



AGRICULTURE AND FARMLAND PROTECTION BOARD MINUTES

3 N. Erie Street, Mayville, NY
September 13th, 2016 3 – 5 pm

PRESENT: Chairman Stephen Kimball, Brian Aldrich, Jim Cafilisch, Jay Gould, Dan Steward, and Katelyn Walley-Stoll.

ABSENT: Fred Crocut, James Joy, Kevin Sanvidge, and Heather Woodis.

OTHERS: Patrick Gooch and Nate Aldrich (Chautauqua County Planning & Economic Development)

MINUTES	None.
CORRESP.	Notice of Intent – Portland, Water District No. 2 and 8; Chautauqua, SCCLSD Sewer Extension for West Side of Chautauqua Lake.
PRIVILEGE OF FLOOR	Nate Aldrich – Introduced himself as the new Junior Planner in the Department of Planning and Economic Development. Nate provided a brief background of himself.
NOTICE OF INTENT:	<p>Pat Gooch – Board members were sent the materials for the Water District in Portland and a Sewer District in Chautauqua Lake. I hope the Members had a chance to review the notice of intents. I'd like to open the floor of discussion regarding these projects.</p> <p>Steve Kimball – There are both macro and micro issues, the effect on the land and creating a more developable area, which creates a conflict between farming and development. What is the highest and best use of this land? Is it development or agriculture? Because, with water and sewer it will be a lot easier to develop that land. Do we want to move away from agriculture and increase development? I think this Board is meant to support agriculture. Yet, at the same time as a landowner, I know I would want my land to have water and sewer, which could double or triple its value. Really, what is the long range plan for this County? Is this the right thing? Do we keep it unimproved so it hopefully stays in agricultural production or do we say go ahead? Who decides this?</p> <p>Brian – If we recommend sewer and water, we are essentially allowing increased development. I know it is only the potential at this point, but water and sewer will make that land more developable at some point.</p> <p>Dan – Although it is likely to increase development, it will also benefit the farmers. Sanitary sewer to neighborhoods will reduce leach fields from septic and should improve ground water quality.</p> <p>Steve – I think there are pluses and minuses to the project, this could increase the potential to convert large acreages into developed land. Maybe, we can limit it to smaller development, which will have less of an impact.</p> <p>Brian – I get both perspectives. But the consequences are that we are allowing greater development in the area. It is a consequence of these improvements.</p> <p>Don – I spoke with Doug, who says he needs jobs and revenue in Town and he can't get either without improved water and sewer infrastructure.</p> <p>Dan – I don't think we should deny Ripley water and sewer infrastructure. But it is my experience that enforcement and remediation in these projects is weak. We clearly can't sit on site and make sure they follow our recommendations. I know a farmer in Erie County who invested \$30,000 into his farm in drainage improvements and when Erie County came by they cut through drainage tiles. No one was there to enforce anything. The farmer had to fix it, he had to spend more money. So, I like to see some</p>

system for enforcement. Maybe we require bonding that is designated for remediation after construction is completed improperly.

Jay – It is Agriculture and Markets who enforces the depth and ensures that errors are corrected. But, they won't be there much.

Jim – Didn't we hear something about this before regarding extension of sewer lines along the thruway? I recall it being nearly \$7 million.

Jim – Is this designed for a major development or just to supply current residents? Does the North County Water District fit into this?

Pat – It is separate, but eventually all North County Districts will be connected.

Brian – I want to clarify, we are assuming that the location is going to be as near or in the right-of-way as possible. If this is the case, I think the physical impact or micro issue will be minimal.

Jim – I say we revise both and add the comments regarding performance bonds and have Pat send it out again. I make a motion to revise the letter and resend it out to all of us for our review before we send it.

Jay – I second that motion.

Chairman Kimball – I will accept the motion, all in favor say aye. Unanimous approval to revise and send out.