case you do have an accident you are going to get two fire trucks up there that are going to totally block the road because the first thing they do is come in and park in the middle of the road and at least if you have the grassy drivable portion on the side you can still get in and out.

Board Member Pierro asked Kristine how about a widened area where the cut outs are on either side of the cut out so that there could be a wider turning radius.

Board Member Rogan asked what cut outs are you talking about.

Board Member Pierro replied where we were going to have the cut outs in the center as opposed to having the cut outs we can have a wider area,

Rich Williams stated but if you are getting rid of the center median and you have driveways like any road.

Board Member Pierro stated right but an occasional place on either side of the right and left where a vehicle could turn around,

Board Member DiSalvo stated like a school bus.

Board Member Pierro stated where the cut out would be maybe widening the road on either side so that you could turn around a vehicle with a sixty foot turning radius. I don't think a school bus has a sixty foot turning radius but I know that Sutphin very well did.

Gene Richards stated you would have an awful lot of those Dave. There is a lot of breaks in that median to allow people to exit from their driveway.

Board Member Pierro stated okay that is not a good idea then.

Board Member Rogan stated I mean the whole point of us going to these other concepts Paul and Dave especially was to try and come up with something that would meet your needs and allow us to alleviate the concern of having a road that was blocked by a fire hazard or by an emergency. If we can get specs that you guys are comfortable with and that was our whole point in all of this. I would say throw out the twenty-four or the thirty wide straight road.

Dave Raines stated I think twenty-four is an absolute minimum and even taking consideration regular day to day deliveries traffic, what not, people parking for bus stops or whatever. Obviously you don't want to encourage residential parking in a subdivision like this but you are going to have the occasional twelve feet blocked by a vehicle.

Board Member Pierro asked is it going to be our recommendation that this roadway not have any overnight parking on the street.

Rich Williams stated typically through out the Town at times during the year there are absolutely no parking after seven p.m. but again, we don't design roads to have parking on the sides people just do it.

Board Member Rogan stated you know what though in driving around the newer subdivisions in the area it seems like most of the off street parking is workers, deliveries I don't see in a subdivision like this I don't see people parking their cars out on the street. It just doesn't seem to fit in.

Rich Williams stated I can tell you consistently I live on a not so good corner as Paul found out the other day not that he had an accident but he responded to an accident all the time in the summer I come home and people are parked all over my lawn right on the edge of the road, parties.

(Too many talking at the same time unable to transcribe).

Paul Piazza stated a question came up before about blocking the road if we have to block the road we are going to block the road there is just no two ways about it. We block 22 from time to time also.

Paul Piazza stated you have got Flintlock Ridge that went through with a thirty foot road, Powderhorn Road.

Rich Williams stated really.

Paul Piazza stated that is a thirty foot road and I don't see why this couldn't be the same thirty foot.

Rich Williams stated I think the issue for me and why I brought it up the Board might want to consider just going with a straight twenty-four foot wide road is we are looking, we need to justify why the Board is not going through the wetlands and if you say that the overriding concern is the environment and then you create all this additional impervious surface you know it is tough to justify that. My recommendation was if you are going down this road where you are going to make a determination that the environment is an overriding concern as opposed to traffic circulation and safety that you go all the way down the road and say the environment is what is most critical.

Board Member Rogan stated I think they are mutual concerns though and I think that you can make the statement that they are both of paramount importance that you have the environmental concern and the offset is to not go through a wetland is to have this concept and then in having this concept and meeting that need to not go through the wetland we need slightly larger or more significant standards to minimize the possibility of the road being blocked other than by the fire department.

Rich Williams stated true I don't disagree if you could come up with a standard that mitigated the safety issue but adding an extra six feet to the pavement I don't see where that mitigates anything.

Board Member Rogan stated it seems to me that it absolutely does though that it creates that extra bit of drivable area that, Rich stated six feet, Board Member Rogan stated well six feet most cars what are we requiring on parking spaces nine feet, ten feet we have given waivers to nine so we are almost to a full, Board Member Pierro stated that is only so car doors can open so six foot is the width.

Board Member DiSalvo stated but you can get the same affect like even the twenty-four foot road with the swale or whatever on the side without increasing impervious surface.

Board Member Rogan stated my concern on the swale is maintenance and they look like hell.

Paul Piazza stated you are going to put this grass paver or this roadbed to the side Charlie goes in there to plow he is going to rip it all up. That is going to get ripped out and then now you are going to have a mess.

(Too many people speaking at the same time unable to transcribe).

Dave Raines asked what kind of drainage is proposed.

(Too many people speaking at the same time unable to transcribe).

Board Member Rogan stated a closed system.

Board Member Pierro asked no catch basins in other words.

Ms. Burbank replied there is catch basins.

Gene Richards asked what about if you kept the boulevard concept but I think as Kristina mentioned earlier if that median wasn't raised, if it was flush you would still keep your drainage, the drainage at the curb line from the outside of the roadbed but your center island is flush with the pavement you could have your

pavers in there or some sort of grass pavers or something, it will still be a surface that can be driven on there is a still an issue of the highway department do they plow it in the winter time or keep it opened.

Paul Piazza stated and that is the problem if they don't plow it now you are back to the fifteen foot road which prevents the apparatus from getting in and out and or other vehicles. It has to be maintained.

Gene Richards stated that could just maybe be something the Town could work out with Charlie.

(Too many people speaking at the same time unable to transcribe).

Dave Raines stated you are increasing the liability from the standpoint of it not being a road that is going to meet specifications. You are saying to someone it is okay to drive on an unimproved median that is a liability issue and I am speaking not just as a Fire Marshall but being a police officer and a certified accident investigator that I just think and I understand where you are going because I have seen that in many areas especially in Connecticut. We have quite a few areas where it has a median that people drive on, loading zones, things like that where it is different Belgian block area or different pavement but you create that liability issue and if it is not maintained.

Board Member Pierro stated and damage is done to vehicles the municipality is going to be found at fault.

Dave Raines stated this is going to be a town road I assume when it is accepted. Then you are getting back to Richie's point where now we are going to have thirty plus feet of impervious surface and we are talking about thirty feet of blacktop plus another six, eight, ten feet of median that you can drive on which means it is going to be an impervious surface.

Gene Richards stated well the median what I was talking about wouldn't be impervious it would be pervious surface so you wouldn't have that issue.

Board Member Rogan stated I think we are all really trying our best here to come up with something but I think we were talking about two, fifteen foot drive lanes with a median just remove the median go with thirty foot to the junction and back down to twenty-four and call it if people are saying that it will meet their needs that will more than meet their needs on the first section. We might be racking our brains for nothing here.

Board Member Pierro asked twenty-four to the cul-de-sac to the turn around.

Board Member Rogan stated thirty from Bullet Hole to the junction where it splits and twenty-four for the loop and be done with it. You need twenty-four anyway that is the minimum that they will allow so you are obviously starting from twenty-four as your minimum I just think we should provide the extra six feet for the first leg. I don't know what everybody else thinks about it but I think we are racking our brains.

Chairman Schech stated I think the fact that we did pull those houses out of the shallow soils down below and we did shorten the road so we did create a little less impervious surface.

Board Member Rogan stated we certainly did.

Chairman Schech stated we are going to have to add on a little bit for the thirty foot road apparently we can't away with the grass driving.

Board Member Pierro stated apparently there are some different thoughts on that amongst the Board why don't we put it to a vote and be done with the issue.

Board Member DiSalvo asked do we have anymore options.

Board Member Pierro stated I don't think so we are creating a maintenance nightmare.

Rich Williams stated I don't want to think about any more options.

Board Member Pierro stated we are creating a maintenance nightmare.

Board Member Rogan stated I am concerned about the maintenance.

Board Member DiSalvo asked well how do other towns handle it.

