

12-16-10 Public Hearing on Dog Licensing and Town Board Meeting

Present: David Lewis, Kitty Brown, Jeff Logan, JaneAnn Williams, Toni Hokanson

7:15 A motion was made by Supervisor Hokanson to open the Public Hearing. Seconded by Councilman Logan, all aye votes cast, motion carried.

Councilman Logan asked for an overview. Ms. Cappillino explained that what's different now is that the New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets will no longer oversee, they will no longer enforce the Clerks who are continuing to provide the licensing for their communities; that's what's happening, nothing else is changing.

Councilman Logan says he is getting a dog. (Marian, should we include this?)

Speaker- Dave Lent- thinks most people who have dogs don't realize that the State requires them to be licensed. Town could benefit monetarily. Town should pursue licensing. He thinks Town should educate people about it.

At 7:24 Supervisor Hokanson made a motion to close the Public Hearing. Seconded by Councilman Logan, all aye votes cast, motion carried.

At 7:32 Supervisor Hokanson opened the meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Agenda: Supervisor Hokanson made a motion to adopt the Agenda as amended. She added a discussion of the Harcourt Sanctuary after the Kniffen Annexation – Seconded by Councilman Logan, all aye votes cast, motion carried.

Public comment- limited to 2-3 minutes per person, and each person is only allowed to speak once. Supervisor Hokanson added – just so everyone understands, the Board is not allowed to comment on the flood plain issue because there is a lawsuit pending.

Reno's wife- Luz DeRosa- 171 Portuese Lane: Flood Plain Laws unfair; went to insurance agency and asked how these laws affect her insurance- said if 51% percent of our property was destroyed- we would be unable to rebuild. Insurance company said untrue- you would have to tear the rest of your house down and then, you would be able to rebuild. Unlikely- she wants clarification about this law – is it true that if more than 50% of our home is destroyed for any reason what so ever- that we can no longer rebuild them unless we tear the rest of the house down first?

Supervisor Hokanson said that she has to contact the Building Inspector: she interprets and manages the zoning code.

Luz- none of you live in the flood plain area- if you did you would be very upset with this law.

Requesting you repeal it because it is really an unconscionable law.

Supervisor Hokanson requested no clapping by audience members.

Bob Gabrielli- true- you should walk on Springtown Road and knock on every door- it is a repressive law, an onerous law. And it should be repealed immediately. You make laws for general population- you shouldn't make laws for a specific set of people. You've made a law that benefits people on the East side of the river, you've created a beautiful park, but it hurts the people on the West side of the river so they can't use their property.

Why do you persist? We've been in touch with DEC, with FERK? With Hinchey and they're going to get in touch with Senator Bonacic. They've conducted a tour with Central Hudson. We've talked to mortgage people who have told us that there are certain mortgage companies that will not issue a mortgage. When you have a law that prohibits people from rebuilding in the same footprint, you have made our homes unmortgagable by certain lenders. That is reprehensible. Good grief- what good do you feel you're doing for us. This is a grievously exigent matter which you should attend to immediately.

Rick Falute? Lives just off of Springtown Road, not party to the lawsuit. He and his wife probably live in the smallest house, 1 bedroom, less than 800 square feet, perhaps the smallest property less than a third of an acre- but because of this flood plain law the value of our property has decreased considerably- Intent was to add a couple of bedrooms to their home – law puts us at risk-the possibility of adding one or two bedrooms, rebuilding if the house was ever destroyed by fire or a tree, it's just unreasonable –our property is above where we're sitting right now, it has never flooded, but since we are adjacent to the flood plain we're included in the district, we're affected by this law. It's immoral, prejudicial, and unfair. I would ask that the law either be rescinded or grandfather those living there to not be included in this law or somebody from the Town board meet with the representatives from the neighborhood committee that have a vested interest in continuing to live here in a beautiful place.

MaryBeth Lunati- voicing opposition- impedes property rights- repeal. If people in Town knew of lawsuit maybe more people would come to meeting.

On record opposing wetlands and watercourse law- sure New York State has a wetlands law that would cover New Paltz's needs.

Desire meet with Board to highlight the positive things that the Board is doing – feels she can't do that yet, so she will continue to come to express her disappointment.

Ray Lunati- read a statement. He said the last two times there was a major rain he called Central Hudson to lower the river level and they did, so no flood. He is requesting the Town Board provide a list to the public of all Article 78. He also wants a tally of the amount of money spent to date and budget spent defending each. He also said that the Town Board should reevaluate the Flood Law feels not all contributing factors were taken into account. He feels that this law is flawed and should be rescinded. And feels the Town would be able to redirect the Article 78 defense money and provide the service of mowing the fields for the Little League, or put the money into the unallocated funds account. Then he read Kenny Campbell's letter that was printed in the newspaper. Kenny said that during the Flood of 2007 he had an illness and medical emergency, and the Town Board uses him and that incident to justify this Flood Law which he feels is a terrible law that takes away his and his neighbor's rights to use their own homes and property. He said that they said he had a heart attack which wasn't true, then they said emergency vehicles or help could not get to him, that wasn't true, his neighbor got him out using a pick up truck. They also said the floods will get worse. He said that's also not true. This was a 100 year flood level and the back up of water was probably caused by the failure to open the Dashville Dam Gates either soon enough or not at all. He said he was thankful for his family, friends and neighbors help, and feels that the Town Board by outlawing rebuilding, improving of existing homes along Springtown Rd., many of the existing homes date back to the 1800's is just not helping anyone. He would like the Town Board to stop twisting the truth about his medical condition for their own purposes and rescind their terrible law. They're not helping anyone and they sure don't act like neighbors.

Ira M- Village resident- idea from attending Village Board Meeting- there for recreation fees. A major Builder in the Village who was let off half way through his recreation fees first when he built one project. Has decided that he is not required to pay for recreation fees for his new major project, Victoria Square. The Building Inspector did the right thing, the Mayor said publically that he was told he would have to pay it. And in fact he was given consideration, which was violation of Village code that he only had to pay it as developed. He paid it and now he is looking to get the money back and is looking to stop payment, and we're talking about a couple hundred thousand dollars here.

Village Board members and Village Planning Board have no interest-

Corporate welfare- get rid of recreation fee and instead institute an impact fee- could cover the cost of infrastructure, water, sewers, police - everything that is impacted. He wanted to mention it because of

the massive project that is going in for the College - lots of stories circulating. Town Board should do something- get rid of recreation fees and install impact fee.

