

RUSH TOWN BOARD
Minutes of July 23, 2014

A regular meeting of the Rush Town Board, County of Monroe, was called to order by Supervisor Richard Anderson at 7:00 PM on July 23, 2014, at the Rush Town Hall, 5977 East Henrietta Road, Rush, New York. Everyone present participated in the Pledge of Allegiance.

PRESENT:	Richard Anderson	-----	Supervisor
	Daniel Woolaver	-----	Councilperson
	Kathryn Steiner	-----	Councilperson
	Cathleen Frank	-----	Councilperson, Deputy Town Supervisor
	Rita McCarthy	-----	Councilperson
	Pamela Bucci	-----	Town Clerk
	John Mancuso, Esq.	-----	Attorney for the Town

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mark David	Highway Superintendent, Resident
Kirsten Flass	Library Director, Resident
Carol Barnett	Resident
Joan Starkweather	Resident
Julia Lederman	Resident, Conservation Board Member
Beth Hoak	Resident
Kathryn Hankins	Resident
Mary Knapp	Resident
Dick Knapp	Resident
Dave Sluberski	Resident
Bill Riepe	Resident

I. OPEN FORUM

Supervisor Anderson welcomed all to the meeting and opened the floor to anyone wishing to address the Town Board with any particular items other than what is on the agenda. If an answer is readily available, it will be addressed. Those requiring research will be answered at a later date.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

RESOLUTION #114-2014

Councilperson Steiner moved to approve the Minutes of July 9, 2014, as written by Town Clerk Pamela Bucci. Councilperson Woolaver seconded the motion.

Roll:

Councilperson Woolaver	aye
Councilperson Steiner	aye
Councilperson Frank	aye

Councilperson McCarthy	aye	
Supervisor Anderson	aye	carried.

III. APPROVAL OF TRANSFER

Transfer was not necessary.

IV. APPROVAL OF ABSTRACT

RESOLUTION #115-2014

Councilperson Steiner moved Be It Resolved that having audited all the claims against the funds listed on Abstract of July 21, 2014 for vouchers #2014 795 through #2014 841 are allowed for payment in the amount of \$38,314.69. Councilperson Woolaver seconded the motion.

Roll:

Councilperson Woolaver	aye	
Councilperson Steiner	aye	
Councilperson Frank	aye	
Councilperson McCarthy	aye	
Supervisor Anderson	aye	carried.

V. CORRESPONDENCE

Supervisor Anderson received and discussed the following:

Monroe County Rush Range Shooting Schedule – Schedule has been received and will be published on the town's website.

NYS Department of Labor PESH (Public Employee Safety & Health) Program - This is an educational program on workers compensation and safety as it applies to public sector employees. Supervisor Anderson will be attending the program.

VI. REPORTS OF OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES

Councilperson Woolaver, liaison to the Zoning Board of Appeals, reported that a fire rack was approved with conditions.

Councilperson Steiner, liaison to the Recreational Agricultural Citizens Committee, attended a meeting wherein Kathryn Hankins, on behalf of the members, has submitted a resolution for Town Board review and approval.

Councilperson McCarthy, as liaison, attended the Library Board of Trustees meeting. Research is being done for the Climate Smart initiative. NYSERDA will be holding a meeting on July 31 which she will be attending. Meeting information will be forwarded to all Board members.

Councilperson Frank, as liaison, attended the Fire District Commissioners meeting.

Town Clerk Pamela Bucci reported that (1) the June monthly revenue report has been filed with the Supervisor in the amount of \$7,413.56 mostly attributed to building permits, pavilion rentals and recreation programs; (2) A summer fish stocking program through Monroe County is available. Orders must be placed by September 3. Order forms will be placed in the town's lobby and located on the town website; (3) Monroe County Department of Human Resources has issued a certified "zero" discrepancies report for the employee payroll and record keeping requirements for Rush; (4) New York State D.E.C. licenses system is installing upgrades for the upcoming hunting season for all issuing agents.