Board Member Rogan stated well that is the problem we have seen alternatives that we have proposed very closely that other towns have done and we have had great feedback from but with the new requirements that we have it is not an option so I think it is a result of the time of where we are in 2005 and these are the requirements that we have and we need to design for those requirements.

Board Member DiSalvo asked what do you think if you calculate the length of road at thirty feet and then the length of the road at twenty-four feet how much more impervious surface are we talking about.

Unable to hear Ms. Burbank's answer no microphone.

Dave Raines asked is there a number in the middle between twenty-four and thirty that the Board is more comfortable.

Board Member Pierro asked if I am going to go over twenty-four let's go to thirty and be done with it.

Board Member DiSalvo asked do we have enough like you said (unable to hear) and valid enough that we are following environmental restraints not going through the wetlands but we are throwing them over here.

Rich Williams stated you know this Board is in a difficult position where it is right now because it is really a judgment call and it is like you can't go to another Town and say what would another Town do because,

Board Member DiSalvo stated I just like to look at what they have done.

Board Member Rogan stated it is unique to this project.

Rich Williams stated absolutely but it is also what this Town considers priorities. I mean if you go to another Town a wetland would have been filled in its entirety. Everybody does it differently.

Board Member Rogan stated and I think the other thing to remember on this case is that the concern with this idea either the boulevard or a twenty-four and thirty-foot wide single access was setting a precedence that we would be going greater than the distance allowed by Code and that would be a precedence in and of itself but I think the thing to remember is that this project went through many modifications trying to avoid

that and you have done a reasonable job in trying to avoid the issues that arise from providing that secondary access. In my opinion it doesn't set a precedence because you have a unique situation here and I think any other situation would have to meet the same process in order to go longer than the distance that we have set in our Town Code.

Board Member DiSalvo stated now another thing going around the loop at twenty-four what is the difference in going with thirty.

Chairman Schech stated let's make a motion and see how it flies. A thirty foot wide road up until the junction of the loop and then twenty-four foot for the loop.

Board Member Rogan stated before we vote though I think Maria's point though is it worth looking at the specs for the whole way what would be the concern with that.

Board Member DiSalvo stated are people going to say why did we do that from a, (too many talking at the same time) Board Member DiSalvo stated aesthetics are those people going to feel like why is my road narrower than.

Board Member Rogan stated I don't think you would even notice it. It is three feet each side on a gradual. They don't do it right in.

Rich Williams stated you are not going to see the difference.

Board Member Rogan stated I am glad to see that you brought that up.

Ted Kozlowski stated plus the road is going to be there before the people are there. They are going to see it before they buy it.

Board Member DiSalvo asked and how do you feel about that from the fire department point of view.

Dave Raines stated I think that the twenty-four feet in here because you will be able to access it either way plus it is going to slow your traffic down which is going to be a plus especially with all your open space it is going to significantly slow the traffic down having a twenty-four foot roadway. Like I said but having to be able to approach any of those lots from either direction it really solves the problem because if you do become blocked you have got access.

Chairman Schech asked on the motion.

The Secretary asked who is making the motion.

Chairman Schech replied I guess I did.

The Secretary asked do we have a second on it.

Board Member Rogan seconded the motion.

Chairman Schech asked all in favor:

Board Member Montesano	-	aye
Board Member Pierro	-	aye
Board Member Rogan	-	aye
Board Member DiSalvo	-	aye
Chairman Schech	-	aye

Motion carried by a vote of 5 to 0.

The Secretary asked so you are going with a thirty foot wide, Board Member Pierro stated roadway to the loop, the Secretary stated to the loop and then twenty-four foot wide loop.

Chairman Schech replied right.

Board Member Pierro stated and from a practical point of view and maybe Dave will agree and maybe he won't but from a public safety point of view excuse my language but when the poop hits the fan people are not going to care and I have drove armored plated vehicles on to front lawns through garage doors while people are shooting at you they don't care what you do to their front lawn when there are babies trapped in the house and the house is on fire.

Board Member Rogan stated well that is the extreme situation.

Board Member Pierro stated as long as the landscaping is contoured in a certain way where emergency vehicles or other vehicles could get on to a front lawn regardless if they cause a little damage we have to be able to,

Dave Raines stated it is majority of the calls, the automatic alarms and it calls for general service, hazard conditions where you don't want to go tearing up somebody's property take down mailboxes.

Board Member Pierro stated yes but in the extreme circumstance.

Dave Raines stated in the extreme circumstance all bets are off but we are not going to have a situation where a truck is going to have to come down and have to back up because now they can't. If the fire is here and we had a boulevard the truck would have to go all the way down to come back to here and that is just not going to fly. I think you resolve that issue clearly.

Dave Raines stated I have one other issue. I just want to hand these out to the Board. He handed out documentation with regards to fire protection to the Board.

Rich Williams asked Dave did you make a copy for the file.

Dave Raines replied no.

Board Member Rogan stated you can have mine when I am done with it.

Dave Raines stated I will give you this one.

Dave Raines stated this was a draft that I came up with that I worked on for about the last year I took into consideration several other municipalities aside from Fire Code. What it is is just a recommended standard

for fire protection water supply specific to this since we are talking about this project here right now there are two tanks designed, two twenty thousand gallon tanks designed for this subdivision. What I am asking for is a tank be installed I don't know if it could happen in open space parcel four but we don't want to have the tanks more than a thousand feet apart. The truck is pulling in, pulling to the closest tank nearest the fire and one truck is parking at the tank drafting from the dry hydrant and laying hose. It is about a gallon a little over a gallon of flood for the five inch hose so right off the bat we are losing say we lay a thousand feet which is a standard lay is a five inch hose some trucks have a little more some trucks have a little less. We don't want to go beyond that thousand feet to get water.

Board Member Rogan asked what are the size of these tanks.

Dave Raines stated twenty thousand gallon tanks.

Board Member Rogan asked can you tell me do you have any idea what we normally use say fighting a structure fire or would that be more, Paul would you be able to tell. Are we using ten thousand gallons.

Dave Raines replied when I was Chief we put fires out with three thousand gallons we put fires out with fifty thousand gallons but looking at this, what size are these three, four bedroom.

Ms. Burbank replied four bedroom.

Dave Raines stated three, four thousand square feet.

Ms. Burbank replied around there.

Paul Piazza stated fifty gallons a minute.

Board Member Pierro asked and the alternative to the tanks I want to cut to the chase.

Dave Raines stated I don't know that there is alternative to the tanks. We have two tanks in this design.

Board Member Pierro asked in all scenarios if we were to equip these houses with sprinklers.

Dave Raines stated you mean cost wise you are talking hundreds of dollars versus pennies.

Ted Kozlowski asked isn't the cost offset though by their savings in insurance.

Dave Raines stated absolutely.

Paul Piazza stated the only tricky part to that is ISO Rating which will have an affect on their insurance (hard to hear no microphone) fifty thousand gallons for a tank. That is the ISO Rating, two hundred and fifty gallons per minute flow in two hours.

Rich Williams asked that is true but isn't the ISO standard town wide an impossible standard to meet.

Dave Raines stated town wide,

Paul Piazza stated town wide but you can go districts.

Dave Raines stated that is why I am saying 60,000 gallons of water will allow us, if this was the town and we had to meet that ISO Rating we could meet it using multiple sources. We couldn't meet it using one tank but if we put the third tank in we limit our distance. There is too much distance between the tanks to pick up these homes in the middle. This tank is placed we can utilize it for anything in the back and this tank obviously is in a great spot as soon as you come into the subdivision the second truck would stop here and the first truck would already lay hose.

Board Member Pierro asked do we have a green space or a community area where we can put that second tank in the center.