Councilwoman Brown responded- New York State prohibited the application of impact fees under George Pataki. The only fees a town is allowed to impose are Recreation fees.

Ira- how about use fees? Councilwoman Brown responded that she thinks those are not allowed either but she'll look it up, and Supervisor Hokanson said she'll check with their attorney. Ira added that once this project is completed the Town is going to have to increase police, fire, etc. without getting money from them.

Joe Custellana- what are Board members view of flood control? – Supervisor Hokanson replied that this isn't the time for discussion. And she said no, they couldn't express their views on flood control. He asked Supervisor Hokanson if she could tell him about any efforts that the Board has made to reach out to the Corporation of Engineers regarding the study that they've made and ask them for an update of the status of that study? He thinks they shouldn't condemn the property, they should investigate flood control.

Chris Ullrich- he would like to encourage the Board to open up a dialogue with George Rodenhausen and the attorney for the Springtown residents- and have some kind of mediation. - a wall is up- last thing you want to do- want to see Board enter into dialogue- ----- not what I pay my taxes for; he would like to see some sort of mediation. There can be dialogue, it's not true what they say that they can't discuss this issue because of legal reasons.

Eric Irwin?- feels you should rescind the Flood Plain laws- was at meeting where they reduced the budget- cutting and making numbers go down; after vote- Jeff realized Supervisor Hokanson still got raise and Marian- and Jeff asked why and Supervisor Hokanson said – Town should subsidize your personal business. Councilwoman Brown reminded Supervisor Hokanson has a business- didn't say- hey I did a great job- hey I worked my butt off. You said everyone knows no business makes money within the first 3 years so I need a raise.

Community Announcements: pancakes on 12/19-

Councilwoman Brown- respond to audience- frustrating not to be able to respond- but their attorneys have told them that the Town Board members cannot comment while there is a pending lawsuit.

Announcements- Marian Cappillino- handicapped spaces and take your dog in when it's too cold outside.

Agenda- Summer Camp-

Group had meetings after addressing Board

We secured the numbers from the New Paltz School District which were forwarded to the Board- We've since gotten an updated figure- 8 week program- tossed around the idea of bringing the Y back into proposal in terms of actually facilitating the 8 week program. Consensus for this year is to use a public school building. Once they had the building the Y was willing to jump back in. If we were going to use the Y we didn't want to just hand it over we wanted to meet with them and our parent group- We wanted our parent group to have impact with what the program would look like for the summer. Wanted to set up a series of meetings prior to establish what the trips would be, what the daily activities would look like, using their existing models that the Y uses to operate their existing camps. And also during the 8 week session to meet once a week on a Friday with the full staff to check how it's going, feedback so the parent group could institute changes on the go so it wouldn't be just turning it over we would have a voice but to take on as a volunteer group to create a program ourselves didn't seem feasible without hiring a Director and hiring someone to actually to build and execute the program. The updated figure from the New Paltz School District is \$8580. And the buses

add an additional \$1000. Based on four 2 week sessions so an 8 week summer camp based on an enrollment of 150 students would be \$90 each week.

This fee also includes trip costs. Parent group would like to meet with the Y- to move forward. Jack Young from the Y is here with Carol Raper, and Helen K., He is serving as interim Director of the YMCA for 2011 would not be using Epworth- heard from Chuck to work with community. Happy to be here- have a plan that was just shared- four 2 week sessions for residents-\$90 per week fee, \$100 a week for outside residents. . Include 1 field trip per session. Using Lenape or Duzine would be suitable. He's speaking on behalf of Heidi Kirscher the new President and CEO. She will meet with the committee in Jan-Feb. We will be meeting with your Committee building up to the Summer Camp season. We will meet with you during the Camp season on a regularly scheduled basis. And our Camp Director will be available every Friday afternoon to meet with the Committee and interested parents. And we would like to meet with the Committee and parents at the end of the camp season to review to build on this coming year and get ready for 2012 with your input.

Councilwoman Brown- She thought it was a 6 week program? It's 8 weeks. Chuck said the camp will end mid-August.

Jack Young said they were basing their budget on a 10-1 ratio so with 150 kids there would be the Camp Director, a Nurse, and a Secretary, and then 15 Counselors. We would be able to carry that staff load right through the 8 week session. Councilwoman Brown said so it would start on 6/27 and run through 8/19? Yes.

Supervisor Hokanson said so if the Board is inclined to do so I can direct our attorney to draw up a contract.

Councilman Logan- putting us out \$25,000. \$8500 on school. \$1000 on bus- without 150 students- Supervisor Hokanson- we commit to no more than \$10,000. It doesn't matter if we only get 100 students instead of 150 students. We still only commit the \$10,000. Supervisor Hokanson objects to only \$10 difference on the Town resident's fee verses Non-Town resident fee.

Councilwoman Brown to Jack- I guess that's your call. But that's a very small differential. Supervisor Hokanson- No, that's not their call, we can stipulate in our contract what the difference will be.

Supervisor Hokanson- we can't give any money unless there is Town oversight.

Councilwoman Brown- thought great jobs for New Paltz kids. Jonah said maybe the Y could contact local schools and offer the jobs to New Paltz people first. - Jack says it makes sense to him but does not want to sit here and make a promise since he won't be here when the time comes.

Councilwoman Brown- Who will parents call if there's a problem? Speak to the Camp Director.

Councilwoman Logan – says he's fine going to contract but he would first like them to reduce the fee for New Paltz residents, and increase the fee for non-residents as long as the total cost remains at \$13,500.

Jack used \$14,000- wants to rework numbers if the allocation is \$10,000.

Supervisor Hokanson and Councilwoman Brown think that the original allocation was \$14,000 but it got cut to \$10,000. So Supervisor Hokanson said she would double check which amount it is and get back to them. Councilman Logan asked so the approximate total is \$28,000 to run program?

Supervisor Hokanson said they'll figure it out later.

Floyd Kniffen-

Supervisor Hokanson said she asked Joe what they needed to do tonight and he said that they needed to talk about SEQR and EAF and possibly do our SEQR determination and talk about whether or not we thought annexation was a benefit to the public. She added that she originally asked Joe to come tonight but Floyd's attorney wasn't available to come tonight so he didn't feel comfortable coming tonight without Floyd's attorney being here and he didn't want to hold things up.