Highway Superintendent Mark David stated that his crew would be performing hot mix paving, true and leveling and asphalt on town roads. The sidewalks to the ADA compliant basketball courts have been completed and he is awaiting fencing quotes.

Rush Library Director Kirsten Flass reported that Susan Bittner Mee, the Town's historian, has written a book about Rush and it is on sale in the Library.

Town Engineer Todd Ewell of CHA will address concerns and comments during the Board review of the Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) Part 2 Discussion.

Town Attorney John Mancuso had no report.

Supervisor Anderson noted that he was pleased that the August/September Town Newsletter has published and if not already will be in town resident mailboxes. Included in the newsletter is an update that the town's healthcare provider, Excellus, has requested a 16.7% increase for 2015. The property tax cap for 2015 will be 2% or less. In preparation for the budget, the town is examining all expenses including utilities and rental policies in order reduce expenses.

VII. OLD BUSINESS

A. Insurance Recommendation Update – Supervisor Anderson stated that age-appropriate signs have been installed by the Highway crew. Highway Superintendent David will provide a photo to forward to the insurance company.

B. Solar Proposal Update – Supervisor Anderson stated that Larson Engineers will be replacing our current contact engineer who has taken another job with a

national solar financing company. The ground work is complete and a meeting will be scheduled.

C. Proposed Rezoning of 7262 West Henrietta Road Update – Attorney John Mancuso provided the following recap and process of reviewing and steps to be taken for a proposed rezone. Mr. Mancuso stated that the public hearing was held. The application, if granted, would become a local law amending the zoning code.

Supervisor Anderson directed Attorney John Mancuso to offer a summary of the procedures in rezoning and direct the Town Board through the EAF Part 2.

Attorney Mancuso provided the following outline. The public hearing was conducted on June 25. The applicant submits the final Part 1 of EAF baseline of project to compare to Part 2 for the areas of potential significant environmental impact associated with the project. The Town Board is the LEAD agency and it is a Type I action which mandates EAF Part 1, 2 and 3 to be utilized. The purpose is to determine if the Board believes that there are one or more significant adverse environmental impacts with the project. If it does, the Board will then issue a Positive Declaration which will result in continuing the environmental review. If the Board determines that there are no potential significant adverse environmental impacts associated with the project specified in Part 1, then the Board will issue a Negative Declaration which concludes the environmental review of the project.

EAF Part 2 is for the Board to identify the potential adverse significant impacts and includes 10 pages of 18 categories. Attorney Mancuso read aloud each category question and provided a guideline definition for making a decision. To the extent that there are technical questions, Engineer Todd Ewell from CHA is present to answer them if any potential environmental effects may occur as a result of the project.

Once the impacts are identified, the Board will decide if it is small, moderate or large. No impact – self-explanatory; Small impact – minor in magnitude and limited to a small area such as grading or large area dealing with a small issue. A moderate impact has more magnitude and can occur with larger parcels and longer lasting impacts are associated such as noise, air, or traffic. A large impact – severe magnitude and cover large areas and last longer.

If there are areas identified for possible potential environmental impact, the Board will evaluate its significance of impact in terms of its magnitude, duration and likelihood of occurrence. After evaluating the impact, a decision of whether or not it may result in a potential significant adverse impact can be

made. If any mitigation measures are proposed, the Board can decide whether or not it will be significant to the extent that the applicant has given the Board something to identify. At this point, it is a rezoning matter with a tentative concept plan, noting that there are not many concrete design measures proposed.

Supervisor Anderson stated that Todd Ewell, a professional engineer, is present, and has received all of the documentation submitted and received by the applicant. Attorney Mancuso agreed that the Town Board members are not expected to be technical experts concerning the EAF Part 2 Form.

Attorney Mancuso stated that consultation with the Town Engineer can be done at any time during the process. He then began by giving an example and definition of the item number as follows:

#1 – Impact on Land – physical alteration of the land including draining, clearing, excavation and any construction on the land. Examples not included are adopting a comprehensive plan or changing zoning regulations or acquisition of land.