Dave Raines asked I was hoping we could use the open space parcel four and put another twenty thousand gallon tank. We would have the 60,000 gallons which it just happen to I did not see the tank layout until today but the way I developed this, on Page 2; residential subdivisions of more than ten lots shall have no less than 60,000 gallons of fire protection water. Any single tank shall be a capacity of no more than 20,000 and that is only from the standpoint in talking to the folks in Westchester and Fairfield County and also Putnam they have run into problems in this part of the country with putting a 30,000, 40,000, 50,000 gallon tank in the ground because contractors want to tie together two, three, four tanks then you run into problems and leaks and then it is whose responsible five years later, three years later, the homeowner's association. We ran into that years ago with Haviland Drive, top of Haviland,

Board Member Rogan stated Quail Ridge.

Dave Raines stated Quail Ridge. We ended up evaluating a couple of properties there when the tanks let loose. We learned a lesson that was we tried to tie together a couple of different tanks granted they were concrete with seams but,

Board Member Pierro asked and how do you recharge these tanks.

Dave Raines stated that is another issue. I don't think we can mandate that somebody tie a well in so you would have a well that would supply the tank. That would be the optimum way to go again that is a big cost factor. I recommended that the tanks have wells if we don't have it I mean in a district it would have a common well system or what not you could have a valve line to tie in.

Board Member Pierro stated most of the time it is a false sense of security because people think that the tank is going to refill in a heartbeat.

Dave Raines stated right. What subdivision was the hydrants, Victorian Heights, who was going to put the hydrants in.

Paul Piazza stated Pondview.

Dave Raines stated I had a proposal that came in that had hydrants on it I said wow they are putting hydrants in, Paul Piazza stated hold on that was this. Dave stated that was for this but yet the hydrants were really for flushing of domestic water but yet talk about a false sense of security. You buy a house and they put a hydrant in front of Lot 33 hey that is good, Board Member Pierro stated and you can't put a fire truck to it.

Dave Raines stated we talked about using different types of hydrants that are not a fire hydrant to flush.

Paul Piazza stated on something like this they are going to be putting underground utilities in if they put hypothetically they put that third tank in you just said, put the well there they can pipe it and fill the other two tanks as well as that third tank with cut off switches on them.

Rich Williams stated the problem is now we are getting into a much more complicated system. I mean even individual wells with the tanks as we experienced at Deerwood becomes fairly complicated because we then have to put a control panel up, we have to weather feed it and then we have to, Paul Piazza stated we bill them. Rich Williams stated but ultimately it is going to come down to the Town maintaining it.

Board Member Pierro asked Paul, aren't there scenarios where the tanks would be put in place with hydrants and the fire department would recharge the tanks.

Paul Piazza stated the fire department does not want to be held liable for it nor should the Town. If the Town accepts that liability and that tank is not refilled or the fire department accepts the responsibility and the tank is not refilled for whatever reason you are talking and a house burns down and that tank is empty,

Rich Williams stated supposed we have a homeowners association maintaining the tanks and they are not filled up and they are not maintained,

Paul Piazza stated that is why they put the well in.

Rich Williams asked is the HOA responsible.

Paul Piazza stated the HOA would be.

Board Member Pierro stated but how do we even know that the wells in this area are going to be capable to support 37 houses and three, 20,000 gallons.

Board Member Rogan stated that is a small amount the tanks because you are not emptying them everyday. Even if you trickled in one gallon a minute you would fill them in a matter of a couple of days. If when,

Paul Piazza stated HYH, Victorian Heights the original subdivision plan for that was to have the stormwater feed into the tank, open grate on top to fill the tank, they came in for a submittal to change the tank from concrete to steel and gave us the opportunity to re-evaluate what was originally approved they now put in a fifteen thousand gallon tank well fed, the HOA is responsible for it. Wyndham Homes they have a new tank in the ground, 20,000 gallons with a well, well feed right now they have water in the tank their well is not hooked up, they put water in the tank and I have a letter from them that if that tank is emptied within twenty-four hours they will bring in tanker trucks at their expense to fill it up.

Dave Raines stated again, I addressed that on page 3 that two things need to happen. We need to create a Water Supply Officer, Water Supply Committee whether it is through the fire department, through the Town, through my office that oversees all the tanks, all the dry hydrants, Victorian Heights the hydrant got snapped off in the winter a plow hit it, whatever, a letter goes out to the homeowner's association or whoever is the owner of record of the tank, it may still be the developer if it has not been an accepted subdivision or what not fix it otherwise you are in violation of New York State Fire Code. It is in the Code.

Board Member Pierro stated sure but Dave, you know (TAPE ENDED).

Dave Raines stated the other side of it is the entity responsible for the maintenance of the subdivision of homeowner's association property Management Company would be responsible for filling the tanks, responsible for maintaining the level. Again the WSO, Water Supply Officer, would do periodic inspections and say tank number two is low or the threads are broken on the hydrant and what not. I don't think the fire department should be responsible for running around and filling everybody's tanks unless you have fire. I mean if there is a fire in there.

Board Member Pierro stated unless there is a nearby fire that is not hooked up to the system and the fire department decides to go up there and hit a hydrant, fill a tank instead of shuttling it from a pond. That is a different story.

Dave Raines stated the first attachment section has an underground tank, typical layout. It is the simplest layout I could find which provides a two and a half inch fill point and an overflow for the tanks. Some of the tanks the Town has fill points; some of them have manhole covers where the water is basically dumped in. This works out much more efficiently and affectively because you are not digging up a manhole in the middle of February trying to fill the tank. I agree with Paul I don't want you to think that I disagree with him in that they all should be well fed, I don't know if that is always viable. There is only two or three spots in the subdivision you can put a tank. I don't know if you are going to get water here if you put a well there.

Board Member Pierro asked Kristina, the existing wells that are in the conservation area what kind of supply do you recall what kind of gallons per minute you got out of them.

Ms. Burbank replied I don't recall it was a huge amount but if we started considering those we couldn't provide access.

Board Member Rogan stated I don't think he is even,

Board Member Pierro stated no I am just trying to get a ballpark whether or not the water is there and are those wells close enough to supply even one of those.

Ms. Burbank replied no.

Board Member Rogan asked if when the tanks are installed as part of the installation they have to get filled by a tanker truck then if they get emptied for use in the subdivision the homeowner's association bears the cost of filling them by tanker. If you guys come in and pump out of them for an outside related issue then the fire department either fills them on their own or back charges to where the fire was or something to that affect for the service. Them providing the tanks in here certainly is a community service. It is certainly going to benefit anyone within a mile of that subdivision within two miles of that subdivision. I just don't like the idea of the individual wells because of the chance that they may sit idle for three to five years not being used and then the pump goes. You know the worse thing for these things is the lack of use now I know that the fire department probably could come around routinely and pump some water out to trigger the well to click on but I think in the long run the maintenance on wells.

Board Member Pierro stated there is a liability to that to the fire department comes up and decides to run a well and it blows the pump,

Board Member Rogan stated exactly.

Board Member Pierro stated then the homeowner's association may have a potential action against the Town.

Board Member Rogan stated remember also the pump is only going to pump at the design requirement. If it is a one horse power pump and it is going to pump three gallons a minute. You are not going to try to get the pump more than it can.

Chairman Schech stated going through an antiquated Code I was looking at yesterday if you have a sprinkler house you don't need a system like this. There was one in there if the houses were a certain distances from one another you don't need a system like this. What is the distance between houses. That was in the State Code.

Paul Piazza stated I think what you are reading is if you are closer than x amount of feet it has to be a fire rated wall on either side.

Chairman Schech stated no.

Paul Piazza stated I am not familiar with what you are saying. I would be more than happy to check it out in the Code.

Chairman Schech stated it might have been an old Code but it was a New York State Code.