Dave's review of the EAF – Floyd Kniffen's comments about it - Supervisor Hokanson asked Mr. Kniffen if he agreed with him. He said yes. He agreed with the County Planning Board for referral. And the build out he understands where he's coming up with 15 units. Supervisor Hokanson said that she just realized that annexation has to be referred to the Ulster County Planning Board, so that's something we could do tonight, do that referral. A discussion ensued between Councilman Logan and Mr. Kniffen about the number of units. Mr. Kniffen said his goal would be to build along Harrington Street some kind of town house configuration or single family houses. Supervisor Hokanson says the one concern she has about the annexation of his whole property creates this island of Town property that's not connected to any other Town property. Mr. Kniffen responded that he had a different way of looking at that. That even though you are in the Village you are still in the Town. So you're really not no longer in the Town. She responded but we really don't have that situation anywhere else. And that is something that she really objects to and she thinks there's a way around that by not annexing his entire piece of property leave a piece that perhaps you weren't going to develop on anyway and leave that in the Town so it becomes a peninsula instead of an island.

Councilwoman Brown asked and how does that help the people who would have been what would have been the island? Supervisor Hokanson responded that by creating the island it really begs the question about that you really should be annexing all of them and I am not going to speak for them and say that it is in their best interest for them to be annexed. She said she would bet that the majority would not want to be annexed. Councilwoman Brown asked and none of them came to the public hearing? Supervisor Hokanson replied no but she doesn't think they realized because she didn't even realize that that was the situation that was occurring when she scheduled the Public Hearing.

Councilwoman Brown said that this has very strong benefits and only one problem. The benefits are that we want to continue clustering density close to the Village infrastructure. The problem for her is we have enormous recreational needs in this community and the way that we fund this is through recreation fees. And if this goes to the Village she's assuming they will collect some sort of recreation fee but A they're lower and B the Town doesn't have the commitment that those funds would be used for Moriello Pool where in her estimation where this community is where they are going to want to recreate. Mr. Kniffen says he sees the recreation fee issue a lot differently. The creation of recreation fees is only as a substitute to land being provided for that development. And even in Town law the first thing is can that Development provide recreational areas within itself? And if the Planning Board feels it cannot then they collect recreation fees. It says that in the Town. It says that in the Village. There's something bigger going on here is that here is the Preserve. There's a desire in the Town to have this Preserve. He thinks it's bigger than the recreational issue. He says he wouldn't foresee the need for recreation fees because it has always been his desire to give the land as a Preserve. The recreation fees are a substitute to providing an area for recreation. Supervisor Hokanson said she disagrees with him. It's not a recreation area providing recreational needs. And the recreational needs of the people who are going to move into this area unless it is age restricted is going to be ball fields, basketball courts, playgrounds. It's not going to be just linear parks. Councilwoman Brown added the law actually specifically mentions playgrounds and parks. Mr. Kniffen responded that he actually took a look at the Town Law as far as what the legislative intent is it does mention parks, playgrounds, recreational facilities to meet the needs of the proposed residential development if they cannot be located on the subdivision site plan. The Planning Board requires a sum of money in lieu of ... established by the Town Board. Typically you don't have facilities on site but I've always viewed this property as having facilities on site that whole piece of property along Millbrook Stream. Now that there's the bigger picture of the Millbrook Preserve... obviously being the landowner wanting to do development I want to maximize the development in this area and preserve this area. It makes sense

to cluster here. He added he understands there are needs for recreation and our taxes go towards that and the recreational fees are used for that. Supervisor Hokanson added with the annexation and the increased density it's going to increase the number of children and put the demand on the other recreational uses that we had. They're not going to create a demand for the Millbrook Preserve. Mr. Kniffen said he doesn't disagree with that. Councilwoman Brown asked him if he would be willing to consider donating a Conservation Easement to the Wallkill Valley Land Trust. She says she thinks they hold the Conservation Easement on the rest of the Preserve. There would be a tax gift benefit if you wanted to donate the Conservation Easement of part of the property to the Preserve. That could be one way of meeting your interests and expanding the Preserve and also reducing some of your development costs because if that is a donation you do get a charitable donation for that, but that would be a Conservation Easement it wouldn't be part of the recreation plan. The Town has an abundance of a lot of wetlands, steep slopes, for passive recreation and bird watching and sanctuaries and that kind of thing which are of incalculable value in terms of protecting wildlife and habitat but our population wants to play baseball, soccer, basketball and we're having a hard time meeting that need. She added she didn't know how much they can or need to decide tonight but the only loss of benefit to the Town is, is if this were developed as the 15 acres in the Town under a cluster subdivision, we could be talking about \$60,000 of recreation fees. Mr. Kniffen responded 23 lots currently exist on the property. I don't know how that would be calculated. Councilwoman Brown asked those have been approved? Mr. Kniffen responded those are lots from the 50's that exist there. Councilwoman Brown said she doesn't know if those expire or not. Mr. Kniffen said they're there. They're on the maps. He said he's not going to try to get out of something that's justified. He just has a different take on it. He said he knows he can't build on 23 lots. The lots would have to be combined to make bigger lots to make septic work. Whatever can be figured out as fair he'd go along with. Councilwoman Williams said Floyd you just mentioned septic systems. I thought part of the idea of being annexed to the Village is that you could use Village. He responded yes, that would be the plan. Councilman Lewis said that he thinks they need to preserve their right to collect recreation fees if we are going to need them in the future. He'd be hesitant to give that up and would want to go very slowly to make sure we are going in the right direction before we made the decision to give them up. Councilman Logan said that one of the biggest things in the EAF and he didn't know they were doing this tonight wished he had brought along his whole packet and he said he thought Councilwoman Brown agrees with his part of the public benefit of having this as density housing and also considering the lack of density housing that we have in our current Town Code. We could probably force it into a PUD, Supervisor Hokanson said or you could do a Residential Variable...we still don't have sewer to the property and there won't be enough units here for Floyd to be able to afford to build a package plant, thinks it might be too large to do shared septic. Councilwoman Williams said that's not true. He continued to say he would love to see this as high density housing that has a mixed use of both. He could picture this having the perfect mix of generations of families moving into this type of project. If you get enough density, then you can't do shared septic...Councilwoman Williams said there are new technologies you can have a small septic system for 15 to 30 houses with one much smaller field that is totally underground, so you wouldn't have any of the odor issues that we have on North Ohioville. Councilman Logan said he's really nervous about sewer districts because of the problems we've been having with Sewer District 6. He said the benefits of us annexing this to the Village certainly outweighs anything for keeping this in the Town just for the sheer fact of the sewer and it's density housing and our Community wants density housing. He went on to say the recreation issue is going to be difficult because it will be within walking distance to a lot of Town sponsored recreation like Moriello Pool of which we need to upgrade. He said putting this in the Village and he'd like to have