Engineer Todd Ewell stated that this answer would be **YES**. Storm water (pond has been reduced) and parking lot would be considered as an impact on the land.

#2 - Impact on Geographical Features – potential impact to registered National natural landmarks such as cliffs, fossils, caves, and any changes in land form.

Todd suggested that this would include harm to endangered species geography. **NO**.

#3 -Impact of Surface Water – Wetland or surface river body disturbance increasing or decreasing water bodies.

Todd Ewell responded **NO**.

#4 – Impact to Ground Water – New additional use; use of and contamination of ground water resources.

Supervisor Anderson stated that they will have public water and anything done involving water or septic will be under the approval of the Monroe County Water Authority. **NO**.

#5 – Impact on Flooding – Engineer Todd Ewell reviewed and saw no cause. **NO.**

#6 - Impact on Air – Attorney John Mancuso stated that the answer would include a state regulated air emission source.

Engineer Todd Ewell stated that there are no industrial sources. Air pollution is the issue. **NO.**

#7 - Impacts to Plants and Animals – Threatened or endangered, rare species or natural landmarks.

Engineer Ewell commented that there is nothing to identify. There is a mix of brush and trees. **NO.**

#8 Impact on Agricultural Resources – Attorney Mancuso explained that the LEAD agency is to assess potential land, farm equipment preparation of marketing of crops and livestock as a commercial enterprise. **NO.**

#9 - Impact on Aesthetic Resources – Attorney Mancuso stated the consistency in land use between the proposed project and other land uses that may be seen as aesthetic resource such as those oriented and publically accessible, such as scenic trails, rivers, roadways, etc. This question is specific to public vantage points such as roadways, pull-offs, overlooks, scenic areas.

Councilperson McCarthy stated that this may seem like a grey area, to a scenic view? Engineer Ewell stated that all 3 other corners of the intersection have commercial businesses and are not providing an impact.

Engineer Ewell reiterated that this would be a vantage point for public scenic view - **NO.**

#10 – Impact on Historic and Archeological Resources – Attorney Mancuso stated that this relates to historical destinations or archaeological sites that are an asset.

Engineer Ewell commented that **YES**, this has a potential for an archeological impact based on the map submitted by Monroe County Planning and because the owner stated that the house situated next door is an old structure with history.

Attorney Mancuso stated that it is applicable for example in a historic district or listed on a national or state registry or if anywhere near the site that has been nominated for a historical listing. As far as archeological significance goes, it means whether or not there are any archeological resources to evaluate. Engineer Ewell stated that there may be arrow heads or pottery on the property that may be of significance.

Councilperson Frank asked of the archeological significance. Supervisor Anderson stated that most of Rush is in the potential archeological significance category. For example, the railroad museum was constructing a retention wall and warranted relief from the NYSDEC. It is a simple requirement bearing investigation. A moderate or large significance would be demolishing something of historic character or a project that would change the character or look inconsistent with that of the community. Small impacts would include not disturbing those areas.

Councilperson McCarthy asked if the property is on a historical registry. Supervisor Anderson remarked that it falls within the area of archeological possibilities.

Agricultural practices by definition do not disturb archeologically sensitive areas; however, excavation would disturb an area.

Attorney Mancuso asked the Board to vote on whether or not there would be an Impact of Historic and Archeological significance – proposed action may occur wholly or partially within, or substantial contiguous to, an area designated as sensitive for archeological sites on the NY State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) archeological site inventory resources would be characterized as a small or moderate impact. Town Clerk Bucci polled the Board as follows:

Poll:

Councilperson Woolaver	small.	
Councilperson Steiner	small.	
Councilperson Frank	small.	
Councilperson McCarthy	small.	
Supervisor Anderson	small.	Carried.

