

**TOWN OF DRYDEN  
TOWN BOARD MEETING  
February 15, 2018**

Present: Supervisor Jason Leifer, CI Daniel Lamb, CI Linda Lavine,  
CI Kathrin Servoss, CI Alice Green

Elected Officials: Bambi L. Avery, Town Clerk  
Richard Young, Highway/DPW Superintendent

Other Town Staff: Ray Burger, Planning Director  
Jennifer Case, Bookkeeper  
Khandikile Sokoni, Town Attorney

Supv Leifer opened the meeting at 7:05 p.m. Board members and audience recited the pledge of allegiance.

**AG AND FARMLAND PROTECTION PLAN  
PUBLIC HEARING (CONTINUED)**

Monika Roth of Cooperative Extension reported that the Agriculture Advisory Committee met last night and reviewed the input received. The typos, formatting and verbiage recommendations were corrected/changed. With respect to comments on zoning, the committee feels those are future consideration items, not necessarily a recommendation. They did include a statement at the beginning at the zoning section to make it clear that those were recommendations of the consultant, George Frantz, who reviewed the zoning and looked at it for its conformance with Ag and Markets Law as well as whether there could be some changes that would be more supportive of agriculture. The intention is to use the document as a starting point for discussion. They hope to work with the Planning Board on that moving forward. The plan is a plan. The intention of the plan is to lay out what is going on with agriculture, what are some opportunities, and provide a roadmap for moving forward. The committee is eager to get to work and they think it is a good plan that can be moved on by the board. They can then get the document to the state and start working. They appreciate the board's patience and recognize that there are always opportunity for changes and improvements, but it is a living document.

Board members have been provided with the most recent version of the plan as well as a summary of the changes made. Supv Leifer said because the newest version was just made available today, the board will take this up again in March.

**PUBLIC HEARING  
CONSTRUCTION OF COMMUNITY SOLAR FACILITY  
2243 DRYDEN ROAD**

Supv Leifer opened the public hearing at 7:15 p.m. Ray Burger explained this project is for two arrays (2 MW and 1.3 MW) on the Carpenter farm.

Nick Vamvas of Chazen Companies explained this is a total 3.3 MW community solar facility to be constructed on agricultural property at 2243 Dryden Road. There are no known occurrences of state-protected flora or fauna; however the site is in range of the northern long eared bat. There is no habitat for the bat on this property as there are no trees. There is a small Army Corps jurisdictional wetland on northeast portion the property. The project is 22

acres in total on two subdivided parcels of combined 26 acres. The existing driveway will be improved. Panels will be post-mounted on the ground. There will be trenching and installation of some utility poles. There will be vegetative screening to limit the views from the neighboring properties and from the public vantage points.

This is a large scale solar energy system as defined by the Town of Dryden solar law. The use is allowed with site plan and special use permit and complies with the Zoning Law adopted February 19, 2015, as amended February 21, 2017. All regulations have been met with respect to lot coverage and setbacks. The fenced area is 22 acres, with the total project on about 26 acres. The use is a very passive use. There is no noise or odor generated. There is no additional draw on community resources, schools or emergency services. Access will be from Ferguson Road. Long term maintenance will be performed a few times a year using small vehicles. There will be some mowing to keep grass below the panels. There are no negative impacts. The site is well suited for the town.

D Weinstein asked about use of herbicides or pesticides and was told they would not be used. The Planning Board had suggested a wider right-of-way so it wouldn't preclude future uses if panels are dismantled. R Winter said the driveways on each flag lot will be widened to 30' each, so there will 60' total available.

S Osmeloski said she supports this project. With the exception of it being located on land currently being farmed, she thinks the project is similar to what was supposed to be allowed in Dryden under the solar proposal presented in October of 2016. Unlike Distributed Sun's project, it will not destroy acres of wildlife habitats or invade wetlands or chop down hundred year old willows. Delaware River has talked to residents and addressed residents' concerns and abided by the town's laws and ordinances. Unlike Distributed Sun, their early site plan showed the 50' internal setbacks that were required by law. When the solar law was amended to reduce those setbacks to 10' instead of being greedy they chose to submit a new site plan showing the new 10' setbacks, something that Distributed Sun has never done (shown any internal setbacks). With the new 10' setbacks in their site plan, Delaware River was able to move the solar panels that were close to Ferguson Road into these internal locations. This is going to allow them to plant taller vegetative screening along Ferguson Road which will reduce the visibility of this project, something that we all really applaud. Delaware River has been straight forward and fair through their application process unlike the shenanigans and bullying that has been felt from Distributed Sun. These two solar projects are as different as night and day. She supports the Delaware River project 100% and will continue to adamantly oppose the two Distributed Sun projects as they are presently laid out. She thanked Delaware River.

Joe Osmeloski said he has mostly spoken negatively about solar projects in Dryden because of the experience they've had at 2180 Dryden Road with the Distributed Sun project at 2150 Dryden Road. Distributed Sun, in his opinion, has done everything to ruin one of the most beautiful sites in Dryden, the Willow Glen Cemetery, and throughout the process seemed unwilling to ever compromise. He supports the Delaware River project 100 percent. Throughout this process they have been willing to do everything they can to mitigate anything that they thought would be a problem in Dryden. They used the 10' setbacks to help the people of Dryden by moving panels back and adding better screening so this project will hardly be seen. He wishes they were doing the project next to him (2150 Dryden Road). He is sure they could have worked something out instead of ending in litigation. He is sure they would have respected the neighbors and the cemetery. It is obvious they have worked with Mr Carpenter to do the best job they could. It's not perfect. It is on very good farmland, so that's an issue going forward and we still have to work on that. It's within .9 miles of another proposed site. That's another issue that should be worked on. We can't have one part of the town obliterated with these and the rest of the town left alone. He doesn't agree with the free

advertisement that Distributed Sun got on the town website for people to sign up. If it was done for them, then Delaware River should also get free advertising on the town website.

Supv Leifer said the information on the website was intended to lessen the number of phone calls to the Supervisor's office asking how to sign up. He agreed it could be done for Delaware River also. It was not intended as a free advertisement.

Rich Winter, CEO of Delaware River Solar, said they have built two arrays (in Chemung and Sullivan County). They will be experimenting with sheep on one of those, and if it works, they will use sheep here as well assuming the town allows it.

R Burger said the Environmental Assessment Form is available. Part 1 was supplied by the applicant. Parts 2 and 3 go through the eighteen areas of potential environmental impact. Dondi Harner of TG Miller will review Part 2 with the board. Part 3 is where the analysis addresses some areas such as aesthetics and community character.

D Harner reviewed Part 2 line by line.

- 1) Impact on Land – Yes – No or small impact may occur
- 2) Impact on Geological Features – No
- 3) Impacts on Surface Water – No
- 4) Impact on Groundwater – No
- 5) Impact on Flooding – No
- 6) Impacts on Air – No
- 7) Impact on Plants and Animals – Yes – No or small impact may occur - waiting on official confirmation from DEC on the northern harrier.
- 8) Impact on Agricultural Resources – Yes – No or small impact may occur – approximately 7.5 acres of highly productive soils 1-4 will be impacted by the project, but no prime land. Land under the project can revert back to the original farmland.
- 9) Impact on Aesthetic Resources – Yes – While there will be screening, the project will be visible from some publicly accessible vantage points and viewed during routine travel or during recreational or tourism based activities.
- 10) Impact on Historic & Archeological Resources – No
- 11) Impact on Open Space and Recreation – No
- 12) Impact on Critical Environmental Areas – No
- 13) Impact on Transportation – No
- 14) Impact on Energy – No
- 15) Impact on Noise, Odor & Light – Yes – during construction. Inverters will be located on interior of the site.
- 16) Impact on Human Health – No

Other than waiting for the DEC letter on the northern harrier that concludes the review at this point. When we have that, it will be inserted in attachment A for Part 3 that will be complete.