your attorney and our attorney and Supervisor Hokanson sit down and work out that doughnut hole to see if there is a way to save that problem. Having this go to the Village is certainly to everyone's advantage. Supervisor Hokanson said well, why not tonight we refer this to the County and get that out of the way because they meet in the beginning of January. And put Floyd back on our meeting in January and have both attorneys come to that meeting. Councilman Logan said but before we refer it to the County do you think... I just want to see if our attorneys can solve the piece in the middle before we refer it to the County. Mr. Kniffen said that Joe did comment that he didn't see anything in State Law that prevents it. Supervisor Hokanson said right. Mr. Kniffen continued it's an oddity, it's almost like an access concern. Councilman Logan asked but can we solve that after County referral though? Supervisor Hokanson said it may end up being one of their comments. Councilwoman Brown asked well, how will they know about it? And Supervisor Hokanson said because we have to send them the map. Councilwoman Brown asked Mr. Kniffen how many units are you proposing? He answered He hadn't worked up any plans. As far as he's gone is he's spoken to Rubco about possible Senior housing or workforce housing. Councilwoman Brown asked so how would the County know what they're... Supervisor Hokanson said it's not a Site Plan or a Subdivision, it's just an annexation. Councilman Logan added it will go back up again for Site Plan. Once Site Plan it will go back up to County again. Councilwoman Brown said that that doesn't make sense to me. Annexation could imply anything on... this is how many acres? Mr. Kniffen responded 30. Councilwoman Brown continued so it could be 180 units. How can the County make a decision? Supervisor Hokanson said because they're not deciding on the housing. Mr. Kniffen added they could look at what the maximum... Councilman Logan and Supervisor Hokanson said they're also looking at the EAF, and the topography... Councilman Logan says that takes out steep slopes and water courses... all 30 acres isn't all developable. Councilwoman Brown asked what is the bad kind of housing that isn't rateable? Condos. It won't be Condos? Mr. Kniffen replied he was sort of thinking of a Townhouse style so they're kind of attached, maybe 2 attached or 4 attached... Councilwoman Brown said it's the kind of ownership that's the problem. Mr. Kniffen said he understood that. He understood the tax problem. He added he lives on this property. He's a part of this community. Supervisor Hokanson added it's a tax problem for him too. He added he wants to do something innovative and wants to take it step by step. He's not really rushing it. Councilwoman Brown said I think we all have confidence in you. We've seen your work. Our big responsibility here is protecting the future recreational needs of our residents. He replied he knows that's out there. He just wanted to give his end of it. He also said he wanted to comment back on Councilwoman Williams comment about septics. The Millbrook Preserve group has commented that water and sewer, sewer especially is good for this site because the possible impact that septics could have on the Preserve being adjacent to it. Councilwoman Williams said she understands.

MOTION: Councilwoman Brown made a motion that we authorize the Supervisor to forward this to the County Planning Board as a referral. Seconded by Councilwoman Williams. All aye votes cast. Motion carried.

Mr. Kniffen asked in regards to the EAF itself is there any more discussion on specifics in this with the Board? Supervisor Hokanson said she didn't think so. Councilman Logan said no. Mr. Kniffen said we'll continue that at the next meeting. They agreed.

BREAK

HARCOURT SANCTUARY: Marietta Snyder? On the Board Chair of HHS and Christy Ferguson Executive Director of the Wallkill Valley Land Trust. Supervisor Hokanson said a couple years ago we applied for an estuary grant to help with purchasing the Harcourt Sanctuary from Historic Huguenot Street. Councilman Logan asked if it was still in our budget? Supervisor Hokanson said that

it was in the 2010 budget. It isn't in the 2011 budget. Councilman Logan said it wasn't in the 2010 because we kept carrying the grant over ... Supervisor Hokanson said from the year before right. That's because there was always a hope that the Governor was going to release those grant awards, that didn't happen. At the time we had proposed a \$30,000 match that was a grant requirement and we were asking \$90,000 for a total of \$130,000 for the property and the idea at the time was that we would try to raise the money for the match. And at that time the Community Foundation for New Paltz had agreed to help us with some fundraising on that. What's happened recently is Open Space Institute was here and told her that they were interested in partnering with the Town on the Harcourt Sanctuary and that they had settled on a price and would like the Town to buy it from them for half the price which would be \$55,000. And that they were willing to hang on to the property to allow us time to raise the money. So now they are on the Agenda tonight so we can bring you up to speed and get your feeling about it. Before we commit to doing that we would have to hold a Public Hearing. So tonight was to bring you up to speed, hear your thoughts and ideas and see if you were interested in going forward and if you are we'll start drafting the paperwork for the Public Hearing for January. Ms. Snyder said she would first like to thank the Board for their public service. And the Board thanked her. And she said she wanted to apologize for the short time frame. The OSI Board just formally met yesterday, they did unanimously approve this potential purchase but they are requiring a commitment from the Town not just an expression of interest. She said this transaction is important for the financial health of HHS (Historic Huguenot Street). They've gone through a strategic assessment and have decided to shrink their scope. And the first part of that was the Harcourt Preserve and since that time have been divesting themselves of other properties that are in better care in other hands. A big part of that is the Locust Lawn and Twilleger House, and another sanctuary that's in Gardiner that was successfully transferred to Locust Grove in Poughkeepsie this year. They're also in the process of trying to transfer the Quaker Meeting House that they own in Plattekill. That would define our focus being Huguenot Street. They're excited about reconstructing their future but it's also about them remaining a healthy organization. So this transaction is really important to us. We originally set down this path with the Wallkill Valley Land Trust to work as Toni described to work with the Town to purchase the property. As part of that process we did enter into a Conservation Easement with the Wallkill Valley Land Trust for a variety of reasons one of which was that in many ways we thought we were giving the Town a gift because it was going to significantly reduce the purchase price of the property by putting an Easement on it before the Town purchased it. We also felt this was a way to give something back to the Community and try to combine putting the Easement on it but still putting it into public hands was the right thing to do as another nonprofit in the community. HHS believes this should be in public hands because it's a green space for the Town. And this was identified as a priority by the Town in 2008 which is kind of why we went down this path. It is an amazing piece of property in that it's on the Wallkill River. It also has rich farmland as well as wetlands. Supervisor Hokanson added and the Ox bow. In the right hands and with the right signage it can continued love and care it will be in much better hands with the Town. The challenge for us is it takes energy, time, and it's expensive for us because it's unique property from an insurance perspective. She doesn't want to go down this path but the reality is that we may at some point have to sell it to someone else in order to shore up some of the financial resources or begin to post the property. The interesting thing about putting it into someone else's hands it kind of starts the clock again about public access. That is not what we want to do because we don't believe that that is where this property should end up being. But we have to think about our own position and that is why this transaction is very important to us. We've done surveys, we've done appraisals that were all part of the first process for this transaction. As part of entering into this because of tightness of our own situation the Wallkill Valley Land Trust waived