#11 – Impact on Open Space and Recreation – Attorney Mancuso stated that when you refer undeveloped land or residential, commercial or industrial land there is some outdoor space that can be used for outdoor recreation there could be a loss for recreational opportunities such as hiking, hunting, fishing or open space recreational plan.

Engineer Ewell suggested a **NO**. A portion of the land is being donated back to the town for the sole purpose possibilities related to recreation and open space.

#12 – Impact on critical environmental areas – Attorney Mancuso commented that it relates to specific location that are identified as a threat to human health, have an important or unique natural setting, important agricultural social cultural, recreational value or have a geological sensitive area adversely affected by a change. **NO**.

#13 – Impact on Transportation – Severe potential impacts can occur when traffic levels increase in a community causing congestion that may cause economic, environmental and safety impacts. It can also result in air pollution and emissions and increase accidents rates, decrease road surface lifetime and vehicle maintenance costs. It can also demand on public transportation, parking, sidewalks, bike paths or bike lanes.

The first question pertains to increased capacity of existing road network. Engineer Ewell stated that it would be unknown; no additional traffic study has been submitted.

Engineer Ewell states **YES**. In reviewing the original traffic study over a year ago, August 2013, it was acknowledged that an update is necessary. A revised application has been submitted by the Applicant; however, an updated traffic study has not been submitted creating the same concerns in regard to location of driveway and general intersection questions. A Planning Board would require the full traffic study, however, unknown at present. The applicant stated that the NYSDOT has authorized access through a letter. Engineer Ewell suggested that the Town Board request a copy of the traffic study being referred to in the application.

Attorney Mancuso stated that 13.b. relates to action resulting in construction of paved parking are for 500 or more vehicles. Engineer Ewell – **NO**. 13.c. whether the action will degrade existing transit access. Bus, taxi, train, subways, placement of public and private transportation services more than ½ mile – overcrowding a system or eliminating access to a bus stop, forcing re-routes, removing a park-n-ride area. Will it have to accommodate for new users? Supervisor Anderson stated that the park-n-ride may potentially be affected. Engineer Ewell stated that it is referring to level of services which most likely will not be affected. The existing system should be able to handle the system or a minor upgrade should be established. A moderate or large impact will create a demand where none currently exists or what exists is not adequate. Engineer Ewell stated that it would be a minor concern. An additional traffic study would clarify the answer.

Councilperson McCarthy stated that #13 is strictly talking about public transportation not automobile traffic. Attorney Mancuso agreed. The concept is what is being reviewed. Creating a demand for something that cannot support it is the issue. An example would be if a Walmart was being placed in the area, one would assume that persons would be taking bus transportation. Pedestrian and bicycle accommodations for new users including bike parking areas and would be a small concern. An analysis by the applicant should include or state possible use and these types of accommodations. Engineer Ewell stated that it would have a minor impact, again speaking of a concept of public transportation and not private vehicle traffic. An alternate bus route may be necessary. This would be small.

#14 – Impact on Energy – Attorney Mancuso commented that increase in the use or form of any energy required and will it require a new or upgraded existing substation. Engineer Ewell stated that it may increase but hard to say, however, with both commercial establishments across the street in both directions, it may be minor. Attorney Mancuso again stated that because it is a concept, the Board is deciding what scale is needed. It is less than 100,000 sq. feet. **NO**.

#15 – Impact on Noise, Odor and Light – Attorney Mancuso defined this as occurring in both construction and operation phases that can affect health. Project area may become quiet when the project is complete. Engineer Ewell said that **YES**, but all minor. This follows the Town Code and regulations. All are possibilities. Engineer Ewell stated that some areas of 15 are **NO**.

Attorney Mancuso gave the following examples of small impact – limited # of lighting of fixtures for safety pointing down and no glare; moderate to large – lighting for large recreation facilities, light illumination all night, creating dark sky glow brighter than existing in the area. Engineer Ewell requests a further definition of how lighting will be done, however, a full definition may be adjusted in the planning stage.