There were no further questions or comments. The hearing was left open and will continue on March 15. At that time SEQR will be completed and then the board will perform the site plan and special use permit review. R Burger will prepare draft resolutions and possible conditions for the special use permit.

## **TOWN CLERK**

### **RESOLUTION #43 (2018) – APPROVE MINUTES**

Supv Leifer offered the following resolution and asked for its adoption:

RESOLVED, that this Town Board hereby approves the meeting minutes of January 4, January 11, and January 18, 2018.  
 2<sup>nd</sup> Cl Lamb

Roll Call Vote	Cl Lavine	Yes
	Cl Green	Yes
	Cl Servoss	Yes
	Cl Lamb	Yes
	Supv Leifer	Yes

**CITIZENS PRIVILEGE**

**Laurie Snyder**, 36 Freese Road, read the following statement:

I support the Resolution that was crafted by our Citizens Committee this week.

It is my fervent hope that the engineers of Barton and Laguidice will be asked to prepare 3 complete design reports, with realistic costs, to present to the Dryden Town Board and the Freese Road Citizens Committee. I think the only way the community will feel that their opinions and knowledge are acknowledged is if all three design reports are given equal focus.

Only then can the Dryden Town Board make a wise decision about the future of our historic Freese Road Bridge.

1. Preservation and Rehabilitation of the existing Historic Freese Road Bridge, with the addition of a pedestrian path that would integrate the ugly water line that crosses the bridge.
2. The design of a 14 or 15 foot one lane bridge with a pedestrian path, with historic trusses added as historical decoration.
3. The design of a 2 lane bridge with pedestrian path and historic trusses added as historical decoration.

Tom Seeley, 332 Hurd Road: I've lived in Dryden for 63 years, except for departures for education, and I'm the Director of Cornell's Liddell Laboratory at the top of the Freese Road hill. I cross the bridge at least twice a day.

I'm here to urge you to vote to adopt the resolution presented by the Citizen's Committee. There's no reason that our Town Board should not support the state of NY looking at ALL of the alternatives presented - the one lane and the two lane. The rehab alternative and the build new alternative.

The Citizens Committee is not demanding that the Town Board support the one lane, rehabilitation alternative - only that the **Town Board explicitly support** including the two one lane alternatives in what gets presented to the state.

He read a description of the Freese Road Bridge from [HISTORICBRIDGES.COM](http://HISTORICBRIDGES.COM)  
*"This is one of two bridges in the county that feature an extremely rare continuous two-span design. Nearly all pin-connected truss bridges were built as simple spans. This bridge acts as one single span, with a pier in the middle, forming the continuous design. This design alone makes this bridge one of the more important bridges in New York. Fortunately this bridge has been well-maintained. Hopefully this will continue to be the case, since this is such a significant structure, and the other similar structure in the county is threatened with demolition."*

Freese Road Bridge (Varna Bridge) - [HistoricBridges.org](http://HistoricBridges.org)

**Jim Skaley**, 940 Dryden Road, read from the following letter he submitted:

I strongly support the Citizen's Committee's resolution to be presented tonight and I ask that the Town Board put it on this evening's agenda for a vote as an indication of citizen interest in the type of designs that need to be considered by the NYDOT regarding the historic Freese Rd bridge. Citizens in Varna and the surrounding area have expressed a strong interest in these design considerations—especially given that this bridge has been listed as eligible for historical preservation.

I note that in another resolution to be acted on and presented by Councilperson Dan Lamb, he has noted in his first Whereas the importance of a historical feature that “brings distinction to the area”. The designated rail trail to which the resolution refers is also defined in the Hamlet of Varna Community Development Plan. I support the Board's action to secure this section of the rail bed in order to complete the Varna section of the trail.

***In the Varna Community Development Plan the Freese Rd bridge is also noted as an important feature and is designated as one of the “gateways” to the downtown area of Varna and is so defined as an important “character” component of the Plan that will bring “distinction to the area”.*** The Citizen's Committee's resolution implores the Town to recognize the bridge's historical character and its components and that in doing so that these be considered in the designs to rehabilitate the current bridge or replace it with an equivalent one-lane bridge retaining the historical truss features in the new bridge—and that in either case a pedestrian/bike pathway be added to enhance pedestrian safety in light of the active use of the trails by pedestrians and bikers that cross over the bridge.

Passing this Citizen resolution lets the members of the Varna community and others in the area using this bridge know that they are being heard by our elected officials, and that this Town Board acknowledges the importance of citizen participation in the democratic process to resolve concerns that have an impact on this community.

I believe that retaining the one-lane bridge as a rehabilitated structure with a pedestrian pathway would be an enhancement to the Hamlet and would add and retain additional “character” to the area as stated in the Plan and bring distinction to the area as Councilperson Lamb has so stated.

Records at the History Center in Tompkins County indicate the Varna community was first established in 1800 only three years after the Village of Dryden. Unfortunately, Varna has lost many community features such as a school, hotel, rail station, a saw mill and a grist mill. Preserving the historical Freese Rd bridge then is critically important to retaining and sustaining community character and cohesion. It gives current and future residents in the area something to be proud of and it will contribute to the rebuilding of the Hamlet with the coming upgrades to Rt 366 that include a redesign of the Freese/366 intersection, sidewalks and crosswalks for pedestrian safety. This bridge then is an essential component of the Hamlet Plan and should be so considered. Goal 1 of the Plan states: “Protect and enhance hamlet character”. Goal 2 states: “Develop a transportation system that is balanced, safe, and equitable for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists”. This Hamlet Plan is appended to the Dryden Comprehensive Plan and therefore has legal standing. It is important that the Town Board and the NYDOT view this citizen initiative contributing to the goals stated in the Plan.

It is my opinion in light of the numerous accidents already occurring at the Freese/366 intersection that a two-lane bridge could contribute to even more accidents as cars in rush hour might use this roadway to move more quickly to the intersection; thereby creating a back-up at the intersection and causing impatient drivers to take inappropriate risks. This is why it is important that this bridge project be considered in relation to how the intersection is to be addressed in the upgrade for 366. Endorsing the citizen resolution to ensure that aspects of a

one-lane bridge be considered equally with other designs is both rational, considerate, and appropriate as efforts continue to promote improvements as defined in the Varna Community Development Plan.

**Janet Morgan**, 940 Dryden Road, read the following statement:

***This 'tiny bridge project'***

Those are the exact words used in an explanation given to the Freese Rd. Bridge Citizens Committee about why the Town Board declined to second a motion (last week) to place a resolution on the agenda for tonight. The Citizens Committee was reminded that the resolution was created as a means to convince Assemblywoman Lifton to get involved with the Freese Rd. bridge project.

The Citizens Committee was told the resolution was not necessary because the Town Board already has good communication with the NYS Department of Transportation, the overseer of the bridge project. And, we were told the Assemblywoman has much more important things to do and does not need to be involved in this 'tiny bridge project.'

Describing this as a 'tiny bridge project' infers that we, the citizens who are concerned about preserving the historic one-lane bridge on Freese Rd., are simply being selfish. Surely we have bigger things to deal with. Surely we should understand that the Town Board has bigger things to deal with and will deal with the bridge project in a sensible way. Town Board members basically say: "Trust us, we've got it covered." Don't the citizens trust the Town Board?

