I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Anderson at 1:30 p.m. Mr. Anderson asked everyone to introduce themselves.

II. GENERAL BUSINESS

A. Designation of Vice Chairman – Mr. Anderson stated he would like to ask Dave English to be Vice Chairman.

Mr. Anderson informed the committee that he will not be available to attend the September 8, 2010 Steering Committee. He asked if anyone would be available to provide a report, if needed. Mr. Spagnoletti volunteered to attend.

B. Topics for Discussion – Mr. Anderson reviewed the Task Force Mission Statement with the committee. We need to discuss what would be affected and how we should address those things. The committee reviewed the following list of committee issues.

**Road Use agreement:**

**Assessment prior to damage:**

**Adjustment of maintenance schedule? Plowing, guardrail repair:**

**Driveway permit increase:** Basically a separate issue. Many towns don’t have driveway permits. This topic may go along with site plan review.

**Site plan review law:** Many towns and municipalities don’t have a site plan review. A site plan review doesn’t necessarily say what you can do, but says the town or municipality would like to know what you plan on doing and how you plan on doing it. Eventually we can provide a site plan to whoever (towns, municipalities) is interested in that part of it.

**Water and gas pipelines crossing roads; erosion:** Has occurred within the County many times. That possibly goes along with Road use agreements.

**Landfill use by industry for tailings, construction debris, etc. Increased waste at Transfer Stations?** Mr. Anderson referenced Steve Orcutt and his expertise.
Gravel shortages/increased prices: A concern for anyone that has anything to do with roads or construction

Loss of employees to gas industry: Covers every sub-committee and the task force itself. This is a possible concern for all municipalities,

Increased workload for DPW in inspecting roads and bridges: Absolutely

Impact upon tourism if roads around Keuka or other important routes are damaged: Increased traffic on other (seasonal) roads.

Pressure upon DPW and Law Department for drafting/tracking/enforcing road use agreements:

Cost of technology to accept drilling by products at landfills (e.g. sensors): Referred to Steve Orcutt

DPW staff fielding questions and complaints from public: Everyone’s involved. Something that generally the task force might address with some sort of number to call or website address.

Site plan review law. Staging areas are a big concern as are the possibility of new trailer parks springing up in fields. Housing will affect road use and infrastructure indirectly.

Mr. Anderson stated he would like each committee member to discuss any area of concern they may have.

Mr. Alger: Road Use agreement and site plan review/model for towns seems to be the main concern. Other issues: What kind of recommendations we might see to help us live through the process more than anything else. Road use agreements eventually will address the problems that may occur with various roads, but during the actual construction phase, while the roads are being used, there is going to need to be a lot of discussion about how we are going to coordinate between the companies and the Public Works people in a town or the County, to maintain roads in a passable/useable fashion until it is finally repaired, but I think those are the kind of issues I think we are going to want to talk about the most. Other than that, I think the issues are those things that people may have concerns about that we can address as we go forward. This list wasn’t intended to be all encompassing it was just a starting point. These two particular issues I think are things that generally people understand are things that you can’t address and if we had models that people could use that would be useful for the towns. There may be other things as we go along that they may identify and they may want to get involved in.

Mr. Anderson: (directed to Amy Dlugos) Resources, Make a list of the kinds of things towns should be looking at: Road use agreements, site planning, and Mobile home park laws. If we could get a list of the towns that already have similar things and use copies of those as a template. Make a list of resources available from towns. That might be where the planning board comes in.

Amy Dlugos: I do have sort of a very rough draft of a site plan model, keeping in mind a lot of these towns don’t have any regulations because they are very resistant to that. Limit it to things that aren’t going to affect residential and agricultural uses but staging areas for RV Parks or group housing.

Mr. Anderson: Throughout the coming months we can generate a list of the agreements, etc. that the various municipalities have. Many towns now have websites and post their local laws.

Edward Young: When a drilling permit is issued, the site is set by DEC. You have no alteration off from that. In many cases they will even give them what’s going to be the ingress, egress to a road. That will be part of their permit process. The towns have no control of where the drilling site will be located.

Mr. Anderson: That’s something we can look into to and be able to advise the towns. We don’t want to reinvent the wheel, but we can do some of the preliminary work.

Amy Dlugos: Maybe eventually we can have a training program in the evening and go over what they can and can’t do.
Mr. Alger: Some of the towns that don’t have any regulations now may be confused and think that they are going to regulate the site.

Edward Young: Approaching the towns with shared services contracts, possible state funds available, might make it more compatible to the towns to want to participate.

Steve Orcutt: When applying for a permit, do they have to go through a SEQR process?

Edward Young: Right now there is a standard environmental process. If you know that a permit has been applied for, you can have input into that process.

Mr. Anderson: If you are a town or a village or the County that has a permitting process that would affect any kind of industry coming in such as gas drilling; in the sense that you might have road use agreements and other things like that, then you’re on the list for the SEQR review and you get copies of everything and notifications of everything.

Elaine Swiler: In Steuben County do all of the towns have a permitting process and if not should we not encourage them to work to coordinate their permitting process that would simplify things when you move between one town to another with roads and so forth?

Mr. Anderson replied some time ago, the question was asked if a countywide road use agreement could be developed.

Mr. Spagnoletti: The first thing you have to keep in mind with road use agreements is you have to get them to sign. How do you get them to sign? Right now the way we get them to come to the table is post the road. The County road use agreement with East Resources is being adjusted to a standard format available for the towns. An analysis of the road will be done prior to and upon completion of the project. We can do that analysis with our Engineering Staff, although some towns can’t as they don’t have engineers. They could hire an engineer and charge the drilling company. Currently there is a County wide law being worked for a permit system. Discussion followed.

Motion to adjourn made by Steve Orcutt, seconded by Elaine Swiler and duly carried.

Respectfully Submitted by

Debra Cotter
Account Clerk
Department of Public Works

NEXT MEETING
Wednesday, October 20, 2010
1:30 p.m.