Dave Raines stated not on single family residential in commercial applications yes. If you do not have a fire separation you have to sprinkle the buildings.

Chairman Schech stated no it had nothing to do with fire separation and the building it had fire separation between houses.

Rich Williams asked we are running across this all the time Gene and I especially when we are reviewing these plans about when it is appropriate to be looking at putting water supplies in and when it is not and I have talked with Paul a couple of times about what standard should be applied I know there is an NFPA standard which I have talked about and I am wondering what standard we really need to be looking at as far as determining how much water and where we need to provide it, does it need to be every subdivision, every subdivision greater than ten lots.

Chairman Schech stated at one time the thinking was that in every subdivision you put in hydrants with a regular standard pipe so that quote eventually they are all going to be hooked together and you would have water throughout the Town.

Rich Williams stated but we are not doing that anymore.

Chairman Schech stated but we are not doing that anymore.

Dave Raines stated what I tried to come up with is a standard by kind of meeting everything halfway, ISO is an extreme and this isn't a planned community from the standpoint that we are not starting from scratch

so let's not penalize anybody who is coming in to develop because ninety-eight percent of the Town doesn't have water but what we want to do and what we are looking at, first of all we create a subdivision that is well longer than fifteen hundred feet which affects our accessibility, getting in and out with a tanker, if we put no water in here we have got to tanker the water with a two thousand gallons per truck,

Rich Williams stated this is a unique situation I understand that.

Dave Raines stated that is why I am saying put the tanks in, let's cover it versus increasing the costs of the homes by sixty thousand dollars each to sprinkle them unless the developer feels that is not an issue.

Board Member Pierro asked is that a reasonable, is sixty k a reasonable,

Dave Raines stated yes it is sixty thousand dollars I just did one,

Board Member DiSalvo stated we didn't spend sixty thousand dollars,

Ted Kozlowski stated that sounds very high.

Dave Raines asked where did you get the water from,

Board Member DiSalvo replied from municipal.

Dave Raines asked municipal what.

Board Member DiSalvo replied the Town of Greenburg.

Dave Raines stated right take that out and you are talking like twenty-two, twenty-five thousand dollars. I do this for a living my company is Safety Solutions. We just did two houses that are about forty-five hundred square feet each right up here on South Quaker again this is no water if you have municipal water a whole different deal. You have got city water. One house was a pressure system, split system, two pressure tanks. The pressure tanks alone are fifteen thousand dollars because you don't have water, you don't have city water. If you have city water you are dropping the costs by more than half.

Board Member Pierro stated I see the Applicant's Engineer getting pale over there while you are talking sixty thousand.

Dave Raines stated my house cost me almost thirty thousand dollars. I am in Sherman, I have no water, I have a well that just makes it on my needs for my house and I had to put in a six hundred gallon poly tank with a pump by Code you have to if it is electric you have to have backup you have to have a generator that is another twelve thousand dollars you are not going to put a diesel system in your home. I am talking about something that meets Code. Greenburg has its own code which is excellent. Many Towns now, Greenwich just adopted one similar to Greenburg, Banksville. It is sixty thousand maybe it is a little high but we are still talking forty, fifty. We did sixty again, this was new, there is sprinklers everywhere throughout not just the bedrooms. Some Codes are just where the sleeping area so this is throughout garage, dry system, you don't want it to freeze up, basement, storage areas the whole nine yards. Let's say forty or fifty thousand I don't know that is a tradeoff versus putting three tanks in with dry hydrants.

Board Member Pierro stated I think the cost is prohibited.

Dave Raines stated fifteen, seventeen thousand is what we paid for the last one, seventeen thousand installed to put a hole in the ground with a tank and a p.v.c. hydrant.

Board Member Rogan stated the twenty or thirty thousand gallon tanks when we first discussed this it was at least a year ago or more we had a conservative estimate of like two hundred or twenty to install each unit and it might have been based on thirty thousand gallons. I am talking about in the ground the units. Who was it that gave us the numbers, Kristina was it you.

Board Member Rogan stated someone gave us numbers for construction costs.

Rich Williams stated I remember we were talking about construction costs and I believe, Chairman Schech stated something came from Deerwood.

Rich Williams stated we were trying to relate what happened out at Deerwood they had given us what it had cost them for a twenty thousand gallon tank of like sixty to eighty thousand dollars for that tank.

Paul Piazza stated no, no, no way.

Rich Williams stated if I recall.

Board Member Rogan stated regardless of the fact you are talking about a significant purchase either way. I just don't think that we need to be requiring each house to put in a system I don't see it.

Dave Raines stated not without municipal water.

Board Member Rogan stated put in your twenty thousand gallon tanks and be done with it.

Dave Raines stated if we had municipal water and we had water mains we could do that and I think it wouldn't be such a great burden and you would set anything over x number of square foot would be required.

Board Member Rogan stated certainly as Ted pointed out you will see a significance savings in insurance but let's face it you are never going to recoup sixty thousand dollars you would have to live two hundred years.

Ted Kozlowski stated I don't know what the numbers are but I know the guy from National Fire Sprinkler Association would answer those questions.

Board Member Pierro stated my concern that there is ample water on the site and wells to recharge these tanks and obviously from what Kristina tells us about the wells that are in place already that there is a lot of water there I mean we already know in the wet lots there is a lot of ground water there if we can come up with a reasonable plan.

Dave Raines stated I think the responsibility to refill the tanks needs to be on the,

Chairman Schech stated the easiest way to refill them is to buy the water. How often are you going to use it. You are not going to go up there and practice with it are you.

Paul Piazza stated we are obligated to test them once a year but we recycle the water.

Chairman Schech stated you are recycling it back you are not going to use the water.

Board Member Pierro asked a tanker truck, what does it cost to fill a pool Herb.

Chairman Schech replied what two fifty a load now.

Board Member Pierro stated that is the kind of thing that if somebody has a fire in their house, sorry about your fire but here is the bill.

Dave Raines stated insurance companies will pay if water needs to be brought in because there are municipalities that have to pay to bring their water in,

Board Member Pierro stated I think that solves a lot and it takes a lot of wear and tear off the well system for recharging a tank.

Paul Piazza stated well you are not first of all when you talk about the well system understand you cannot use the well for potable water. You have to have independent wells.

Board Member Pierro stated right.

Paul Piazza stated I just want to make you aware of that.

Chairman Schech stated then you have maintenance on the wells and the pump is going to sit there all year long rusting and the fire department when they go anywhere near a water pump it breaks.

Paul Piazza asked but how are you going to get that into the homeowner's.

Chairman Schech stated the homeowner's association is going to have to pay for filling it.

Board Member Rogan stated it would be no different than how we are going to get them to maintain the basins.

Paul Piazza asked are you going to do it like a lighting district. Would it be a,

Rich Williams stated now you are talking apples to oranges what we did in Deerwood is we included as part of the stormwater district the special improvement district and it is going to be a Town obligation. The Town is going to be responsible for making sure that everything works out there. The problem with doing it with the homeowner's association whose the president after awhile you have no idea of who the contacts are, you don't know who to go after. You know that these people are,

Chairman Schech stated so you have to create a district.

Board Member Rogan stated assume from the get go that it will be a defunct organization and just charge it through the taxes and be done with it. You said the Town has to go out and obviously and see whether or

not the things are being maintained or whether repairs are needed. They should be in charge of having the repairs done and back charging to those thirty-seven homes and be done with it.

Rich Williams stated something Dave said tonight and I absolutely agree with if the Town is going down this road, if we are going to be starting to install these tanks consistently we are going be looking to have a lot of them as we seem to be doing we are going to need an individual to go out and inspect them and make sure that they are full.

