

WARREN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

COMMITTEE: **PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

DATE: MARCH 31, 2006

Committee Members Present:

Supervisors Stec
Monroe
Tessier
Champagne
Mason

Others Present:

Representing Planning & Community
Development Dept.:
Patricia Tatich, Director
Laura Moore, Associate Planner
Joan Parsons, Commissioner, Administrative &
Financial Services
Joan Sady, Clerk, Board of Supervisors
Trish Nenninger, Second Assistant County Atty.
Katy Goodman, Secretary to the Clerk

Committee Members Absent:

Supervisors Belden
Gabriels

Mr. Stec called the meeting to order at 11:34 a.m.

Motion was made by Mr. Mason, seconded by Mr. Monroe and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the previous meeting, subject to correction by the clerk.

Privilege of the floor was extended to Ms. Tatich, as she distributed copies of her Agenda packet for the meeting to the committee members, and a copy of same is on file with the minutes.

Ms. Tatich advised the committee members that previous to the meeting Mr. Stec and she had discussed the issue of the agendas for the meetings being provided to the committee members before the meetings. However, she said they had not been able to do that for this meeting because during the past two weeks they had been working to meet grant submission deadlines and some staff had been absent due to illness. Ms. Tatich stated their intent is to meet regularly with Mr. Stec before the meeting and to try to get the agendas out to the committee members before the meetings.

Pursuant to the first agenda item, Pending Items, Ms. Tatich stated a copy of the Pending Items List from the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors' Office was included in the agenda packet. She commented most of today's agenda items concerned the Pending Items.

Pending Item No. 1, Ms. Tatich stated concerned the issue of options to assist an elderly household in the Town of Warrensburg relative to the department's pursuit of a partition of property. She advised she had discussed the matter with Attorney Thomas Clements on March 27th wherein he had indicated that he would pursue Judge Aulisi and urge him to take action as soon as possible on the matter. Ms. Tatich stated if his efforts do not work they will have to try something else to resolve the situation. Mr. Champagne asked what their back-up plan was. Ms. Tatich replied it would be to have Ms. Nenninger approach the judge's law clerk, although she understood that would not be the most appreciated way to approach a

judge. She said she had also spoken to Mr. Tessier and he had some thoughts on it.

Ms. Tatich pointed out the second Pending Item was with regards to problems encountered with the Mobile Home Replacement Program and alternative housing options under the Rural Development Program (formerly known as the Farmers' Home Administration). She mentioned that Laura Moore, Associate Planner, had recently met with staff from the Rural Development Program regarding two clients in the Trailer Replacement Program.

Ms. Tatich commented the Rural Development Corporation's resources have been severely impacted by its efforts with the Gulf Coast hurricane victims. Therefore, she said, it has been difficult to get their assistance with mortgage applications, etc. for our local area, at the present time. However, she declared, her staff would "continue to plug away at it" and she would keep the Committee apprized.

Regarding Agenda Item 3, Public Information meetings in the Town of Lake Luzerne, Ms. Tatich reported the Town Board had recently agreed to go forward with securing additional information. However, she said she felt, it would be important to have certain key issues resolved, before she could recommend the County go any further with the project. She identified those issues as the following:

1. Clear access to the site by the Town of Lake Luzerne, along with additional access to the site from East Shore Drive, which might serve as an alternative route to bypass the residential neighborhood.
2. Resolve issues of County Resolution No. 423 of 2005 (Financial Participation by the County for Additional Site Analysis). The Town of Lake Luzerne had agreed to provide \$25,000 towards that phase of the project, and the County had secured grant funds for another \$25,000, with the balance of the expenses to be covered by the County. To date, she stated, the County had yet to set aside County dollars for the project. She observed that Saratoga Associates had estimated (2 years ago) the analysis work could run as high as \$80,000 to \$100,000.

Ms. Tatich cautioned that the site analysis did not include the facility's design and she expressed her concerns about moving forward without resolving the other key issues. Otherwise, she said she felt, it was a large chunk of money to spend without being sure the project would go through.

Responding to Mr. Champagne's question, Ms. Tatich clarified the Lake Luzerne Town Board was very sensitive to the residents concerns for an alternative path into the site.