NO, at this point we do not trust the Town Board to seriously consider all possibilities for rehabilitation of the historic one-lane bridge. We have heard strong indications from the get-go that several Board members are determined to install a two-lane bridge on Freese Rd.

As a member of the Citizens Committee I do not trust the rationale given to us about the resolution. I suspect the real reason Town Board members don't want the Assemblywoman involved is territorial. I can imagine Board members thinking: "We are managing this project and don't want the Assemblywoman involved. After all everyone knows the sensible thing to do is to build a two-lane bridge that will last a really long time."

So, let's talk about things that last a really long time. Things that shine a light on the history of our Town. Things that give us roots. And character. The one lane bridge in the hamlet of Varna is a piece of history. It still works. It can probably be fixed to work even better. Let's find out.

Use every avenue and resource available, including Assemblywoman Lifton. Put the new resolution on your agenda, discuss it, pass it. Do the right thing. Here. Tonight. Because this is not just a 'tiny bridge project,' it is part of history right here in Dryden. Thank you.

Cl Lamb stated the view of the board had been misrepresented and 2.5 million dollars is not tiny.

**Hilary Lambert**, 1676 Hanshaw Road, said she is nervous about this because this situation, the Fall Creek valley, the bridge, the intact landscape, the historical nature of not just the bridge itself, but its context, is enormously important to her. She is not speaking as a NIMBY, but is troubled by the idea of expanding the bridge which would then expand highway capacity and probably lead to other changes that would not be good for the area. She has lived here a long time, started exploring Fall Creek in 1962, and she has seen the structures,

foundations, and old buildings down in there. She has also seen the Cayuga Trail built along the edge of the gorge that wanders down and crosses Fall Creek and continues to the Cornell campus. She sees the dozens of people that use the trail and sees the scientists who benefit from this area and the quiet unity and beauty of the valley. She sees the bridge as a keystone in keeping this precious place intact. She hopes, in a spirit of compromise, that the board can please consider the idea of a perhaps an improved one lane bridge for this location.

**David Weinstein**, 51 Freese Road, read the following statement:

I am speaking in favor of the resolution offered to you by a near-unanimous consensus of the Freese Road bridge Citizen's Committee.

By passing this resolution, the board would tell the NYDOT that the board wants an open process in which all options, including rehabilitating the current Freese Road bridge, are treated as viable.

Viable means that if a one-lane bridge option proves to be the most economical and practical, it would receive full consideration for approval.

This resolution is unfortunately necessary because the NYDOT has already informed us it will not give full consideration to a one-lane bridge option, and that "a two-lane bridge is required for this funding".

They have said this even though they have yet to provide a written justification for that that doesn't have holes a mile wide and is supported by documentation.

Finally, the National Historic Preservation Act says that it is your obligation to ensure that that there is no feasible and prudent alternative to the elimination of use in place of the historic structure, and that you have exhausted every pathway that could have led to saving the structure in place.

If you are at all concerned about the State Historic Preservation Office stopping this project because you did not push the DOT emphatically to open the process, this is a perfect opportunity to start showing due diligence by passing this resolution.

**Simon St Laurent**, 1259 Dryden Road, read the following statement:

It's not very often that I get to say that history has been kind to Varna. The highway slashing through it has damaged it for decades. The community's willingness years ago to build water and sewer infrastructure has made it the dumping ground for the Town's dreams of density and tax revenue. "So far from God, so close to Cornell," or something.

However, history did us one massive favor. The historic Freese Road bridge is both an emblem of local industry and the most effective traffic calming device in the area. The intersection of Freese Road, Mount Pleasant Road, and Dryden Road has some of the worst sightlines in the area, combined with steep hills that make winter driving exciting.

We know that the Town Board wants to see lots and lots of development in Varna. Why would you want to draw even more traffic to the area than it already has, to an intersection that's broken and unlikely to get better?

History's been protecting us here. Be kind to history.

Don't sell us out and claim the state made you do it. If it comes down to it, don't take state money to make your Town worse.

**Bruce Britton** said he is an engineer and lives in Forest Home. He worked on both Forest Home single lane bridge projects. He is also the historian for Forest Home and is on the citizens committee for the Freese Road bridge. He is in favor of preserving the bridge as is. It is an extremely rare two span continuous pinned pony truss bridge. Those are very rare and there are few survivors of this type of bridge. The truss is in very good condition. It looks like all major components of the truss are original. It has seen some repairs through the years, but for the most part it is in very good condition historically. It does need paint and new stringers; minor repairs in the big picture. The resolution presented simply keeps all options open. It may not be strictly necessary, but he doesn't see how it could hurt to make sure all options are given full consideration. He would be happy to meet any board members to take a look at the bridge and share what he knows about the history of the truss bridges and that one in particular. This bridge started out a mile upstream at Sherwood Mills. In 1922 when the Freese Road bridge went into the creek that bridge was brought down, new abutments built and a new pier in the creek to accept the bridge.

**John Burger**, 1686 Hanshaw Road, said he is in favor of the resolution and in favor of protecting that one lane bridge. Doug Mills from DOT cited DOT guidelines for retaining a one lane bridge including the fact that a one lane bridge can have a maximum of only 350 vehicles per day. They made up the document. There's no context for making that statement. It is preemptively insensitive to tell us they've already decided this. Based on what? People should not make this abstract designation. Travelers have to pass through places where people are living. There is something under that bridge. It has hiking trails on both sides of it. There is something called mental health and physical health and it has to do with valuing something for what it is. When people are enjoying themselves they want to be where they are. That place is such a gem. People have spoken to the beauty of that area. It's such a contradiction to think about the beauty of that area, the history it represents, the sense of a place having a meaningfulness, and then some think they just have to get through that place. He is glad when he has to stop there and see how beautiful the place is. He'd rather stop there than at the top of the hill at the intersection. This elected board is not expected to take crap from higher ups, and the citizens don't want to take crap from this board. He supports this resolution.

**Ken Burkhardt**, 98 Hickory Circle, said he serves on the Freese Road bridge committee and supports the restoration of the bridge as a single lane bridge with whatever modifications are necessary to meet requirements for the funding. Ultimately it is a historic structure that needs the board to help save it.

**Martha Robertson**, 1655 Ellis Hollow Road, speaking as a member of the citizens committee, said the citizens committee is sort of an official part of the process. She has been to most of the meetings trying to expedite the process to make sure that we do not lose the money. People were told at the public meeting in January that time really mattered. There are two different tracks: the decision about what's possible under the funding structure and the question of investigating which designs should be looked at and have design development and cost estimates done. This resolution asks the board to make sure that we have investigated all the relevant design possibilities while you sort out what is possible under the funding. Both can be done at the same time and if you don't do both at the same time you are delaying the process. They are making it clear now that these are the things they really want to see in the design development.

She received an email from the County Highway Manager today and wanted to make it clear that the County is paying the local share of \$191,887. (Supv Leifer said he was unaware that decision had been made.) Regardless, DOT has told everyone that the County will own the bridge and maintain the bridge, so the County has to approve the design. Everyone concerned will be way better along much faster if we do what the citizens committee has asked, which is pass a very modest resolution that makes it really clear. One option is rehabbing the existing

bridge. Another option is a new one lane bridge that is wider with the trusses added on and the pedestrian path, or two lane option. They hope any new construction options would include the trusses added on and a pedestrian lane. Basically, what seems to have been left out of all the lists she has seen is a new, wider one lane bridge. It is important to make it crystal clear that is what they are talking about: rehab existing, a wider one lane, and then a two lane. The community is trying hard to be rational and reasonable in this and she hopes the board will agree.