Dave Raines stated we do it now for commercial properties it is part of my whether it is quarterly or annual inspection we will get to the tanks whether it is A&P, whether it is Clancy's. We look at the tanks we make sure the water level is there, we run the pumps and if there is problems we send them a letter. I don't think that is a huge issue as far as oversight because we are not talking a hundred tanks. We are going to maybe have ten or twelve tanks.

Rich Williams stated no but somebody has to be assigned that responsibility.

Dave Raines stated and again, part of my proposal is it is part of the New York State Fire Code, we need to create the position of Water Supply Officer or by committee however it is going to be handled.

Chairman Schech asked who was the guy in Carmel when we had the restaurant the guy use to come around like every six months to a year and check out the sprinkler system who was that the insurance company.

Paul Piazza stated no you had a private contractor. You are obligated to demonstrate to the Health Department.

Rich Williams asked if I can just get back to my original question though, what do we need to be looking at for a standard when we are looking at water supplies for individual subdivisions because typically I know NFPA has a standard where you look at rural water supply which is based on hauling water and needing to provide a volume of water based on the fire department's ability to haul that is the way they look at their standard if I read that correctly. Is that a standard that we need to be applying or do we need to be applying some other standard or how are we trying to assess where we need water and where we don't need water.

Dave Raines replied I took NFPA 1142, ISO guidelines, New York State Fire Code and then the NFP, Fire Protection Handbook and I took it like this and I brought it down to what I thought was realistic and cost affective for the Town of Patterson.

Rich Williams asked do you have a methodology within that we can say we have got a ten lot subdivision here,

Dave Raines stated yes.

Rich Williams asked and there is a lake right across the street so they are covered or there isn't,

Dave Raines stated I took into consideration that we don't have anything else up here so specific to this, this is the only water we have. Field & Forest I did a calculation there and I spoke to the Engineer and I came up with a number based on the other water that is available not only in Brewster's fire district which

borders Field & Forest but the schools and what not again, if those variables weren't there I would have said we need more water for Field & Forest.

Rich Williams stated okay here is my problem with what you are proposing here, residential subdivision ten lots shall have no less than sixty thousand gallons of fire protection water. Sixty thousand gallons in what kind of a limiting distance.

Dave Raines stated you need to read the whole standard and not just because I took into consideration there is a lot of variables. You may have if there was a subdivision built across from here five years from now we would take into consideration the twenty thousand gallons being a thousand feet from the road.

Paul Piazza stated this is something that is going to have to be looked at and reviewed by Code Enforcement on each and every subdivision that is proposed or site plan that is proposed.

Rich Williams stated I hear what you are saying I am just worried about there being a reasonable standard that everybody can understand and apply.

Board Member Pierro stated what does not sound reasonable to me is we have a thirty-seven lot subdivision and we are requiring three, twenty thousand gallon tanks and then a mile and a half away at Paddock View we have a ten lot subdivision and we are going to require the same amount of tanks and there is more water in Paddock View close by.

Dave Raines asked how long is the road going to be in Paddock View if it is going to be a thousand feet long then,

Rich Williams stated twelve hundred feet.

Dave Raines stated one tank would reach all the homes.

Board Member Pierro stated one, twenty thousand tank.

Dave Raines stated I took into consideration what zoning was and zoning said no more than fifteen hundred feet so I said okay then we can lay either way. You can put it in the middle you can lay either way you are good but we are beyond that here.

Paul Piazza stated each subdivision is going to have its own criteria basically what we are saying this is the standard that we are going to apply when we do the review of the subdivision.

Chairman Schech asked all right if you have a two lot subdivision.

Paul Piazza stated you are not going to be required.

Dave Raines stated I think that is too much of a burden for two lots.

Rich Williams stated if you do a three lot subdivision you need twenty thousand gallons,

Dave Raines stated again, it is the recommended standard Rich I am not trying to set gospel I am just trying to say that if you have a cul-de-sac with three lots and we could put a tank in there.

Rich Williams stated all I am trying to do is come up with a reasonable standard so that when somebody comes in for conceptual review Gene and I know based on some standard that this is what we are going to be looking for.

Dave Raines stated if we are within the existing zoning regulations and we have fifteen hundred foot roads at a maximum you can put one tank in every subdivision and we will have ample water to pull that twenty thousand out and deliver it to the scene of a fire but when you are going two thousand, three thousand, four thousand feet,

Rich Williams stated unique situation.

Dave Raines stated that is when and again I should have written it more of a linear footage well if you are zero to a thousand then one tank but I am also looking at fire load and distribution. I know that with two acre zoning or three acres you are going to spread the houses out so again, there is no calculation. I didn't use a mathematical calculation I took the different requirements under the different guidelines ISO, NFPA because they are guidelines, they are standards they are not,

Paul Piazza stated the other thing we have to look at to in doing the calculations is it a simple straight raised ranch or is it a four thousand square foot colonial.

Rich Williams stated but I think nowadays you have to assume based on the housing that is being built that we are going to be looking at anywhere between four and six thousand square foot houses.

Paul Piazza stated a four thousand square foot as opposed to a twenty-two hundred foot square house is a major difference in the fire load. The problem is we need to take a look at them, Code Enforcement needs to take a look at them and make sure they meet the State Code.

Rich Williams asked what is the State Code, what is the State requirements for providing water supply.

Paul Piazza replied as per Code Enforcement.

Board Member Pierro asked you mean there is no State Code it is up to you.

Paul Piazza replied it is up to me.

Rich Williams asked so there is no standard.

Paul Piazza replied not in the Fire Code.

Dave Raines replied not in the Fire Code for single family residential dwellings that is why I used the different guidelines that are out there inclusive of other ordinances that were developed.

Rich Williams stated most State codes reference NFPA standards.

Dave Raines replied right NFPA 1142 or whatever it is. In any case, I am trying to be realistic to Patterson and take into consideration whether a house is five hundred feet from the road, two hundred feet from the road, the topography and etc.

Board Member Pierro asked where do we need to go with this tonight.

Chairman Schech asked do you think we had enough out of this so we know where we are going. I got confused.

Board Member Pierro stated we are going to go with three, twenty thousand gallon tanks.

Chairman Schech stated in this project just this project.

Board Member Pierro stated independently hooked up to separate wells for recharge.

Board Member Rogan stated we didn't decide that.

Board Member Pierro stated well we have to. I thought the indication from them was they wanted wells for recharge.

Chairman Schech stated no they are trucking water in, they are not but the district is trucking water in.

Board Member Rogan stated I think in the long run that I have heard both sides of it but the maintenance on those things,

Rich Williams stated if I could make a recommendation I think the Board needs to think about this a little bit.

Ted Kozlowski stated I think you need to,

Board Member Rogan stated but that also is not an environmental concern that is a design issue that is not something that is precluded on being decided on tonight.

Rich Williams stated and maybe you want to invite Dave and Paul back at a later date to kick this around a little bit more. I don't know.

Dave Raines stated I think it is a moral question.

The Board replied moral.

Dave Raines asked are you going to put fire protection water in a subdivision when you are going two, three thousand feet off the road or you are not.

Board Member Pierro stated absolutely. I think we all agree that we are going to go with the recommended three, twenty thousand gallon tanks.

Board Member Rogan stated you have won that one.

Dave Raines stated I am not looking to win.

Board Member Rogan stated no what I mean is we agree with you on that we are looking at now at how do we supply them independent well versus filling.

Board Member Pierro stated it would be much easier and cheaper for the Applicant and builder of this project to truck the water in and make it the responsibility of the offending party to refill them.

Paul Piazza stated I think that is become a nightmare later.

Board Member Rogan asked do you have a scenario where we have an independent well functioning right now with some kind of history on it as to how it has functioned over the last five years let's say.

Board Member Pierro stated Clancy's, A&P.

Paul Piazza stated no, Clancy's is not (unable to hear). A & P is.