their fee until we're able to save the property. They've been working with us in a wonderful way to try to make sure this gets into the right hands. The other thing that the Wallkill Valley Land Trust has done is to commit to help fundraise for this property. We have this commitment in writing from the Wallkill Valley Land Trust and one of the reasons Christy is here tonight is to answer questions about the Wallkill Valley Land Trust support and their commitment to help in any way that they can on providing some support for the Town for this property. The vote, my understanding, I haven't seen this in writing yet, but the vote from OSI does give the Town 3 years to come up with the purchase price. The clock is running from OSI's perspective they are applying for funding which expires in December. Supervisor Hokanson said that she specifically asked them if they had to use money that expires in December and they said no. She replied, well, that's interesting because we were under the impression that time sensitivity that that money will go away which is why they were very interested in entering into a contract with HHS before the end of the year. Supervisor Hokanson said ok. She added they were willing to, they are still willing to wait until January for the decision and kind of bridge it for another month assuming it will be shortly after they have made their application. If there isn't a commitment in January OSI will withdraw its offer to HHS but the commitment would be to purchase it in the 3 year period of time. The specific funding source for the Town does not have to be identified. We haven't had time to re-approach the Community Foundation to see if they would work with the Wallkill Valley Land Trust but that's also an additional possibility. I think everyone believes the \$55,000 is a pretty reasonable amount to be raised and I think hence the Wallkill Valley Land Trust interest because it takes their fundraising commitment down from \$130,000 to \$55,000 so effectively OSI is providing a matching grant for the purchase of this property and it kind of helps 2 important organizations. Councilwoman Brown asked so the Land Trust already holds an Easement? She answered Correct. Councilwoman Brown asked on how much of the property? 55.8 plus acres. Councilwoman Brown asked how much is the land in total? The answer: that is it. That's the entire Preserve including the farmland piece of it. Councilwoman Brown asked is there a building lot reserved on that parcel? The answer, there can be sheds. There's some small kinds of things that can be done for recreation and support but no residential properties. Councilwoman Brown added because I thought you said something that you didn't want to have to sell it but that you... she responded it's not that it could be developed but then someone could then post it and use it for their own personal use. It can be used for public use but it's not required to be open to the public. Councilwoman Brown added but it's not under any threat for development. It just could be taken away from public access. They said correct. So someone could use it for their own recreational purposes and at \$55,000 it's not out of reach ... Councilwoman Brown said but an individual wouldn't get it for \$55,000 would they? Councilman Logan said no, it would go to market value then. Supervisor Hokanson no, it would be \$130,000 at minimum. She responded that they are willing to reduce their price to \$110,000 for OSI potential. Councilwoman said but if that for some reason fell through the market price ... she added that what's confusing about the survey that you sent us is it does talk about how that there could conceivably be some building lots and that's how they came up with their price of \$230,000, Ms. Snyder responded no, they assumed that there was going to be a conservation easement on the property for the \$230,000 in the kind of beginning piece of it. The appraisal itself did contemplate that an Easement would be placed on the property. Councilman Logan said he would like to wait and see the **CWOESP?**'s ranking for this property first and they won't be able to rank it until January because the most available funds available for us, hopefully there would be some fundraising but we could take it out of our bonding money. He added and I know we are getting closer and closer to getting a bond ready sometime next year Toni? She said yes. We have \$2 million dollars and some of it we've already spent on some other land. He added the other concern he's having is this is property that is

going to abut up to 2 farms. So we've got the 2 farms that we've paid for with Easements and this is currently held by Huguenot Historical Society. It would seem to be in the best interest of Huguenot Historical Society to hang on to this property because it can't be developed and there's not a lot of tax pressure on it. Councilwoman Brown said the problem that they have ...she asked them are you managing the property now? The HHS spokesperson said no, we hold the Conservation Easement on it, we do not manage it. Councilwoman Brown asked so is there an endowment that is contemplated? Ms. Snyder said no. Councilwoman Brown said that's a problem for us because we are having a terrible time managing the few Easements that we've got right now. We're not doing it basically. Ms. Snyder said the Village does provide the upkeep on the property right now. We did enter into an agreement with the Village in 91 or 96, I'd have to look back to get that, and they've been maintaining the trails. We do if the bridge goes out, we maintain the bridge, The Wallkill Valley Land Trust just provides the work for the protection of the property makes sure that the Easement is being upheld - the annual monitoring. Councilman Logan said and again and things like that become a huge problem it then becomes ... That would be Town property, that bridge for example, would no way meet standards under Town ... Supervisor Hokanson added actually the Town built that bridge. Ms. Snyder said the one that washed out was not under appropriate standards, the rebuilt one is going to be there forever. Ms. Snyder said to Councilman Logan there isn't an option for HHS to continue to hold this. He asked what are the top reasons why HHS cannot hold onto this? She replied it diverts us from a management perspective, a resource perspective, a liability perspective, and from our mission. And we also think the property deserves better care than we can give it. Councilman Logan replied I guess I'm just questioning then the Mission, and having grown up in this community and ...she responded our charter is educational. It is not preservation conservation. Councilwoman Brown said the problem is you were given this piece of property. Ms. Snyder replied no, we had to buy it. Councilwoman Brown said it said it was deeded to you. Ms. Snyder responded it was deeded but then we had to buy another piece of property for \$17,000. Councilwoman Brown replied well, this is what Jeff and I like to say this is the gift that keeps on taking... Ms. Snyder added in 1976 that \$17,000 was a lot of money to us. A condition of that deed was that we purchase a home on the property for \$17,000. Supervisor Hokanson added The Open Space Institute gave the Town \$10,000 endowment fee for the **Palmetier** Conservation Easement. Councilwoman Brown added well the **Palmetiers** also contributed something. Supervisor Hokanson said she thought they should discuss an endowment with OSI. Councilwoman Brown said the much bigger thing for me is, I don't want to stop this in its tracks but all of the management problems that you cite are multiplied 100 times for the Town. This is by Historic use something that the public considers a public right of way. It's an important active sanctuary which I'm not sure the Town has the expertise to take care of any better than you do. Ms. Snyder said that would be a concern for us but if we sell this to another party the clock just starts again on public access, or under different ownership it could be taken away. If we were in a different position I don't think we would be looking at this. The other properties were harder for us to divest of. We're chartered by the State Educational Department and we went through the Attorney General and the State to make these other decisions. The Harcourt was the first of the requests that we made of them. It was the easiest because it is clearly outside of our mission. Councilman Lewis asked is there any State or National Preservation Commission that would buy it and maintain it like something like the Roosevelt property? She replied, it's possible. The thing that she thinks is so valuable to the Town is this Wallkill River access, the potential for landings and recreation that wouldn't be able to be developed and necessarily pursued. Councilman Lewis said what Kitty and Jeff are saying is we won't be able to afford to develop it in the near future. Ms. Snyder said that's true now but the economic chimes do change, and this is kind of a long term plan as is all the planning for the Town. Supervisor Hokanson