**Jim Gustafson**, 350 Baker Hill Road, said he attended the meeting in Varna with DOT and the consultants because he wanted to make sure his view was heard there. He supports a new two lane bridge. He joined the citizens committee to also represent that point of view. In the process it became clear, as demonstrated by the statements made tonight, that in order for the process to be perceived as fair and open these different points of view need to be presented both to the consultants and to the DOT. We need to determine what the actual rules and guidelines for the funding for the federal government and state government are for the bridge so we find out whether a one lane bridge, rehabbed or new, is an option or not. His two priorities are that we not lose this funding. It would be too cavalier by far to pass up 2.7 million dollars and throw that burden back on the taxpayers. We need a process that is fair and open.

He does think that despite the passionate feelings in favor of the historical nature of the bridge and love of the one lane bridge, if you were actually able to survey scientifically, which we don't have the time or money to do, the 2200 a day that drive across that bridge, he believes a majority of them would be in favor of a two lane bridge. They are going to work and to various medical facilities and such in Lansing and that is the most direct route from most of the Ellis Hollow area without having to go through downtown. There isn't time for a survey, so we'll have to decide this on our own. If you decide it is wise to pass this resolution, that's fine in order to be able to facilitate the process of finding out the answer from DOT and he leaves that to the board's wisdom. He thanked them for their service in these difficult matters.

Cl Lavine said it may be easy to put a motion detector camera up and find out how long people wait.

**Priscilla Barkley**, 98 Hickory Circle, said she crosses the bridge every day going to and from work. While she is in a hurry to get to work, waiting each morning to cross the bridge (most times she doesn't have to wait) is a bright spot in her day. She thinks there are a lot of people who feel that way. Many people have told her they are so glad that someone is taking this on. She doesn't speak for everyone, but says that it makes her day easier.

Cl Servoss moved the resolution drafted by the citizens committee for discussion by the board and read it aloud. It was seconded by Cl Green.

**A RESOLUTION TO REQUEST THAT NYS DOT CONSIDER A SINGLE-LANE BRIDGE ON FREESE ROAD AS A VIABLE OPTION FOR EVALUATION**

WHEREAS the Freese Road Bridge, built ca.1890 by the Groton Bridge Company using steel produced by the Passaic Rolling Mill Co, has been judged eligible for the National Register of Historic Places Registry, and appears to be largely original; and

WHEREAS the Freese Road Bridge functions well as a single-lane bridge, with minimal delays, even at rush hour, and the bridge has an impressive safety record, with no reported crashes related to the bridge itself from at least 2012-2016; and

WHEREAS the two single-lane bridges in Forest Home function well as single-lane bridges, while carrying substantially more traffic; and

WHEREAS the Varna Community Association (March 5, 2017 Resolution), the Dryden Town Board (June 15, 2015 Resolution), and the Town of Dryden Conservation Board (February 28, 2017 Resolution) have all voted to support keeping the Freese Road Bridge as a single-lane structure; and

WHEREAS the Town's 'Hamlet of Varna Community Development Plan' (2012) states: "The single-lane [Freese Rd] bridge serves as a gateway into the Varna community" (p. 17), and the gateways are designated for "specific traffic calming treatments" (p. 51); and

WHEREAS the bridge and the immediately adjacent road are crossed in two locations by an extensive system of hiking trails in the area and thus contribute to healthy lifestyles and appreciation of the natural beauty of Dryden; and

WHEREAS the residents of Freese Road are in favor of keeping the Freese Road Bridge as a single-lane structure (petition signed by more than 50 citizens presented to Town board, February 16, 2017); and

WHEREAS to fulfill requirements of the Bridge NY grant, the Town must seek community input and has established a Citizens Committee;

***NOW BE IT RESOLVED*** on recommendation of the Citizens Committee, that the Dryden Town Board hereby respectfully requests that NYSDOT provide full consideration to a one-lane bridge as a viable option in the BridgeNY project design phase for the Freese Road bridge. Analysis of this option should include:

- (1) Evaluating whether rehabilitating the current historic bridge, with the addition of a separate pedestrian walkway, can be done practically and economically; and
- (2) Evaluating whether replacing the current bridge with a one-lane bridge, including a pedestrian walkway and transferring the historical elements to the new bridge as nonstructural decoration, can be done practically and economically.

***AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED*** that the Dryden Town Board requests that full consideration of these options by NYSDOT be treated as integral to the BridgeNY funding for the Freese Road project, and in a manner that does not jeopardize that funding.

Cl Lamb said he appreciates the views expressed tonight and isn't sure how this disconnect happened, but hopes it can be clarified tonight. He will vote against the resolution for a number of reasons, most having to do with the wording and the number of subjective things in it. He's heard the residents don't trust the board, and the board is going to show that it can be trusted. The board has an ongoing dialogue with DOT and he has spoken with them twice today and is in conversation with experts in this field. He believes this resolution was requested by Barbara Lifton's office because they needed something current before she could begin advocating on this issue to whomever. That's a loss of control for this town and they want to negotiate this for the best of all our residents (15,000 people). That's a lot of people crossing that bridge and he isn't willing to relinquish that negotiation with DOT to her or anyone else. He respects her for respecting us. If the committee wants something brought to DOT's knowledge, let a board member know. DOT has the citizens committee's resolution that was already sent. They are reviewing it and appreciate it. Cl Lamb had a conversation with DOT today about options. The BridgeNY program is a set program enabling the construction of some 36,000 bridges in New York. No one he spoke with had any knowledge of a waiver to this program. The BridgeNY program does stipulate particular rules for a one lane bridge. He hopes everyone has seen what the rules are. This is not negotiable. There are facts governing the process. We can work with DOT and explore other options. He learned there are three other options that we aren't even talking about. There is an option for twinning. If you want to

preserve this bridge and its historical significance, why wouldn't we want to consider this as an option? They have rules governing the process that they can't just waive because of political pressure. NYS DOT is willing to find what will work in this community.

To sit back and say "we don't trust you anymore" and "you've got to get somebody else involved" isn't going to work. We aren't going to pass the resolution and we are stuck with each other. He's happy to take phone calls over the weekend and talk to the DOT on constituents' behalf. He is not happy about relinquishing the process and allowing the public to say we don't trust you anymore. He talked to people using the bridge for an hour this week. That's fact gathering. He heard things very different from what is being said here tonight and acknowledged that it isn't scientific. The board is willing to look at other options. The resolution doesn't talk in depth about other things, and has some things he disagrees with. The DOT will not allow us to use a one lane bridge as a traffic calming mechanism. We might want to talk about a stop light at the bridge.

Cl Lavine said there would be no loss of control to Barbara Lifton. This is a democracy; people want to say be sure you consider this and take it seriously. We have nothing to lose. She doesn't understand Cl Lamb's attitude that Barbara Lifton shouldn't have control of this and that the people of Varna shouldn't tell him what they want done. All they are asking for is emphasis that this one lane option should be given a fair shake. Three years ago the Town Board passed a resolution saying that. This board didn't do it, and they are asking this board to reaffirm that same statement that says please give this fair consideration. She doesn't understand what anybody has to lose by this.

Cl Green asked whether there were elements of the resolution that would be reasonable to pass as a board. There was a lengthy, loud and passionate discussion by the board and comments from audience members.