#16 - Impact on Human Health – exposure to solid or hazardous substances. Ewell stated **NO**. The tank site has been previously vindicated as well as area farmed, irrigated, etc.

#17 – Consistency with Community Plan – The proposed action is not consistent with adopted land use plans. Attorney Mancuso stated that this essentially is asking if consistency with adopted land use plan including the town's comprehensive plan. Supervisor Anderson stated that roughly 2 acres is zoned commercial. The remainder is zoned residential. Does the community ever think the property will include residential development? A residential neighborhood

does not seem likely. Engineer Todd Ewell agreed. The area that is closest to the existing residential area is planned to be a park-type setting. Engineer Ewell stated that the question is is it not consistent with community plan – **NO**.

Attorney Mancuso stated that as the directions state, if the answer to any within the specific # question is NO, there is no need to answer further questions. All must go to the next section. If anyone feels it is not consistent, then other parts of the question need not be answered. If it is YES for letters a through h, the potential impact must be addressed. Consistency with community plans open space, comprehensive plan, agricultural and farmland protection plans are included. Comprehensive Plan goals and objections and principles and guidelines for strategic growth and development in the community are to be considered. It is not a law but development needs to be consistent with the plan. The proposed plan should be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and provide the context in determining whether it is compatible with the community. Attorney Mancuso stated that discussion took place at previous public hearings related to the comprehensive plan. Engineer Ewell stated that the discussion was reference to it being in the commercial corridor and that part of the property is already zoned commercial. Supervisor Anderson clarified the question stating that the Board must decide what zone is best suited for the corner property. He continued that previous leaders zoned most of the area R-30 and may not have anticipated single family homes. Some talk of qualified housing, however, without the advent of sewers that could not be achieved is why this application has been presented. The park-n-ride and gas pumping station is at one corner, Diamond Limousine and Colby's Restaurant at the other and an auto dealer is at another. The property being discussed is within the confines of a commercial zone.

Councilperson Frank stated that #17 a through h should be **NO**.

#18 Consistency with Community Character – Attorney Mancuso stated that it is defined by all manmade and natural features of the area, including visual character of town/village and also includes buildings and their uses and all that defines the area. Changes to the balance of commercial and residential uses can change a character of a town. There are probably few that result in no change. Engineer Ewell stated that #16 spoke to the character especially the other 3 corners of the intersection.

Attorney Mancuso stated that 1-18 concludes the review of Part 2 of the full EAF which identified potential environmental significance. Part 3 of the EAF must be now be completed. The Town Board must now evaluate the significant impacts that were identified as moderate to large impact. Items identified were (1) Impact on Transportation – moderate to large. (2) Impact on Noise, Odor and

Light. A determination of magnitude, duration and likelihood of the impact of it occurring as a result of the proposed action and depends on scale and context of the project. Context refers to unique characteristics of the natural and manmade environment. Magnitude assesses factors such as severity, size or criterion of people impacted by the project, the geographic scope of the project and the duration and probability of occurrence of the impact and any social or environmental consequences.

Determination of Significance must be answered on Part 3 for either A and C. B is for an Unlisted Action. The Board has 2 options. It must evaluate whether the Board believes the project will not result in any significant adverse impact based on those 2 items identified. The Board can then issue a negative declaration concluding the environmental review. If the Board believes there may be one or more significant impacts related to traffic, light, noise or odor or a multitude of them then the Board must issue a positive declaration. The positive declaration entails identification of an impact. The applicant then must prepare an Environmental Impact Statement which further analyzes and identifies those impacts and whether they are significant enough to revise the plan or modify the design to mitigate to the fullest extent possible the adverse impact would cause.

Councilperson Woolaver stated that the Board is only dealing with a concept and they would need something more from the applicant.

Attorney Mancuso stated that in cases where there is a rezoning and a concept plan, the Board must identify reasonable impacts that they may foresee with what has been proposed. The Board must not speculate on what potential future impacts may or may not occur and it is also not permitted to "segment it's review", meaning looking at the action before it which is rezoning and not consider the development of a potential commercial scale that has been proposed as a concept.