Rich Williams stated here is the big concern for me anyway A&P is a commercial site you have got an entity you can reach out and touch. Homeowners typically are problematic.

Paul Piazza stated in the Town no nothing that is up and running.

Board Member Montesano stated the only thing that I am worried about is what Richie is bringing up. We have had communities that have had pools run by a homeowner's association it is now a filled in dirt field why because the homeowners said go take a hike, we are not paying and you are talking about putting these things in and,

Paul Piazza stated that is different that is why I am saying you take this and within that district, you form a district, that district in their taxes get billed, the maintenance of the pump, the maintenance of the tank and the hydrants.

Board Member Rogan stated and you know that could be something that could be, Paul Piazza stated just like a lighting district is setup, just like a sidewalk district is setup.

Rich Williams stated but that raises the question and I don't have a clear answer on this I don't know whether it is more cost effective for the Town to actually haul the water in or have the wells and deal with those issues and I don't know.

Board Member Montesano stated it is going to be a Pandora's Box.

Paul Piazza stated that is why I was trying to make it easy before,

Board Member Rogan stated either way though,

Board Member Pierro stated to provide fire protection Mike we have to open the box.

Board Member Rogan stated no he is not saying not to open the box, (too many talking at the same time unable to transcribe).

Chairman Schech stated for the number of times you fill these things you might as well truck the water in.

Dave Raines stated my feeling is operationally a well is not going to affect fire protection. Operational is what we need, if we need to create an ordinance through the Town Board that creates a person responsible for checking this and a vehicle to cite the districts I think it is important with acceptance of these roads and acceptance of these tanks there needs to be something that clearly these tanks are being accepted as meeting the standard and that they will be, shall be maintained by whoever the entity is and it is probably going to be different throughout each subdivision whether it is a homeowner's association or another entity.

Board Member Rogan stated either way we go we have a concern on who does the check ups and how it gets charged but it is a simpler system without the well and all the electrical just the cost alone of putting in the well, the maintenance, the box, the connecting panel you are probably talking seven to ten thousand dollars realistically, three grand to drill the well and another couple thousand to have it all hooked up, seven to ten thousand dollars buys how many truck loads of water. I mean they are going to be filled regardless initially, if we put them in the Applicant is required to have them filled,

Paul Piazza stated you never have to worry about the tank springing a leak if it does the well is going to kick it on and you are going to see it in your billing, you are going to see it in your electric charges.

Chairman Schech stated that is why you have the guy come around and peek in there every once in awhile.

Rich Williams stated trust me that is assuming that somebody actually looks at the billing and see that there is a spike in the cost. That may not work.

(Too many speaking at the same time unable to transcribe).

Dave Raines stated I am concerned that we are going to preclude the installation of these tanks, prevent the installation by mandating that they have to be well fed. It would be great if they were but if you say well I can't put a well here but I really need a tank it has got to be well fed we are tying our hands and the key thing is to have this fire protection water for public safety so we can put a fire out in the event that there is a structure fire.

Board Member Rogan stated we can put the tanks where you want them that is not even a concern but short of the I don't know about the open space we have to look at that one closer.

Dave Raines stated I just don't want to get hung up on the wells. I don't want to get hung up and lose sight of the fact that we need the tanks that is all. Again, I am an advocate of having the wells it would be great to have a well every tank but I don't want to limit our ability to provide fire protection.

Board Member Rogan asked hey, do we want to do one as a trial because if we do one well so that we learn from this and see what the cost is over the time, one well for one of the tanks and the other two as recharge and then we will know in fifteen years time we will have this question answered.

Rich Williams stated we are doing Deerwood. We have got a twenty thousand gallon tank with an individual well.

Board Member Rogan asked a poly tank not a concrete.

Rich Williams replied a poly, the yellow submarine we have pictures.

Paul Piazza stated we also have one at HYH, Victorian Heights.

Board Member Rogan stated the obvious answer too is we can always go back and drill a well. I mean you can always go back and abandon then all too so I could buy either side of that. I don't think we should get overly stuck more than what we already have on it.

Board Member Pierro asked Paul would the fire department choose to get involved in refilling these tanks if occasion,

Chairman Schech stated we went through that already they said no.

Paul Piazza stated fire department no they don't want the liability.

Dave Raines stated and there is too much changing of the guard within the two fire districts.

Board Member Rogan stated we have private water haulers that you call up and you say if it takes twelve hundred dollars to fill it up for whatever was used if it is within that district it gets charged thirty-seven ways and if it is outside then really it has got to be through like you said insurance or by the Town.

Paul Piazza stated bill it right through the Town taxes.

Board Member DiSalvo asked how are you recharging the one in Deerwood.

Paul Piazza replied Deerwood has got a well.

Board Member DiSalvo asked and there is one tank there.

Paul Piazza replied one tank, twenty thousand gallons.

Board Member DiSalvo asked for that whole subdivision.

Paul Piazza stated yes because that was the only thing that was put in when they subdivided.

Board Member DiSalvo asked in the ground there.

Board Member Pierro replied yes.

Board Member DiSalvo stated I would like to go see it.

Board Member Pierro replied you can't see it, it is underground it is a dry hydrant.

Board Member DiSalvo stated I know I would like to go see it.

Mr. Piazza stated Lot 9 you can see the well you can see the hydrant.

The Secretary stated Rich has the pictures.

Board Member Pierro stated all right next issue.

Board Member Rogan stated we don't have to decide if we are putting the wells in or not.

Rich Williams stated I think we have committed to providing, Board Member Pierro stated three, twenties. Rich stated three, twenty thousand gallon tanks and we are going to have to wrestle with the issue with the best way to maintain them. I think at some point the Town Board needs to be party to the conversation because as Dave brought up very validity that there needs to be an individual that is going to be assigned the responsibility,

Board Member Pierro stated I think we ought to poll the Board and see what our direction is going to be I know for one I would rather have a system in place where there is a re-fill and I don't think that I would require the wells for individual tanks on this subdivision. If we can put a system in place where we can get an automatic refill after a fire event or after an entity tests the tank and realizes it needs water I would be incline to go without the wells.

Chairman Schech stated they could put an alarm on each tank can't they in case it empties by itself.

Board Member Pierro stated it doesn't have to be electrical I think. I think it can be battery operated.

(Too many talking at the same time unable to transcribe).

Board Member Rogan asked can I make a recommendation that we copy the Town Board on the minutes relevant to this topic from tonight's meeting.

Rich Williams asked would you rather us send them a memo outlining.

Board Member Pierro replied yes because they will see how confused we are if we send them the minutes so let's just send them a memo.

The Secretary stated and the minutes will not be done for weeks.

Board Member Pierro asked what is next.

Rich Williams replied I think we are all done.

Board Member Pierro stated no we have other issues to discuss.

Board Member Rogan stated Gene was kind of enough to type up I don't know if he typed it up but he certainly worked awful hard on a nineteen page memo with very fine detailed comments but overall though reading through the impact statement I will agree with him that I didn't like when it just said comment noted it does sound like you are saying okay I have read your comment but I don't really agree with it and therefore I am not really going to do anything about it and that is the impression it gives and so I think some explanation as to honestly if someone brought up a comment that is so extreme I would say that the Board deemed it is not applicable within this review.

Rich Williams stated that is not the way it can work. We really have to include all the comments within this document.

Board Member Rogan stated you have to include the comments but,

Ms. Burbank stated you don't have to respond (hard to hear).

Board Member Rogan stated the Board set the final scoping so what was in the final scoping.

Rich Williams stated no this is in other words we have set the final scope within the scoping process we can consider comments whether they are relevant or not we just have to explain why they are or are not and whether they are included but when it gets to the comments that you generally received on the DEIS you want to include every one of them whether you address them or not. I don't disagree with what you are saying that some sort of response is generally appropriate.