- The design report includes six options rather than three and each one should be looked at.
- Considerations need to be given to the historic nature, practicality, and costs.
- Preservation of trusses will need to be paid for by the town or county.
- Design consultants have to explore all options.
- There may be an exception to keep the one lane bridge.
- Barbara Lifton is inquiring about the rules of BridgeNY already without the resolution.
- A public information meeting was required.
- The citizens committee was formed as a courtesy.
- Trust is an issue for both the committee and the board.
- The board is not done looking at options.
- No one wants to lose the funding for the bridge.
- Citizens Committee and landowners feel the twinning option is a waste of time to consider.
- The design consultant must look at all options for repair, replacement or rehab.
- This funding could be lost.
- The bridge is in danger of being flagged against use.
- All options will include a pedestrian pathway.
- A new one lane bridge would have to be wider.
- Any other viable options can be considered.

Discussion resulted in the following resolution.

**RESOLUTION #44 (2018) – REQUEST NYS DOT CONSIDER ALL OPTIONS FOR EVALUATION FOR FREESE ROAD BRIDGE**

Supv Leifer offered the following resolution and asked for its adoption:

Whereas, the Dryden Town Board appreciates the ongoing time and commitment that NYSDOT has provided in assisting the town with the development of this project, including the agency’s willingness to consider various design options, and

Whereas, the Dryden Town Board looks forward to a continued dialogue with NYSDOT and requests that our counterparts in other levels of government respect the town’s lead role in this project and not advocate particular bridge design options to NYSDOT, and

Whereas, the Freese Road Bridge Citizen's Committee has provided input for the Draft Design Report,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Dryden Town Board requests full consideration of these options, and any other viable options, during the project design phase for the Freese Road Bridge, and these options be treated as integral to the BridgeNY funding:

1. Null – do nothing and essentially cancel the project.
2. Rehab the existing bridge in its existing geometry.
3. Replace the existing bridge with a new one-lane bridge.
4. Rehab/modify the existing bridge to provide a two-lane crossing.
5. Replace the bridge with a conventional two-lane bridge.
6. Replace the bridge with a new two-lane truss.

2<sup>nd</sup> Cl Servoss

Roll Call Vote	Cl Lavine	Yes
	Cl Green	Yes
	Cl Servoss	Yes
	Cl Lamb	Yes
	Supv Leifer	Yes

**HIGHWAY/DPW DEPARTMENT**

Highway Superintendent Rick Young presented his proposed §284 agreement.

**RESOLUTION #45 (2018) – APPROVE §284 AGREEMENT**

Supv Leifer offered the following resolution and asked for its adoption:

RESOLVED, that this Town Board hereby approves the 2018 §284 Agreement as presented by the Highway Superintendent.

2<sup>nd</sup> Cl Green

Roll Call Vote	Cl Lavine	Yes
	Cl Green	Yes
	Cl Servoss	Yes
	Cl Lamb	Yes
	Supv Leifer	Yes

Board members signed the agreement.

R Young asked for approval to purchase a Chevrolet 3500 pickup truck from account DA5130.2 not to exceed \$40,000, and another truck (that will eventually need a dump box) from DPW account A1490.2 not to exceed \$45,000.

**RESOLUTION #46 (2018) – AUTHORIZE TRUCK PURCHASE**

Supv Leifer offered the following resolution and asked for its adoption:

RESOLVED, that this Town Board hereby approves the purchase of a 2018 Chevrolet 3500HD 4 wheel drive pickup truck at a cost not to exceed \$40,000 from account DA5130.2 and the purchase of a 2018 Chevrolet 3500HD 4 wheel drive pickup truck at a cost not to exceed \$45,000 from account A1490.2.

2<sup>nd</sup> Cl Lamb

Roll Call Vote	Cl Lavine	Absent
	Cl Green	Yes
	Cl Servoss	Yes
	Cl Lamb	Yes
	Supv Leifer	Yes

**AMBULANCE RATES**

Kevin Westcott of Dryden Ambulance came to the board last month and explained their request for an increase in previously approved 2018 ambulance rates.

**RESOLUTION #47 (2018) – INCREASE 2018 AMBULANCE RATES**

Supv Leifer offered the following resolution and asked for its adoption:

RESOLVED, that this board hereby approves the following increase in rates for Dryden Ambulance, Inc. for 2018:

Service	2018 rate	Approved Increased 2018 rate
BLS Sign-Off	\$ 132.30	\$ 164.00
ALS Sign-Off	363.83	452.00
BLS Emergency	792.75	990.00
ALS I	972.40	1,210.00
ALS II	1,033.18	1,320.00
Paramedic Intercept	634.00	780.00
Mileage/loaded mile	15.75	22.00

2<sup>nd</sup> Cl Lamb

Roll Call Vote	Cl Lavine	Yes
	Cl Green	Yes
	Cl Servoss	Yes
	Cl Lamb	Yes
	Supv Leifer	Yes

**BUDGET MODIFICATIONS**

2017 end of year budget modifications were presented for approval.

**RESOLUTION #48 (2018) – APPROVE 2017 BUDGET MODIFICATIONS**

Supv Leifer offered the following resolution and asked for its adoption:

RESOLVED, that this Town Board hereby approves the attached budget modifications for the 2017 budget.

2<sup>nd</sup> Cl Lamb

Roll Call Vote	Cl Lavine	Yes
	Cl Green	Yes
	Cl Servoss	Yes
	Cl Lamb	Yes
	Supv Leifer	Yes

**RECREATION DEPARTMENT STAFFING** – Cl Green said we are about to begin interviewing recreation supervisor applicants. She has looked at the mission for the Recreation Department and it is unclear whether there have been changes in the expectations that we might have for the Recreation Supervisor. The town has a mention of work that a recreation coordinator would do, that a recreation director would do, and a comprehensive plan that involves quite a high level of planning for town park development as well as expanding programs. That directive to the department was expanded on in the master plan for recreation that was adopted in 2011. We’ve had a recreation director that was really involved in planning. A subsequent recreation director seemed less involved in planning. We’ve had a recent period where we just had two recreation assistants essentially continuing to maintain programs and not involved in any overall recreation planning or coordinating.

The title for the head of the department has gone from director to coordinator and now to supervisor. It seems timely to ask some questions and those were previously sent to board members via email.

*Does the current fiscal situation of the Town, and changing priorities for recreational initiatives like the rail trail, change the Town’s vision for the work of the Recreation Department?*

*Does the Board see the role of the Recreation Supervisor as leading ongoing parks development, or as simply maintaining and coordinating current programs?*

*What is the vision for the use of the recreation reserve fund, and how does that relate to the work that the Recreation Supervisor will be expected to do? Should the Recreation Department take the lead in helping the DRYC and the board develop priorities for using the fund?*

*Should the hiring focus be on administrative competencies (like planning; budgeting; managing contracts, purchasing, equipment and supplies; supervising volunteers; marketing programs; networking, etc.) or direct service skills (like supervising night-time and weekend programs or driving the van)? All of the above? What else?*

*Are there any other staffing configurations that would better cover the department workload better?*

Cl Lamb said there has been robust discussion about this by the Town Board in the past. The board resolved to spend less on this position and not invest in someone with the administrative capacities to do strategic planning. He would like to reopen that discussion. He is in favor of hiring someone who can do strategic planning and do a long range vision at a wage that would attract the appropriate candidate. We may not have someone in the current

round that would bring that skill. There was a hope that we would find someone willing to settle for a job under their skill level and that hasn't panned out.