Councilperson McCarthy reiterated that the Board's decision is based on the rezoning concept and not the plan that will be presented to the Planning Board. Attorney Mancuso stated yes and no. The LEAD agency (Town) is to consider the scope of a development in a commercial nature with the plan that has been submitted. The Board cannot look at only the rezoning. It must make a determination, without speculating, what building the development may cause. It may not materialize. The concept development before the Board includes a fast food restaurant, a bank and a professional office and does need to be considered. Decision-making for site plan specifications apply only to the Planning Board.

Councilperson Frank stated that more information is required of the applicant.

Engineer Ewell stated that the biggest concern from an engineering perspective is transportation because of the unknowns. Once transportation is set, it cannot be adjusted as easily. Some issues may change the atmosphere as far as smell although Colby's Restaurant is directly across the street. Lighting can be shielded and engineered correctly to the town's satisfaction.

Attorney Mancuso stated that the Board needs to ask itself during this phase not whether there would be mitigation measure but what may eliminate an issue based on project design. Also if there may be a potential significant impact that requires further review by the applicant.

Attorney Mancuso commented that based on Part 3, the Town Board wishes to issue a negative declaration. The Board must provide a resolution that the action has the potential to create at least one or more significant adverse impact and, therefore, a positive declaration will be issued. Attorney Mancuso will supply the resolution.

RESOLUTION #116-2014

Supervisor Anderson moved that after the Board's review of the Full Environmental Assessment Form Part 2 – Identification of Potential Project Impacts, the proposed action does have the potential to create at least one significant adverse environmental impact and, therefore, a positive declaration shall be prepared pursuant to SEQRA and the applicant shall be required to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement with respect to the impacts of the action. Councilperson McCarthy seconded the motion.

Roll:

Councilperson Woolaver	aye	
Councilperson Steiner	aye	
Councilperson Frank	aye	
Councilperson McCarthy	aye	
Supervisor Anderson	aye	carried.

Attorney Mancuso stated that a negative declaration will be prepared with the Town and Town Engineer Part 3 input with essentially what the Town Board determined during the meeting and it will be filed in accordance with the resolution. This process is concluded.

The next phase is that the applicant will prepare the Environmental Impact Statement which will identify those 4 items from Part 2 of the EAF and analyze them in greater detail as a potential impact that they may result in and any

alternatives in order to negate those alternatives. At this point the Board can take no action as it relates to the application.

Supervisor Anderson stated that there is no timeframe related to this application. Once the applicant submits all the information to the Town, it will act with due diligence, however, there is no set timeframe. It is based on the applicant's ability to prepare and submit the requested information.

VIII: NEW BUSINESS

A. Waste Management Service Agreement - Supervisor Anderson stated that Councilperson McCarthy has contacted and secured 3 new contracts for approval with Waste Management who covers the Town Hall/Library and Highway. Our previous cost for all three contracts was approximately \$900 per month. Our new cost will be approximately \$350 per month. All Town Board members have been supplied copies of the contracts. An additional 8% will be saved by providing a tax exempt form. Tax was previously rolled into monthly cost and not indicated as a line item.

RESOLUTION #117-2014

Councilperson Steiner moved to authorize the Supervisor to enter into three (3) separate agreements for non-hazardous waste removal services with Waste Management, Rochester Hauling, 220 Kenneth Drive, Suite 500, Rochester New York 14623. The combined cost for all three contracts effective July 2014 through July 2017 is \$350.00. Councilperson Woolaver seconded the motion.

Roll:

Councilperson Woolaver	aye	
Councilperson Steiner	aye	
Councilperson Frank	aye	
Councilperson McCarthy	aye	
Supervisor Anderson	aye	carried.