Board Member Rogan stated we get comments that are from one end of the spectrum to the other of course some of them hit the nail on the head and some of them are just extreme.

Ms. Burbank stated the problem that I had, sometimes I can combine them and address sometimes you can give (hard to hear her statement no microphone). If it was a logistic question or broader ranging letters where I had a hard time pulling out specific comments I wasn't sure how I addressed other than including the letter in the document I wasn't sure how other than writing the whole letter over.

Board Member Rogan stated the comments the way they were outlined in your document seemed to be pretty straight forward. I mean there are things that obviously you left out, someone wrote a letter you didn't put every single thing they said in there but you tried to figure out what they were asking and that I think was done fine.

Ms. Burbank stated but there were some letters that had no comments pulled from them and it was noted that somehow I should acknowledge the letter and I wasn't assure how to achieve that.

Rich Williams stated just to be clear I think you are talking about two different issues now.

Board Member Rogan stated no I understand.

Ms. Burbank stated no I understood the no comment.

Board Member Rogan stated you have letters that are not addressed specifically as questions here you have the letters as part of the document for what was received but they are not listed so the concern there is as you are saying someone brings up a broad based concern and you have addressed it in other areas of the document I guess she just needs to try to explain how that was addressed. I understand that. That is a difficult task.

Board Member Rogan stated I have nothing else.

Rich Williams stated I guess the issue is having seen the comments that Gene raised and the comments that I have raised other than the ones that you have said is there anything specific and do you want to find the document complete tonight pending those issues being addressed. Typically, what we have done in the past

is Kristine will take the document back, make the changes, Gene and or I will take a look at it and make sure that have been properly addressed rather than going through another Board meeting.

Board Member Pierro stated well Rich, I have the issue in your review, comment number eleven, concerning Claire Burdick, questions the impact of taking her property the Board may wish to include the following statement; the Planning Board requested the developer to explore the possibility of addressing improvements along Bullet Hole Road at the Ice Pond intersection by using property by the abutting land owner if they are willing and at no time did the Board consider taking any property. I would like that expanded to include the discussion that we have had at nauseam about the barn and about straightening that portion of Ice Pond Road in front of Mr. & Mrs. Burdick's.

Board Member Rogan asked wouldn't that be part of the Findings Statement.

Rich Williams replied generally that is something that we are going to put in. The response here is specific to an issue that was raised by, Board Member Pierro stated about the taking of Claire's property. Rich stated right and having heard the Board on a number of occasions expressing concern that there seems to be confusion on Claire Burdick's property about the whole taking issue. I thought it would be prudent to just make it very clear that the Board had no intentions at any time of taking this property and so I suggested toughing the language up a little bit.

Board Member Pierro asked so you are saying that any further discussion on the straightening of any roadway beds in that area would be part of the eventual Findings Statement.

Rich Williams replied ultimately yes that is going to be an issue that is definitely addressed in the Findings Statement.

Board Member Rogan stated that is laid out in the text that we talked about that the discussion is open with the property owner Jensen Tree Farm whatever.

Rich Williams stated and we can take a look at that section and maybe take a look at something there but on this specific comment I don't know if it is relevant there.

Gene Richards stated and let me point out something Shawn you had mentioned our review was nineteen pages and it is but of the nineteen pages the first five really dealt with volume one relative to completeness the other pages were relative to stormwater management (hard to hear) and those are issues that we feel are important to be addressed and will be addressed we have every confidence they will but that will be done once we get through this process and we are looking at a specific subdivision layout. (Hard to hear)

Board Member Rogan asked Rich, if I can put you on the spot for one minute because I like to keep an idea of where we are in the process and where we are going, outline please for everyone the audience included after deeming the FEIS complete where are we going and what happens in terms of the review of the project, the Findings Statement.

Rich Williams stated once the Board deems the project complete they have to, Board Member Rogan stated you mean the document, Rich stated yes the document they have to give other involved agencies and the general public a minimum of ten I believe it is ten to twenty certainly a minimum of ten days in which to review the document, subsequent to that within thirty days the Board must adopt a findings statement

either a positive findings statement, denying the project or picking one of the alternatives or some sort of modification. The next step in the process is since we have had a public hearing on the (TAPE ENDED)

Rich Williams stated on a preliminary subdivision plat the next step is within a very short time frame because the clock is ticking we need to approve or deny a preliminary subdivision plat based on whatever project the Board has decided to go with.

Board Member Rogan asked after the preliminary approval of a concept plan they have to get other agencies for approvals but we still have the opportunity between preliminary and final to fine tune not only obviously a lot of stormwater issues but, Board Member Pierro stated drainage district issues and,

Rich Williams replied once we file this document complete all the other agencies then also have to consider the document and adopt their own individual findings then depending on the agency their time frames kick in and they would have to make a final determination on the project also.

Board Member Rogan asked does the deeming of this document complete does that end the SEQRA process.

Rich Williams replied yes.

Board Member Rogan asked or is it with the Findings Statement.

Rich Williams replied well the Findings Statement actually ends the SEQRA process unless as we have seen in the past some unforeseen circumstance comes up which would re-open the whole SEQRA process.

Board Member Rogan asked now the review by other agencies after we deem this complete, minimum ten days I remember reading that does that run concurrent with thirty days from now let's say assuming tonight thirty days from now for the findings statement.

Rich Williams replied yes.

Board Member Rogan asked so they are reviewing it at the same time that we are basically getting ready to issue a Findings Statement.

Rich Williams replied yes.

Board Member Pierro asked Rich, my question is can we deem the document complete tonight and do it with the inclusion of the thirteen items in your completeness review that have to be included, Board Member Rogan stated well it would be not only that but it would be, Rich stated Gene's memo also. Board Member Pierro stated Gene's memo as well.

Rich Williams replied in the past the Board has deemed documents complete conditioned on addressing the issues then the time frame that actual ten to twenty days and the thirty days does not actually start until they have resubmitted the document and have gotten a letter back from Gene and I.

Board Member Rogan asked that would also include the thirty days correct.

Rich Williams replied yes.

Board Member Rogan asked so in other words if we deemed it complete contingent upon meeting these requirements by you two gentlemen and it took sixty days to do that to get a document to do that then that is when the time frame starts. That was my main concern for bringing this up, Board Member Pierro stated yeah I don't want to put us under the gun.

Board Member Pierro stated I don't have any problem,

Gene Richards stated I think that is what the Board actually did on the DEIS.

Board Member Pierro stated it seems like you have got a lot of work in ahead of you Kristina real quick.

Board Member Rogan stated well a lot of this as Gene pointed out a lot of these things are more through the design stage that you were bringing up but that will be addressed at a later date.

Gene Richards stated three quarters of our memo is later on.

Board Member Rogan stated I think your biggest challenge is just what you were asking with some of the comments how to answer them in an acceptable way that they are being addressed or that the concerns are being thought about because there were questions that I have to think back it might have been Mr. Gunderman who said why aren't we looking at a lot of other alternatives and you said comment noted. How do you answer that do you say that well we looked at these other alternatives and found that they are not or the Board didn't require us to look at those other alternatives which really would probably be the appropriate response.

Rich Williams stated the one I think I wrestled with is Mr. Gunderman's comment about prohibiting, Board Member Rogan stated pesticides, Rich stated pesticides and fertilizers. We don't do that anywhere else in the Town and I wrestled with trying to come up with, Board Member Rogan stated but the answer there was appropriate I thought. It was based on the label guidelines and the requirements of the State and I thought that it was answered appropriately.