Mr. Stec queried what the purpose was behind the site analysis at a cost of \$80,000 - \$100,000. Ms. Tatich explained the site analysis was required as part of the permit process with the Adirondack Park Agency. In addition, she confirmed the NYS DEC would also have some requirements to be met, which would probably include an EIS (Environmental Impact Statement).

Mr. Champagne expressed his concerns with all of the permit requirements and associated costs, coupled by the community members who were not certain this project was something they could support.

Ms. Tatich explained the Town Board had requested more information, which she would be glad to provide to them. However, she pointed out that the site analysis and the traffic study have not been done yet.

Mr. Tessier said he felt Lake Luzerne's Town Board may be under the impression the County had funded the whole project. He noted the County and Town would need to come to some financial agreement and clearly define the Town's responsibilities. He pointed out the Town's commitment of \$25,000 would not go too far.

Ms. Tatich suggested that a business plan should be drawn up for the project, which would define who would build it, who would support it and how it would operate.

General discussion ensued.

Mr. Stec concurred with Ms. Tatich and Mr. Tessier's concerns with the number of questions to be addressed by Lake Luzerne's Town Board, beyond the East Shore Drive issue. He agreed that the financial and public support realities would need to be dealt with before anyone spent \$80,000 - \$100,000 on just a study, without the Town's firm commitment.

Mr. Monroe said he felt that after the Town of Lake Luzerne resolved the access road question, the Town Board would need to provide the County with at least a conceptual approval of the project.

Responding to Mr. Stec's questions, Ms. Tatich commented that the longer the decision process took (on even the front end issues) the longer the entire project would take. She said she felt it would be the Committee's decision as to how much time the Town would be allowed, before a firm commitment was required.

Mr. Mason said he felt the County needed to develop a timetable for the project and give the Town of Lake Luzerne a deadline to come to a decision.

Following a brief discussion, Mr. Stec said he would work to arrange a meeting with Chairman Thomas, Supervisors Merlino, Tessier, and himself to discuss the above mentioned concerns.

Mr. Champagne queried whether or not a rough plan of the work to be done and associated costs could be prepared for the meeting Mr. Stec was proposing. He said he felt a rough plan could facilitate the decision making process.

General discussion ensued.

Returning to the Agenda review, Ms. Tatich stated Mr. Champagne's comment touched briefly on her third major concern with the Outdoor Theater Project, and she moved to Agenda Item 3C, the alternate site in the Town of Lake George. Given the questions behind the primary site, in Lake Luzerne, she stated the alternate, or secondary site, in Lake George, has had a slight change in circumstance, as well. Consequently, she said she spoke with Scott Parker, from the Institute for Outdoor Drama. She said she learned the Institute could take another look at both sites, at a cost of less than \$5,000 (possibly payable through the LDC ((Local Development Corporation)) with economic development funds).

Mr. Tessier said he would first like to see how the road issue was resolved in the Town of Lake Luzerne. He stressed he did not want to give anyone the impression that Lake George was attempting to take over this project.

Returning to Agenda review at Agenda Item 4, West Mountain Road Bikeway Pedestrian Plan, Ms. Tatich reported that Wayne LaMothe, of the Planning Department attended a recent meeting of the Adirondack/Glens Falls Transportation Council (AGFTC). She pointed out that Mr. LaMothe discussed the Bikeway Plan at the Council's March 9th meeting and they agreed to include the project as part of its current work program. In addition, she said the Council would also conduct an analysis of the trails throughout the County, and she directed attention to the AGFTC's resolution of support in the Agenda packet.

Mr. Stec mentioned the same Bikeway Plan had been discussed at the most recent DPW meeting. He said he understood that Mr. Remington had announced a second traffic study which will include vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian usage, to determine if a lower speed limit would be warranted. However, he acknowledged a lower speed limit would require law enforcement, as well.

Returning to Agenda review at Item 5, Community Housing Trustees' Program, Ms. Tatich stated that in view of the time constraints today, she suggested the issue could be tabled until a later meeting.

Next, Ms. Tatich reported on Agenda Item 6, Sewer Project at the Countryside Adult Home. She stated Mr. Lamy, of DPW, had consulted with her regarding an "immediate needs" situation with the septic system at the Adult Home. She also noted that Joan Parsons, Commissioner of Administrative & Fiscal Services, had inquired if there was any way the Planning and Community Development Department could assist in securing grant funds.