added and we do continue to generate recreation funds for it. Councilman Lewis asked the Supervisor if she had any idea about the cost of the yearly maintenance for that would be? Supervisor Hokanson said when I was first on the Environmental Conservation Commission they had a role in maintaining this. They would go out, and they inspected the bridge. They rebuilt the bridge. They put up educational markers. It was our volunteer board that did it. We did provide for some of the materials for the bridge repair but there is a person who works for the Village who loves the Sanctuary and volunteers to mow it twice a year. And really that's really it. Ms. Snyder added that's the extent of the upkeep right now. Councilman Lewis added and you said we won't have to worry about the bridge in the near future? Councilman Logan said he uses the Sanctuary frequently...and the Town there is all the Recreational facilities, there is a boat launch that is currently available on the other side of the Wallkill over off of Mountain Rest, there is one on Springtown maintained by the DEC, one by the Town, there are fishing areas on Huguenot Street, there's a fishing area also down along The Gardens For Nutrition which is the John G. Memorial Park which for historical reasons that was a park I built for my Eagle Scout Project and I'm very familiar with this property. That was all poison ivy and swamp land, and actually the Gardens For Nutrition my father helped establish. This is land I'm very familiar with and to Kitty's point This Harcourt Sanctuary is a great piece of land but it's a gift that's going to keep on taking. That bridge is nowhere close to meeting any ADA codes, or any codes. That steel bridge would become a liability which probably would have to be removed if the Town were to take it over. We have a library in this community, how long did it take to raise 3 million dollars? This property doesn't have any private ownership value whatsoever. This is a property there is a lot of community interest in it. Ms. Snyder said except for fishing and personal enjoyment. Councilman Logan said true, that notwithstanding there are lands farther out on the Wallkill, if you hike out by the old bridge there's some large lots out there that have actually been on the market for a long, long time that have greater acreage and have availability and there's no takers whatsoever. I think if OSI can kick in \$55,000, I think a campaign could be started, Friends of Harcourt Preserve and \$55,000 could be raised and this could end up like the Rail Trail did. Councilwoman Brown was President of the Land Trust when we bought the Rail Trail. The Rail Trail is a great example of what private money can do. Supervisor Hokanson said the Rail Trail is owned by the Town and the Village. It's just managed... Councilman Logan said that's what we need. We need a management piece to this. Us kicking in money. I'd like to see what the CWOSP, what Seth and Kara come back with the score on it. And see that they see this as a valuable piece of property that we can kick money in but ... Supervisor Hokanson added well they see it as a valuable piece of property; they're not sure that they want to recommend that Open Space funds that it meets the criteria of their scoring for Open Space. That's the whole purpose of doing the private funding not taking it from there. Councilman Logan added he'd like to see something more like we have on The Rail Trail. Where someone else is managing it. Where we're not taking over the management for it because we're just not in a position financially right now. Supervisor Hokanson added well we have 3 years to get that all together. Councilman Logan says but they're saying they need a commitment now. Ms. Snyder said OSI would buy this property now and give the Town 3 years to purchase it from them. Supervisor Hokanson added so it would be owned by OSI for 3 years. Councilman Logan added then in 3 years what happens? Ms. Snyder said you have to make a commitment to purchase it. Councilman Logan said making a commitment to purchase it in 3 years is the same as making a commitment to purchase it tomorrow. Supervisor Hokanson said right but you don't have to maintain it for the first 3 years. Councilwoman Brown asked what's the management plan for the Millbrook Preserve? Do they have a volunteer group that's going to manage it and take care of it? Supervisor Hokanson and Councilman Logan both said not yet. Ms. Snyder said Kitty going back to your point the current cost will be

significantly less to the Town for a variety of reasons because I think you would find that your insurance isn't going to change. Supervisor Hokanson agreed the insurance isn't going to change. Ms. Snyder said and that's a big piece for us. The Village I'm sure would be willing and maybe that's something we could work on over the next month, the Village maintains the trails. There's a bridge issue ... Supervisor Hokanson said we could have our Engineer take a look at that bridge.