Cl Lavine said that we need to take advantage of the riches of Tompkins County and find someone who has networking, coordinating, and mission-oriented skills. We could use volunteers for what we now sometimes pay staff to do so that we free up that person's time. She thinks we may be better off hiring a part time person who is highly skilled to do the administration, management, mission, and networking part of the job. Other tasks could be done by assistants and volunteers.

Cl Servoss believes at least one full time person is needed for continuity of communications, so everyone has a single person to deal with and the information is not convoluted or misinterpreted as passed along.

Cl Green said there was a decision to downgrade from director to coordinator to supervisor so that we could get someone with good skills and more qualified/civil service approved candidates. It seems that now we should really look at the field of candidates for the recreation supervisor and look for some higher level skills. We are no longer just maintaining programs. If we find someone in the current applicants, we want someone with that higher level of skills. The next step is to begin the screening and interviewing process and they will report back to the board. There are twenty applicants; four had applied for the coordinator position. The plan is to have a committee (two from DRYC, J Case from Human Resources, Cl Green and Marty Conger, who understands the nuts and bolts) conduct the interviews. She will report on the status at next board meeting.

## **PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

R Burger has provided the board with the department's monthly report (attached). Next Thursday the Planning Board will have hearings on a conservation subdivision on Ellis Hollow Road and the 2150 Dryden Road subdivision final plat.

The PUD passed last year at 1061 Dryden Road has decided to downsize. The six buildings will be shortened in depth by about 10' (that increases the setbacks from the lot lines). The internal units of the buildings will now be 2 bedrooms instead of 3 bedrooms. The overall density and traffic and other concerns will be reduced. The matter will be heard on March 15 at 7:30 p.m.

There is a special use permit application for a hair salon on North Road at the old Avinet building. The Avinet special use permit was specifically not transferrable. A hair salon is an allowed use in the rural residential district by special use permit. That public hearing will be March 15 at 7:45 p.m.

## **COUNTY BRIEFING**

Mike Lane said Martha Robertson apologizes for having to leave. She is leading a group to Albany tomorrow to meet with representatives of the Governor's office with respect to our airport grant issues.

Sales tax came in well and we had the best year and best quarter we've ever had. That is a relief after last year. That trickles down to the town because the town shares in sales tax. TC3 continues to struggle with enrollment although they did meet their budgeted enrollment numbers. There is a 2 million dollar gap to fill. The Governor's proposed budget reduces amounts allocated to community colleges. The argument is that enrollment is down and they don't need as much. They still have fixed overhead costs to pay. Please talk with your state representatives and advocate for more community college spending.

M Lane addressed the board about being in an era now where people are not being civil to each other. It's at every level of government. He has been in local government for over 30 years and seen a lot of meetings. In order for any board to be successful the group has to be respectful and civil to one another. Sometimes that means being extra patient. One person in a board is charged with chairing that group, and if the others don't have respect for that person chairing (whether they agree with that person's position or not), the meeting cannot be successful in any way. If they are not civil with one another and don't set the example of being civil with one another, then they cannot expect civility from the people in the audience who come to talk to them. They have to set that example. Please practice civility.

## **ADVISORY BOARD UPDATES**

**Planning Board** – On January 25<sup>th</sup> the board discussed the 1540 Ellis Hollow Road conservation subdivision and a proposal for a warehouse at 55 Hall Road.

**Conservation Board** – They talked about the Brotherton property conservation easement and the need for an inspector for the conservation easements (volunteer). There was support for a resolution for the rail trail.

**Recreation & Youth Commission** – David Peck will serve as chair. They selected members to serve on the recreation supervisor committee interview (Chris Sidle, Kris Bennett and Deanna Madigan). They decided to hire a camp director and the Town Board approved salaries last week. They talked about committees' proposal for programming and they are asking the Community Café for sponsorship for the program. Chris Sidle will represent the DRYC on the Rail Trail Task Force.

S Mulinos sent a youth programming proposal today. It sounds like she is still working with a potential sponsor and another service provider as yet unnamed. No town board action is necessary at this point.

**Agriculture Advisory Committee** –The committee was working on edits to the Ag and Farmland Protection Plan last night. The next thing to work on is whether to turn that committee into a board with permanency like the conservation board.

**Rail Trail Task Force** – They are at the point of beginning to implement the \$182,000 grant from NYS Parks & Historic Preservation. They now need to make sure that we integrate the volunteers for the project with town staff. She thanked Bob Beck and John Kiefer who saved the town thousands of dollars in preparing the specs for the grant and presentation. They are volunteers who now need to integrate with town staff to get the work down while being respectful of the time frames and workloads of current staff. Right now they need staff time to begin project planning. There is a meeting scheduled for the 22<sup>nd</sup> to map out the interaction and how the project happens. Supv Leifer would like a resolution in March authorizing expenditure from recreations reserve fund for the trail and setting a top limit of full town contribution though some of it may come from in kind town time. Expenditure from that reserve is subject to a 30 day permissive referendum, so we should get that underway before it is time to start paying bills.

## **Other Business**

**MOU with Village of Dryden** – Supv Leifer said our attorney has suggested minor changes. He will make those and send the document to the Village.

**RFP for Consultant Housing Conditions Study** – A housing study is required before the town can apply for CDBG funds for housing stock improvement. Murphy Grant Consulting

has submitted a contract to prepare an RFP for bidders to supply a housing conditions study and related activities at a cost not to exceed \$1,800. The contract has been reviewed by the town attorney.

**RESOLUTION #49 (2018) – AUTHORIZE CONTRACT FOR HOUSING CONDITIONS STUDY**

Supv Leifer offered the following resolution and asked for its adoption:

RESOLVED, that this Town Board hereby approves the contract with Murphy Grant Consulting in connection with a housing conditions study at a cost not to exceed \$1,800 and the Town Supervisor is authorized to execute the same.  
2<sup>nd</sup> Cl Lamb

Roll Call Vote	Cl Lavine	Yes
	Cl Green	Yes
	Cl Servoss	Yes
	Cl Lamb	Yes
	Supv Leifer	Yes

**Rail Trail** – There was discussion about whether it was necessary to prepare SEQR for the resolution to appropriate funds from the Recreation Reserve. It may be necessary because there is a construction project. Counsel will check on that.

**Support of DEC Game Farm** – Cl Lamb would like to pass a resolution to help make it clear that the rail trail project is not to encroach on their facility and to go on record so they feel secure in knowing that we want them to stay there. The town wants this project to be complementary to what they do there and not a threat. Sportsmen’s groups may appreciate seeing this.

