



**MINUTES OF THE PARK POLICY AND PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
February 16, 2012**

Committee members in attendance included Agency Chairwoman Leilani Ulrich, William Thomas, William Valentino, Sherman Craig and Designee Jen McCormick, Department of Economic Development, and Richard Booth, Committee Chair. Members Frank Mezzano, Arthur Lussi, and Designee Dierdre Scozzafava, Department of State joined the Committee. Also participating in the meeting was Executive Director Fred Monroe of the Local Government Review Board. Staff included Executive Director Terry Martino, Associate Counsel John Banta, Planning Director James Connolly, and Associate Natural Resource Planner Matthew Kendall.

The Committee meeting convened at approximately 2:00 p.m.

Map Amendment 2010-02 (J. Connolly, M. Kendall)

This item was for action. Mr. Connolly reviewed the property location and original proposal for amending the private land classification of the property involved. He reviewed the staff proposal in the Draft Final Environmental Impact Statement. He reviewed the timeline associated with the original application for amendment of the Official Adirondack Park Land Use and Development Plan Map which was requested by the landowner of the property involved. He referenced the soils reports that were submitted as a part of either the application or public comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and stated that the reports are included as appendices to the proposed Final EIS. He also noted that there is a great deal of public comment associated with this classification proposal.

Mr. Kendall reviewed staff's recommendation to reclassify the property from Resource Management to Rural Use. He explained that the premise for the map amendment process is based on regional boundaries; therefore, classification alternatives are developed based on both regional boundary considerations and land use area determinants. He explained the various regional boundary and classification alternatives that were reviewed by staff and the basis for staff's preferred alternative.

Member Mezzano asked if the soils in the proposed map amendment area are limited for placement of septic systems, why is staff recommending a change from Resource Management to Rural Use. Mr. Connolly responded that such limitation is characteristic of a land use area classification of Rural Use. He noted that Rural Use has similar characteristics to Resource Management. Agency Chairwoman Ulrich asked why Alternative 1 was not considered by staff. Mr. Kendall responded that due to the size of the area, near the shoreline parcel, the 1/10 mile setback from the shoreline was considered more

appropriate for Moderate or Low Intensity Use but the area had resource constraints due to soils and slopes which precluded these options. Staff believes that the larger alternative with the Rural Use classification is more suitable for the existing resource conditions of the site. Member Mezzano asked if additional information has been obtained since the original classification that was done in 1973. Mr. Connolly responded affirmatively, that the detailed soils data shown in Mr. Kendall's presentation was new data provided recently by NRCS and was only available subsequent to the public notice and hearings on the Draft EIS.

Committee Chair Booth asked if this action is undertaken, are there any implications for the area further southwest where the Girl Scout camp was located. He asked if the soils had been evaluated in that area. Mr. Kendall responded no but the lot configuration in that area consists of one contiguous lot that is not in separate ownership. Agency Chair Ulrich asked Mr. Kendall to address the issue of future development if this proposal went forward. Mr. Kendall responded one additional principal building lot for the applicant and one additional principal building lot for the adjoining landowner would be available under the Rural Use classification. He added that currently under the Resource Management classification, the build out would be 10 and under the Rural Use classification the build out would be 12.

Member Thomas asked if Alternative 2 could be chosen. Counsel Banta responded that in his opinion, Alternative 2 which involves the tenth mile setback in terms of the regional scale should only be associated with Moderate or Low Intensity Use and not the Rural Use classification. The same regional scale considerations apply to Alternative 1.

Member Valentino asked if the adjoining landowners within the 53 acre parcel were in support of the reclassification proposal. Mr. Kendall responded that some of the landowners were in opposition of the proposal.

Committee Chair Booth suggested to the Committee to have staff return next month with this item so that the Board could further review the proposed changes to the draft Final Environmental Impact Statement and the additional public comment letters that have come in since the last mailing to the Board. Agency Chair Ulrich asked if there were any sensitive time clocks associated with the proposal. Mr. Connolly responded no.

Member Valentino moved to table the item until the March meeting. Designee McCormick seconded the motion and all were in favor.

Old Business

None

DRAFT Minutes of the Park Policy Committee Meeting

February 16, 2012

Page 3

New Business

None

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:00 p.m.