Councilwoman Brown said we don't have any kind of written letter of understanding with the Village on management plan with this property and most of the Conservation Easements we have now have never been monitored, have barely had baseline studies done on them, they haven't even done that for this particular piece of property, there it is, much less, but they're small they're more like people's backyards they don't really require management plans, so if we had a fund that was dedicated towards a management plan that might be undertaken by the Land Trust or somebody that removed the Town because this is way too important a piece of habitat, I think, for the Town to manage. It's a big responsibility and I don't think we have the expertise to take care of, part of the proposal is neither do you. My feeling is that raising the money to buy this first of all it's going to be slightly controversial because most of this is in the flood plain which as we know, that is what the Surveyor says, it's in the flood zone, all of it... Ms. Snyder agreed, so part of the Open Space Bond momentum came from the Community's desire to prevent Sprawl... Ms. Snyder asked why do you think this was identified Kitty as a high priority and why do you think the Town kind of positioned this to have a Conservation Easement on it before we acquired it that's what, I'm curious why it was important when the Bond was issued but it's not important for the Town to own this anymore? Councilwoman Brown responded well the land between Huguenot Street, all of Huguenot Street, and the Wallkill was deemed by the Community as an important view shed but whether or not the Bond was passed, the first paragraph of our bond is that we know the Town wants to prevent sprawl. And this particular piece of property has immeasurable habitat and ecological benefit but it's not a threat in terms of being developed so all the ecological benefits suggest a level of care that I don't know how the Town will give in perpetuity. So, what I'm interested in looking at is funding some kind of management plan that can really maintain that piece of property the way it needs to be taken care of because this is not simple recreation. We can send our Recreation Director out to mow ball fields ... this is a huge 50 acre ecosystem and I don't know how to manage it. Christy said that The Wallkill Valley Land Trust is also not in the position to manage the property. We don't manage The Wallkill Valley Rail Trail we hold the Conservation Easements we monitor them in perpetuity, defend those but we're not managers. Supervisor Hokanson added which is the point that I want to make because you mentioned all the Conservation Easements that the Town holds and we don't monitor them, we don't have the money to monitor them. That's not the situation here because they hold the Conservation Easement. They're responsible for monitoring it and the cost of monitoring it. Councilwoman Brown added and if the property is not being taken care of we have to repair those, we have to remedy those problems. Supervisor Hokanson said if we own it yes. Councilman Logan said and this is a piece of property that does ... I know the property well... the biodiversity is incredible, it's something definitely beyond our scope to manage this property in the form that it's in now. And if you go back and you read why we did that bonding and certainly if you take flood plain and you saw what our residents are speaking about, everyone wanted to speak about flood plain, and if I start purchasing flood plains that are in the heart of the Village, and a lot of it was to prevent sprawl, I can take you to flood plain land at Craagswood Road, there's probably a resident sitting in his room right now that's not at this table who would gladly want me to buy his land. Supervisor Hokanson said that she is not in favor of using the Open Space Bond for this purchase. I've never been in favor of it, that's why I pursued the grant. Councilman Logan said I don't have \$55,000 sitting around somewhere, unless you know of \$55,000 somewhere, Supervisor Hokanson replied but I

think it can be raised within 3 years. An audience member asked if this property was on the tax roll, the Board members all answered no. Councilwoman Brown said I guess what I'm saying is because we're talking about negotiating a sale... I do not want this land to go into private hands, however, I feel that probably more than most pieces of property around here, this is a challenge for management because the public has gotten so used to having it available because I know birdwatchers are out there all the time, it's the firefly capital of the world, Ms. Snyder responded, Kitty it's a decision for the Town. It could end up in private hands. Councilwoman Brown answered here's what I'm looking at if the Town is going to spend \$55,000, my preference, and I know HHS like any nonprofit today needs to raise some capital but my feeling would be is I would want to create some sort of fund to manage this property. And I don't know whether or not you could go back to your Board and ask if the price could be lowered. Ms. Snyder said that's not going to happen Kitty. We've already gone from a \$230,000 value, we've offered this at a really reasonable price to the Town, that's not going to happen. Councilwoman Brown responded, ok. Councilman Lewis asked Councilwoman Brown what kind of management needs to be done? What do you envision? Or the cost of this management? She answered signage. He responded that's a one time thing isn't it? Councilman Logan added no, this is flooded all the time... Councilwoman Brown added somewhere in here is a discussion of the management challenges that HHS is facing... Ms. Snyder added it's more about potential... I don't think to maintain it the way it is today is diminimus to be honest, and HHS doesn't have a management plan for this property. All that is being done right now is mowing the fields. So there is diminimus cost for the Town at this time to just assume just what HHS is doing which is just to mow the trails. The signage does exist. I also know that there is signage available from the County Executive's Office. They are very willing to help with that type of support. To maintain it as it is being maintained today isn't that expensive for the Town. Supervisor Hokanson said that she, personally, would like to see the Town purchase this property. And I'd like to see us move to at the very least the Public Hearing so we can hear from the Public whether or not they would like to have the Town purchase it. Councilman Logan said another thing that is tough to is if you look at the listings of the properties, like at this lot 2 on Plains Road, and lot 3, and lot 1, the landowner of those has not been back in front of The Planning Board and I don't even know if they're even active anymore. I know there is still a for sale sign on them. And the Old Kingston Road one, the 205 acres, it has a lot of access issues, it is bisected by The Rail Trail. The CWEOSP looked at those and they're unable to purchase those. Ms. Snyder responded this is 2 years old, the OSI as part of its process did its own appraisal of the property with the Conservation Easement on it and that's where they came up with \$110,000, so irrespective of what you may think or value this was done 2 years ago, and again, the price was much reduced from the pieces that you're seeing there, and we further reduced the price to the Town from \$130,000 vs. the \$230,000 appraisal even and it does clearly state that the sale would be after having placed a Conservation Easement on the property but OSI wanted to do its own appraisal of the property and went through an independent process and that's where they came up with \$110,000. Councilman Logan asked How about the Village purchasing this? Supervisor Hokanson said I have? Haven't? discussed the Village purchasing this. Councilman Lewis asked Supervisor Hokanson to state her proposal and a motion? She said ok.

MOTION: Supervisor Hokanson made a motion that the Town Board authorize our attorney to prepare the documents necessary to put the question of the purchase of The Harcourt Sanctuary forward for Public Hearing. Seconded by Councilman Lewis. Councilwoman Williams asked the Supervisor what the commitment would be. Is the commitment solely to hold the hearing? Supervisor Hokanson replied the commitment would be to hold the Hearing on the purchase of the property at \$55,000, or to partner for the purchase ... Councilwoman Williams added to partner for the purchase so if a committee were