**Resolution #50 (2018) - In support of the NYS Department of Environmental Conservation’s Reynolds Game Farm in the Town of Dryden**

Supv Leifer offered the following resolution and asked for its adoption:

WHEREAS, the Dryden Town Board recognizes the importance of the DEC’s Reynolds Game Farm as a local institution that brings distinction to the area through its historical mission, preservation of open space, and well kept grounds,

WHEREAS, the Reynolds Game Farm has been in operation for over 90 years and is New York State’s only Pheasant production facility,

WHEREAS, Pheasant hunting has a long tradition as one of the most popular small game hunting activities in New York,

WHEREAS, the Dryden Town Board takes pride in knowing that DEC’s activities at the Reynolds Game Farm yield results that benefit New Yorkers throughout the state,

WHEREAS, DEC’s Small Game Hunter Survey indicates that about 23,000 hunters harvest over 50,000 pheasants statewide, while spending almost 106,000 days afield annually,

WHEREAS, the Reynolds Game Farm contributes to the local economy by providing local employment opportunities for four full-time workers and over a dozen part-time employees,

WHEREAS, all aspects of NYS’s Pheasant Propagation Program are efficiently and effectively conducted at the Reynolds Game Farm,

WHEREAS, the Reynolds Game Farm achieves results that impact thousands of New Yorkers by providing hunting and viewing opportunities while enjoying the outdoors and appreciating the value of open space,

WHEREAS, New York youth and adults are involved in caring for and releasing healthy, disease-free pheasants through state cooperator programs,

WHEREAS, the Dryden Town Board supports local hunting activities and invites hunters to make use of appropriate town property, including the 60 acre Parke-Dabes Natural Area near the hamlet of Varna,

WHEREAS, in 1982, a sewer and water line easement for the Town of Dryden was placed on the rail bed, and title to the rail bed which crosses the Reynolds Game Farm was transferred to Cornell University,

WHEREAS, in 1983, title to the rail bed which crosses the Reynolds Game Farm was transferred to the NYS Department of Environmental Conservation,

WHEREAS, the Dryden Town Board greatly appreciates the NYS Department of Environmental Conservation’s willingness to negotiate public access to the rail bed in order to complete the Dryden Rail Trail,

WHEREAS, under the leadership of Governor Andrew M. Cuomo, the Town of Dryden’s Rail Trail was awarded a \$182,000 grant in December, 2017 from the Environmental Protection Fund through the Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Dryden Town Board supports the work of the NYS Department of Environmental Conservation’s Reynolds Game Farm and embraces its presence in the Town of Dryden; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Dryden Town Board seeks to build its partnership with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation and requests that the agency establish a cooperative use agreement for the previously conveyed rail bed, at a length of approximately 2,500 ft., allowing pedestrian and bicycle access to the rail bed and thus, the completion of the 10.5 mile Dryden Rail Trail.

2<sup>nd</sup> Cl Green

Roll Call Vote	Cl Lavine	Yes
	Cl Green	Yes
	Cl Servoss	Yes
	Cl Lamb	Yes
	Supv Leifer	Yes

**Town Website** – The town’s website has apparently been hacked and is not functioning properly. Priority IT Works (a company familiar with WordPress) has submitted a quote to fix it. They estimate up to 15 hours at \$85.00 per hour, or \$1275. He expects it should be done fairly quickly.

**RESOLUTION #51 (2018) – AUTHORIZE CONTRACT WITH PRIORITY IT WORKS**

Supv Leifer offered the following resolution and asked for its adoption:

RESOLVED, that this Town Board hereby approves the quote for website work by Priority IT Works of \$1,275 and authorizes the Town Supervisor to execute the same.  
2<sup>nd</sup> Cl Lamb

Roll Call Vote	Cl Lavine	Yes
	Cl Green	Yes
	Cl Servoss	Yes
	Cl Lamb	Yes
	Supv Leifer	Yes

IAWWTF – Grit Removal Project - The board held a public hearing on the public interest order. There is a resolution to approve and authorize the contract for the same.

**RESOLUTION #52 (2018) - Capital Project Engineering Services Agreement for Grit Removal Project, Concrete Restoration Project, Emergency Generator Replacement, and Miscellaneous Plant Improvements at the Ithaca Area Wastewater Facility**

Supv Leifer offered the following resolution and asked for its adoption:

WHEREAS, the Ithaca Area Wastewater Treatment Plant is in need of certain Capital Improvements, and

WHEREAS, the Town Board of the Town of Dryden held a public hearing pursuant to Town Law Section 202-b on February 8, 2018 following publication of the required notice, and

WHEREAS, the Town Board has determined that it is in the public interest to perform the proposed infrastructure improvements at the Ithaca Area Wastewater Facility, and

WHEREAS, staff in association with the Plant’s consulting engineers, GHD have estimated the cost for the engineering services for the final design of Grit Removal, Concrete Restoration, Emergency Generator Replacement, and miscellaneous plant improvements to be,

1-Concrete Restoration and Leak Repairs (final design)	\$22,900
2-Grit Removal and Miscellaneous Repairs (final design)	
2.1-Grit System	\$200,700
2.2-Influent Building Improvements	\$28,700
2.3-Stair Tower Improvements	\$37,400
2.4-Structural Improvements	\$10,200
2.5-Miscellaneous Improvements	\$56,700
2.6-Instrumentation and Control	\$15,100
3-Emergency Generator Replacement	\$41,800
Total Design Fees	\$413,500
Contingency 5%	\$20,675
Total	\$434,175

As detailed in GHD’s letter and Scope of Services Schedule A dated October 9, 2017 Revised Scope of Services and Engineering Fee Grit Removal and Concrete Restoration Project, and

WHEREAS, the Special Joint Committee (SJC) recommends to the Owners that this project be authorized and funded in the amount not to exceed \$434,175 for the final design engineering services agreement with GHD, and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Town Board of the Town of Dryden authorizes, agrees, and commits an amount no greater than its percentage share per the Joint Sewer Agreement as follows:

Municipality	Percentage	Project Cost
City of Ithaca	57.14	\$248,088
Town of Ithaca	40.88	\$177,491
Town of Dryden	1.98	<u>\$8,596</u>
		\$434,175

FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Town Supervisor, in consultation with the attorney for the Town of Dryden, shall be authorized to sign agreements for such improvements.  
 2<sup>nd</sup> Cl Lamb

Roll Call Vote		
	Cl Lavine	Yes
	Cl Green	Yes
	Cl Servoss	Yes
	Cl Lamb	Yes
	Supv Leifer	Yes

There being no further business, on motion made, seconded and unanimously carried, the meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bambi L. Avery  
 Town Clerk

## Recreation Department Report

January 2018

### Recreation Office:

- Updating social media page along with mass emails for upcoming events.
- Vouchers for invoices and referees completed.
- As of today 2/14/18, the program guide is 75% done. Completion date 2/16/18
- Secured a candidate for the Summer Camp Director position.
- Spoke with the Village about supplies for summer camp. They are willing to store them for us until summer. Will need to find a space to store them after camp is complete.

### Youth Travel Basketball- (Boys and Girls) Started Nov. 27<sup>th</sup>

- The basketball program will be ending for most teams the end of February. The 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> grade boys teams will continue into March, participating in a tournament held in Homer.

### Karate-

- Session #3 starts 2/14/18
- I am transporting with the van from Dryden Elementary to VFW
- 13 children enrolled in the Advanced class and 7 in the Junior.
- Enrollment Session #1-18 Enrollment Session#2-16 Enrollment Session #3- 20

### Pickleball

- Sundays from 11-1
- Highest attendance: 2
- Thoughts on keeping the program?

### Shooting Stars-

- Added an extra Saturday in March to make up for two missed days due to weather.

### Youth Volleyball –

- Added an extra Saturday in March to make up for two missed days due to weather.

(Over)

### Father Daughter Dance – February 10<sup>th</sup>

- 47 girls 38 dads= 85 attended
- \$257.77 total for expenses (food, DJ, decorations, flowers)
- \$665.00 in registration fees
- Two volunteers to help during the event, volunteer photographer, cupcakes donated by Karris's Cakes, vases for flowers borrowed from Dryden VFW, no charge for use of hall.

### Color-A-Thon- May 19<sup>th</sup>

- Registered with Better World Fundraising.
- Waiting on arrival of promotional items and registration. Will arrive first week of March.