Ms. Tatich stated her Department took the matter under advisement and researched the Small Cities Funds Program. She said it was determined that a new application under the program would not be appropriate, since Mr. Lamy had emphasized the need for an immediate solution. However, she observed there may be existing grant funds that could be re-directed to the Countryside Adult Home, given the urgency of the situation.

Ms. Tatich explained there was a possibility the residents at the Adult Home could meet certain financial criteria. She said she would be meeting with Small Cities representatives to further discuss what would be needed to amend the Block Grant Program to assist the residents at the Countryside Adult Home. She further stated such an amendment would require a public hearing on the Block Grant projects which was held on March 30, 2006 at 4:00 p.m. In addition, she said she expected the Small Cities representative to have an answer for the County within the next week or so.

Turning to Agenda review of Committee Actions, Ms. Tatich presented a resolution request to amend the agreement with the Corridor Communities. She clarified the amendment was to correctly reflect the actual monies received late in 2005.

Motion was made by Mr. Champagne, seconded by Mr. Mason and carried unanimously to authorize the inter municipal agreement with Corridor communities be amended, and to authorize a resolution be prepared for the April 13th Board meeting. A copy of the resolution request form is on file with the minutes.

Ms. Tatich requested approval for a non-paid student intern to work with her staff during the month of April. She explained an Adirondack Community College (ACC) student had offered to work with the Department as a course requirement.

Responding to Mr. Stec's questions regarding the intern's insurance coverage, Ms. Tatich said she would verify the student would be covered by insurance through ACC.

Mrs. Parsons reported that Ms. Tatich's request may not require a Board resolution, since the County Attorney's Office had been inserting language that would allow interns to be used on a continuing basis.

Motion was made by Mr. Mason, seconded by Mr. Champagne and carried unanimously to authorize the use of a non-paid student intern from ACC for the month of April, and authorized a resolution be prepared for the April 13th Board meeting, upon the County Attorney's determination. [*Subsequent to the meeting it was determined the ACC student had withdrawn her offer to work as an intern for the Planning Department.*]

Ms. Tatich turned to the final item of business concerning Project Updates. She reported her staff has had discussions with the County Attorney's Office regarding the LDC Agreement as related to programs managed by the Planning Department. She acknowledged that Second Assistant County Attorney, Patricia Nenner, was in attendance at today's meeting.

Ms. Tatich explained that a few more programs were becoming available, that would require a non-profit participation, such as the County's LDC. Therefore, she said she felt it was a prudent time to examine the contractual relationship between the County Planning Department and the LDC.

Responding to Mr. Champagne's questions, Ms. Tatich clarified the County may need to "tighten up how it does business" with the LDC.

Ms. Nenninger pointed out that different types of grant funds were becoming available, only through the LDC's application process. In the past, she noted, the federal grant programs allowed the County to be the recipient of the grant funds, and pass the funds through to the LDC. However, she said a number of State grant programs placed different requirements on the County and how the funds are to be administered.

As an example, Ms. Nenninger stated, the Access to Homes Program was geared towards persons in the hospital or living elsewhere who needed to have certain improvements that would allow them to function better in their own home.

Ms. Tatich expounded that currently, the monies were flowing through the Housing Trust Fund Corporation (a public benefit corporation) and the County had been successful in securing grant funds such as the Restore, Access to Home and the Main Street Program. She said both the Planning and Community Development Committee and the Board of Supervisors have asked her staff to seek programs that bring in administrative dollars to assist with her Department's expenses. Therefore, she said the question has been raised as to how her staff could continue functioning as it had in the past. In addition, she noted the Governor's Budget will not list the aforementioned programs as line items in the State budget since the monies come through the Trust Fund Corporation. Ms. Nenninger pointed out the County was not an eligible applicant for those types of programs, since they required a not-for-profit corporation, such as the LDC.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, on motion by Mr. Mason and seconded by Mr. Tessier, Mr. Stec adjourned the meeting at 12:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Katherine Goodman, Secretary to the Clerk
Typed by Carlene A. Ramsey, Sr. Legislative Office Specialist