formed to raise that amount, that could all be part of the discussion? Supervisor Hokanson said yes. Councilwoman Brown added, wait, no, the proposal is with the Town will pay \$55,000, Supervisor Hokanson said the idea of going forward is the Town would partner with OSI to purchase the property within 3 years for \$55,000, that's what the Public Hearing will be on. Ms. Snyder added well, OSI will purchase the property and then they will sell it to the Town. Councilman Logan said he just wanted to add did you not hear the residents come here and tell you of their hardships? And you're willing to take on another expense. It doesn't have any management plan with it. Has the backing of our **CWEOSP** as far as this is a good piece of land but this has no tools whatsoever to say that this is something we want to put bonding money in for...Supervisor Hokanson said, no I'm not saying I want to spend bonding money on it. He replied I'm not saying that either but that is the source, there's no other source for that money, and don't say 3 years because in 3 years we need to come up with the money. The Village has not been ...has the Village been approached for this property? Ms. Snyder said no. Councilman Logan said is the Village even interested in doing part of it? Ms. Snyder said it's because most of the land is in the Town. There's only a tiny piece in the Village. Supervisor Hokanson said she's asking to go to Public Hearing to purchase the property. At the Public Hearing if the Public says no we shouldn't do this then the Board will decide whether or not we want to do it. A discussion ensued between Councilman Logan and Councilman Lewis, then Supervisor Hokanson added we have to vote on it after the Public Hearing whether or not we want to buy it or not. Councilman Lewis we don't vote on it until after the Public Hearing. Then, Ms. Snyder showed the Board members the map that shows which part of the property falls in the Village and which part of the property falls in the Town. Councilman Logan asked we just bought a big chunk of land in the Village didn't we? We just bought a big chunk of land behind Duzine School that's Village property. You certainly can approach the Village to purchase the land. It certainly would bend well towards Village because the majority of the access to the property is through the Village. So the Village could be an interested party in purchasing this, and they may have better resources in maintaining it. Ms. Snyder said to be honest ...Supervisor Hokanson said well that can be explored between now and the Public Hearing ... Councilman Logan said he's not interested in going to a Public Hearing on this, he said people are welcome to come and speak...Supervisor Hokanson said well, we know how you will vote but I would like to hear how everyone else is going to vote. All in favor....then Councilwoman Brown said wait, I just want to know if your motion allows for the opportunity for the Town to do all of this through private fundraising. Supervisor Hokanson said that's absolutely my intent. Councilwoman Brown added but if that fails under your motion are we still committed to using \$55,000 of our...? Supervisor Hokanson said under her motion we are only committed to holding a Public Hearing nothing else. Councilwoman Brown said and the Public Hearing the language will say the Town of New Paltz is contemplating buying this..? She answered yes. Councilwoman Brown said that's a problem for me. I don't want the language of the Public Hearing to lock us into having to use Town funds to purchase this. So when you ask Joe to draft it...Supervisor Hokanson said we can put that in there... Councilwoman Williams said yeah...Councilman Logan and don't forget Kitty the future maintenance costs too. Councilwoman Brown said well, what I'm hoping is if we can do this through public fundraising then we can start allocating money towards whatever this \$55,000....Councilwoman Williams said what I would suggest is that we set our fundraising goals to include an endowment so that it will be kept up. Councilwoman Brown agreed. Supervisor Hokanson said we could also talk to OSI about giving back a little bit of money for that. Ms. Snyder said as part of this we would still like to do some programming on the property. Supervisor Hokanson said can we have the vote now? Councilwoman Brown said if you ask Joe to give us the option to go to private fundraising...Supervisor Hokanson said, right, I've wanted to do the public fundraising since I first

started talking about this. She said I promise. Councilwoman Brown said. Ok. Supervisor said; all in favor? All aye votes cast, except Councilman Logan who said he was opposed, and said nay. Motion passed.

LOCAL LAW FOR DOG LICENSING: Supervisor Hokanson made a motion for her to declare the local law to add a new chapter 63 entitled Dog Licensing to the Code of the Town of New Paltz, a type 2 action, and adopt this local law. Seconded by Councilwoman Williams. All aye votes cast. Motion carried.

THE REFERRAL PROCESS FOR SITE PLAN PROCEDURES: Supervisor Hokanson said this has to do with the referral process for Site Plan Procedures was something George and Staci found - an oddity in our code how it currently reads - doesn't match how it really works. This is a Resolution that basically codifies or approves the process that has been happening; that the Building Inspector reviews the application, or Dave Clouser is reviewing for her as we authorized when we went down to one Building Inspector. They determine that the minimum requirements have been met before it goes to the Planning Board and The Building Inspector is not deeming that it is complete but it is complete enough for referral. So basically we've been given a Resolution that sanctifies the process that has been happening and continues to happen. And that language will be changed in the Code when we update our Zoning. Councilwoman Brown asked so it will be changed to include this final paragraph? "That the Building Inspector satisfactorily ..." Supervisor Hokanson replied that is what we are passing by Resolution but we don't know what the new procedure will be under the new Code. George and Joe said this is a good housekeeping matter for us to do. Councilwoman Brown said she thinks this is something they need to talk about in Executive Session considering Staci's letter. Councilwoman Brown added actually I'm going to propose we go into Executive Session anyway to review certain contracts that have expired, or pending....Supervisor Hokanson said she doesn't think there is much that they can do about those contracts tonight. Councilwoman Brown said she would just like to have a discussion based on the proposals that have been submitted to us. Supervisor Hokanson said so should we just take care of everything else we have before and then take care of this? Councilwoman Brown said yes.

Warrant and Motion: Councilman Lewis made a motion for us to empower the Supervisor to pay the Warrant in the sum of \$354, 496.34. Seconded by Councilwoman Williams. All aye votes cast. Motion carried.

Motion: Supervisor Hokanson so we want to make a motion to reappoint Anne Winfield to The Board of Assessment Review, another term. Seconded by Councilwoman Brown. All aye votes cast. Motion carried.

Motion: Supervisor Hokanson made a motion that they reappoint Tom O'Dowd to the Clean Water and Open Space Commission to the vacant position. I don't know when it expires. Seconded by Councilman Logan. All aye votes cast. Motion carried.

Setting Date For Paying End of the Month Bills: Supervisor Hokanson said she only really needs 3 of you. So they decided on Thursday, December 30th at 11 am.

Question about Sewer District 6: Councilman Logan said to the Supervisor the only question I had on the Warrants was there were a couple of big bills in there on Sewer District 6 and it looks like we paid for them under the SSF Fund. How did they end up back in Sewer District 6? Because you have to pay for those out of the actual District. She replied SSF is Sewer District 6. Councilman Logan said, you're right. Okay. Sewer District 6 is going to end up being short. She replied, yes. He asked so are we going to borrow money and rebuild those homes? She replied we are going to ask our Accountant for some advice on that. Councilman Logan said because by law they have to pay for that. She replied, yes. We can give them a short term loan to pay the bills and pay it back between funds. He said No.

She said yes we can. It would be from the Unexpended Fund Balance. She added there is an Unexpended Fund Balance in Sewer District 6 too. He replied I think we've eaten most of that up. She said we need to check on it and we need to talk to the Accountant. And we also need to amend Water and Sewer rates. He agreed. She added shortly after the first of the year. Councilman Logan said Sewer District 6 certainly needs large sums of money.

Motion: Supervisor Hokanson made a motion to go into Executive Session. Seconded by Councilwoman Williams. All aye votes cast. Motion carried. Supervisor Hokanson added we are going in for the purposes of Contract discussions. She then told Eli that they were letting him go for the night.