### Lacrosse

- Meet with the coach. Found some very outdated unsafe equipment.
- Ordered 10 new helmets, balls, 3 goalie protectors.
- Ordered 10 larger jerseys and shorts. Most were ordered s/m last year. They do not fit the older children.
- Skills and Drills Clinic set up at TC3 with admission to a TC3 home game for the participants.
- Registration has been opened for the Lacrosse Season.
- Approval from the school superintendent to send lacrosse flyers home with the children in grades K-6.

### Track

- Secured 2 new track coaches.

-Marty Conger

## Memorandum

Date: February 13, 2018

To: Town Board

From: Ray Burger, Planning Director

Subject: Planning Department Update

**Application materials** and other documents for the items below can be found at:

<http://dryden.ny.us/departments/planning-department/permit-review-links/>

**Subdivision at 2150 Dryden Road for Large-Scale Solar Facilities:** The planning board approved the preliminary plat with conditions on August 24, 2017. A public hearing will be held at the Planning Board meeting on February 22 to consider the final plat submitted by Sun8 PDC LLC. An application for common driveway approval will also be considered.

**Conservation Subdivision at 1540 Ellis Hollow Road:** The Planning Board reviewed a preliminary plat for a 5 lot conservation subdivision at 1540 Ellis Hollow Road and approved with conditions. Some neighbors are concerned that their wells will be harmed by the addition of 5 wells in the area. These issues will be discussed and a final plat will be reviewed at this month's Planning Board meeting on February 22.

**Subdivisions for Large-Scale Solar Energy Systems at Ellis Tract:** Cornell University and SUN8 PDC LLC have applied for four minor subdivisions at Stevenson, Dodge and Turkey Hill Roads (known as the Ellis Tract) for purposes of installing solar facilities. This follows the sketches that were part of the project drawings reviewed by the Town Board for the Special Use Permit (approved August 17, 2017.)

**Special Use Permit (SUP) applications for Large-Scale Solar Facilities at 2243 Dryden Road:** Delaware River Solar is applying for SUPs to construct two facilities on land behind the electrical substation on Dryden Road. The Planning Board reviewed the site plan and made recommendations, which the applicant has incorporated into a revised application. TG Miller, acting for the Town, has reviewed this application for environmental impacts and prepared a draft SEQR Full Environmental Assessment Form Parts 2 & 3 for consideration. A public hearing is scheduled for the February 15 Town Board meeting at which time the board can begin review of the application.

**Special Use Permit (SUP) application at 225 North Road:** A small manufacturing facility closed down and a hair salon business wants to move in. A service business is allowed in this Rural Residential District by SUP. This project will be introduced at the February 15 meeting and a public hearing set for the March 15 Town Board meeting.

**Revised Site Plan for 1061 Dryden Road (Evergreen Townhomes) Planned Unit Development (PUD):** The Town Board approved the PUD and site plan on May 30, 2017. Upon further design work the footprint of all 6 buildings in this project have been reduced and this increases the setback from the lot lines. An application to revise the site plan will be introduced at the February 15 meeting and a public hearing will be scheduled for the March 15 meeting to consider this application.

**New Business at 55 Hall Road:** A sketch plan for a new warehouse on Hall Road will be reviewed by the Planning Board on February 22.

**Zoning Board of Appeals grants area variance:** A resident on Turkey Hill Road was granted a variance to build a garage in front yard and within 18 feet of the road.

**Former fill operation on German Cross Road:** Landowner Kim Whetzel is looking to get a new Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) approved and resume filling.

**Dryden Agriculture and Farmland Protection Plan:** Another round of edits to the plan will be reviewed at the Agriculture Advisory Committee meeting on February 14.

Planning Department activity for TOWN -January 2018

Building permits: 10  
Zoning permits: 1  
Special Use Permit Reviews: 1  
Site Plan Reviews: 1  
Variance reviews: 0  
Fire safety inspections: 0  
Building inspections: 26  
New businesses: 0  
Subdivisions: 5  
Violation notices: 0  
Complaints: 6 (property maintenance)  
Fire calls: 0  
Training hours: 8

Planning Department activity for VILLAGE -January 2018

Building permits: 1  
Zoning permits: 1  
Special Use Permit reviews: 0  
Site Plan Reviews: 1  
Variance reviews: 0  
Fire safety inspections: 0  
Building inspections: 5  
New businesses: 0  
Subdivisions: 0  
Violation notices: 0  
Complaints: 4 (property maintenance)  
Fire calls: 0



**DA FUND: NONE**

<u>DB FUND</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>\$</u>
DB5110.4	ST MAINT CONTR	DB5112.21	RD IMPRVMT	21.73
DB9040.8	WORKERS COMP	DB9030.8	SOC SEC	973.03
DB9040.8	WORKERS COMP	DB9089.8	MEDICARE	70.29

DIFFERENCE IN REV. VS EXP. CHIPS BUDGET  
 INCREASED WITH INC IN PAYROLL TOTALS  
 INCREASED WITH INC IN PAYROLL TOTALS

**SS1 NONE**

<u>SS2</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>	<u>\$</u>
SS2-8110.4	ADMIN CONTR	SS2-8120.4	1652.23
SS2-8110.4	ADMIN CONTR	SS2-8130.4	1035.13

**SS3 NONE**

**SS4 NONE**

<u>SS5</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>	<u>\$</u>
SS5-8120.2	CAP IMPR	SS5-8130.4	5156.59

<u>SS6</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>	<u>\$</u>
SS6-8120.4	SAN SEW CONTR	SS6-8120.1	21.97
SS6-8120.4	SAN SEW CONTR	SS6-8130.4	478.03
SS6-8120.410	SAN SEW CAP IMP	SS6-8130.4	535.00
SS6-8110.4	ADMIN CONTR	SS6-8130.4	300.00
SS6-9030.8	SOC SEC	SS6-8130.4	.08
SS6-9089.8	MEDICARE	SS6-8130.4	.33
SS6-599	FUND BALANCE	SS6-8130.4	712.20
			2025.64

<b>SS7</b>						
<u>From</u>		<u>To</u>				<u>\$</u>
SS7-8120.4	SAN SEW CONTR DPW	SS7-8130.4	TRTMT/DISP CONTR			133.11

**SW1 NONE**

<b>SW2</b>						
<u>From</u>		<u>To</u>				<u>\$</u>
SW2-8310.4	WATER ADMIN CONTR	SW2-8320.4	SOURCE SUPP CONTR			655.79

**SW3 NONE**

**SW4 NONE**

<b>SW5</b>						
<u>From</u>		<u>To</u>				<u>\$</u>
SW5-8310.4	WATER ADMIN CONTR	SW5-8340.1	TRAN/DIS PER SER DPW			60.32
SW5-8310.4	WATER ADMIN CONTR	SW5-8340.4	TRAN/DIS CONTR			733.43
SW5-8320.4	SOURCE SUP CONTR	SW5-8340.4	TRAN/DIS CONTR			910.23
SW5-9089.8	MEDICARE	SW5-8340.4	TRAN/DIS CONTR			.48
SW5-599	FUND BALANCE	SW5-8340.4	TRAN/DIS CONTR			<u>1282.16</u>
						2926.30
SW5-8310.4	WATER ADMIN CONTR	SW5-9030.8	SOC SEC			6.25

<b>SW6</b>						
<u>From</u>		<u>To</u>				<u>\$</u>
SW6-8340.4	TRANS DIST CONTR	SW6-9030.8	SOC SEC			45.40

**SW7 NONE**