Gene Richards stated there is one comment on that subject from somebody maybe somebody else I don't know but I think it was just a comment noted and I think that is where I think we offered some language that they could use just to respond to it. I mean it is nothing that the Town can control or does control currently with any homeowners what they do with their lawn maybe in the future they will maybe they won't. There is no control but also in Volume Two there is a reference to the pollutant loadings and practices that are designed with that in mind that homeowners will use herbicides on lawns. I think the answer is there you just have to pull it together.

Board Member Rogan stated the flip side is there is a lot of discussion about and a lot of public concern people thinking that you are constructing septics on twenty percent grade and we know that is not true that obviously Health Department wouldn't allow that and you go into great detail to explain that it doesn't meet applicable codes of the Putnam County Health Department. I think that it needs to be blatantly obvious in ten words or less that says we are not only constructing septic systems but the tow of the slopes, the grade, any of the fill section none of that area is on twenty percent slopes it is not applicable. Although, I think there was mention of applying that you had,

Rich Williams stated I thought there were some but, Board Member Rogan stated there shouldn't be then, Rich stated you get into the whole issue of where you may have a hundred square foot of slope, Board Member Rogan stated if you figure a slope based on a five lineal foot area yeah that is not the way slope determination is figured and then that needs to be stated that by Code it is figured from the top to the bottom of the area. If you have a hill that goes like this you may have an area that is thirty feet lineal that might be over twenty percent but that does not apply to that.

Board Member Pierro stated that needs to be spelled out because there are many people who believe that we are building septics on twenty percent grade and we need to clear up that misconception.

Board Member Rogan stated you know where it became aware and I don't want to put anyone on the spot but Bob asked a question about what is a pump septic system. It is a really valid question. Someone who knows what it is said well it is obvious it is something that you are pumping up but it is a question of maintenance and it was something that you addressed but I thought really people don't know what a septic system is and Bob may have known what a pump septic is but at least it was put out there to explain so I think those are some of those key issues that people have been concerned about with the steep slopes in the surrounding area. I would make it blatantly obvious that those kinds of things are not occurring. You gave the proper version the long and detailed government type regulation answer. My first sentence would be the obvious state what you are going to say then give the answer you provided and I think that would help.

Board Member Rogan asked how does everyone else feel.

Board Member DiSalvo asked I stepped out did you discuss about the barn, the property.

Board Member Pierro stated that is something that we will address, it is in that document we will address it further when we do the final.

Board Member Rogan stated he says in the document that it is open to negotiations.

(Unable to hear Board Member DiSalvo)

Board Member Rogan stated that will be an interesting thing if something happens with that and that falls through that is part of the Findings Statement. We would be back to the table looking at alternatives on that corner because that was a requirement of the Findings Statement at 49 lots that that land be purchased and,

Rich Williams stated usually when we give you a preliminary resolution where there has been a Findings Statement that we incorporate within the preliminary that it is based on meeting the conditions of the Findings Statement.

Unable to hear Ms. Burbank.

Rich Williams replied if you can't meet the conditions it voids the preliminary plat we start over.

Board Member Rogan stated I wondered a long time about this subdivision about what number in lots would require no change to the road or very, very little change and we have always kicked around ideas and said ten lots, five lots, I don't know.

Board Member Pierro stated we have never took it off the table.

Board Member Pierro asked before we do a motion where did Dave Raines go he snuck out on us. I wanted to do the gentlemanly thing and put it on the record I wanted to thank him and Paul for being here tonight.

Board Member Rogan stated we do appreciate you being here Paul.

Board Member Pierro stated and we appreciate their input and the learning experience because I have been away from firematic activities for fifteen years since RB&W & Gulliver's burnt down it helps to have guys that have a working knowledge and we appreciate you being here because you helped clear up this issue for us.

(Unable to hear Paul Piazza).

Board Member Rogan stated Paul if I had my way I would have it over time or that you got paid to come to these meetings every single one of them and I know that probably does not sound like it fits into your evening plans but that is what I prefer quite honestly.

Board Member Rogan made a motion in the matter of Burdick Farms Subdivision that the Planning Board deem the FEIS substantially complete pending the resolution of comments contained in the Planner's Memo dated February 14, 2005 and Dufresne-Henry Memo dated February 15, 2005.

Gene Richards stated Shawn on our memo it should really just be the comments regarding Volume one.

Board Member Rogan stated so moved.

Board Member Pierro seconded the motion.

Chairman Schech asked all in favor

Board Member Montesano	-	aye
Board Member Pierro	-	aye
Board Member Rogan	-	aye
Board Member DiSalvo	-	aye
Chairman Schech	-	aye

Motion carried by a vote of 5 to 0.

Board Member Pierro asked is there anything else we were going to discuss tonight Rich.

Board Member Pierro asked do we have to do it in the meeting as our earlier discussion on Patterson Crossing about a recommendation for the minutes being on the web site.

The Secretary stated first they have to be approved.

Rich Williams stated what I need to do is I need to talk to Peter Riebold to find out what we can do, what we can't do, what the limitations are then we can come back and like I said we need to talk to the Town

Board about what their opinion is for posting things up on the website because really everything is supposed to be going through them.

Rich Williams stated the only other thing that I have is to let you know that Patterson Outdoor Storage has been staked and is ready to walk.

Ted Kozlowski stated hey, guys before the meeting ends I just called the National Fire Sprinkler Association it is three to four dollars a square foot to sprinkle a house.

Chairman Schech stated but then you need the tanks.

Ted Kozlowski stated no that is including the tanks and it is offset by your insurance. A sixty thousand quote is a retrofit.

Rich Williams stated he was going to send the information.

Ted Kozlowski stated the houses we are talking about is around twelve thousand dollars not sixty.

Board Member Pierro stated a retrofit would be sixty.

Ted Kozlowski stated a retrofit is sixty. He is willing to come give it to us so I wouldn't shut the door on sprinklers. (Too many speaking at the same time unable to transcribe).

Board Member DiSalvo asked Kristina, how do you feel about the sprinkler system.

Ms. Burbank replied I think sprinkling is a real possibility for the Applicant but I would like the opportunity to explore it.

Rich Williams stated if you have a tank there is a way to do the well if you construct it right at the beginning so you can use your well in which case you need auxiliary power.

Ted Kozlowski stated a retro fit is far more expensive.

Rich Williams stated there is a way to do it with a three hundred gallon tank that is pressurized with a separate CO2, (Too many talking at the same time unable to transcribe)

Board Member Montesano stated I think if we are going to go through this and we have an offer on the table to have someone come in and explain it I think we ought to have that meeting.

Board Member Rogan stated I think that is a good idea.

Board Member Pierro stated but there is an inherent benefit having three, I mean fine and dandy if the Applicant wants to talk about sprinkling the houses that is fine but there is an inherent benefit to the community and the other residents in that area to have 60,000 gallons of water sitting around.

Board Member Rogan stated that is a great point.

Board Member Pierro stated there is that benefit.

Board Member Montesano stated Mr. Chairman I would like to make a motion, Board Member Pierro stated I would hate to be the guy on the end of an inch and a half in a burning fully involved building and the water goes out and there is no other tank in the area,

Chairman Schech stated Rich could you write a letter to National Sprinkler to come down let's make a date and have them make a presentation to us.

Rich Williams replied yeah I mean Ted gave me some information I called the gentleman he said he was going to send us more information, he gave me a website that people can go on to get more information on sprinklers, I did a memo to the file and gave the Board a copy so you have all that information and when the additional information comes in I will copy you, I will give it to Paul, I will give it to everybody and then after you have digested that if you want him to come down I have his phone number.

Chairman Schech stated I read a lot of stuff on it but that was years ago and it didn't seem to be that expensive.

Rich Williams stated like I said Dave does it for a living.

Board Member Pierro stated and the heads that are available nowadays don't even look like sprinkler systems they can blend right in.

Board Member Rogan made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Board Member DiSalvo seconded the motion. All in favor and meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.