B. Standard Work Day Resolution – Town Clerk Bucci stated that all elected and appointed who participate in the New York State Retirement System must complete a 3 month calendar work schedule within the first 150 days of the start of their new term. The calendars are submitted to the Finance Director who performs a complex formula created by the State and supplies it to the Town Clerk. The Standard Work Day is posted for 30 days; the Clerk prepares an Affidavit and then enters all information into the State system.

Supervisor Anderson added that during the New York State audit of the Town, November through May 2014, they audited the town's reports for NYS Retirement System and found no errors.

RESOLUTION #118-2014

Councilperson Steiner moved that the Town of Rush hereby establishes the following as standard work days for elected and appointed officials and will report the following days worked to the New York State and Local Employees' retirement System based on the record of activities maintained and submitted by these officials to the Town Clerk of this body. Councilperson McCarthy seconded the motion.

STANDARD WORKDAY RESOLUTION

*Town officials are given credit for the same town holidays as town employees

Participates										
					Standard			in	Days/Month	Record of
					Work			employer's	based on	Activities
					Day			Keeping	Record of	Tier 1
					(Hrs./Day)			System	Activities	Member
Title	First	Last	Soc. sec # Last 4	Reg. #		Term				Submitted
					(Hrs./Day)	Begins/Ends				
Elected Officials										
Supervisor	Richard	Anderson	████	██████	6	01/1/14-12/31/15	N		22.06	
Town Clerk/Tax Collector	Pamela	Bucci	████	██████	7	01/1/12-12/31/15	N		23.80	
Highway Superintendent	Mark	David	████	██████	8	01/1/12-12/31/15	N		23.08	
Town Justice	Tom	Doupe	████	██████	6	01/1/12-12/31/15	N		9.58	
Appointed Salaried Full Time										
Library	Kirsten	Flass	████	██████	7	01/01/14-12/31/14	N		23.45	
Appointed Salaried Part Time										
Assessor	Dan	Stanford	████	██████	6	10/1/2013-9/30/19	N		12.50	
Building Insp./Code Enforcement Officer	Gerald	Kusse	████	██████	6	01/01/14-12/31/14	N		23.28	
Fire Marshal/Emergency Coordinator	Richard	Tracy	████	██████	6	01/01/14-12/31/14	N		8.72	
Director of Fin./Budget Officer	Donald	Reynolds	████	██████	6	01/01/14-12/31/14	N		18.42	
Planning Board Chair	John	Felsen	████	██████	6	01/01/13-12/31/17	N		1.44	X
Conservation Board Member	Julia	Lederman	████	██████	6	01/01/13-12/31/17	N		0.25	
Conservation Board Member	Susan	Woolaver	████	██████	6	01/01/14-12/31/18	N			X

RUSH TOWN BOARD
July 23, 2014

Historian	Susan	Mee	████	██████	6	02/05/14- 12/31/14	N	4.53
Appointed Hourly Full Time								
Deputy Town Clerk	Shivaun	Featherman	████	██████	7	01/1/14- 12/31/14	Y	
Appointed Hourly Part Time								
Recreation Supervisor	Patricia	Stephens	████	██████	6	01/1/14- 12/31/14	Y	
Supervisor's Secretary	Valerie	Mertsock	████	██████	6	01/1/14- 12/31/14	Y	
Court Clerk	Sally	Newell	████	██████	6	01/1/14- 12/31/14	Y	
Court Clerk	Stephanie	Anderson	████	██████	6	01/1/14- 12/31/14	Y	
Assessor Clerk	Colleen	Statskey	████	██████	6	01/1/14- 12/31/14	Y	

Roll:

Councilperson Woolaver aye
 Councilperson Steiner aye
 Councilperson Frank aye
 Councilperson McCarthy aye
 Supervisor Anderson aye carried.

C. Recreational Agricultural Citizens Committee (RACC) Draft - Supervisor Anderson has received a draft report from Kathryn Hankins which has been distributed to the Town Board. The requests are reasonable and will be addressed on an ad hoc basis. A budget line item is being built into the 2015 budget.

Councilperson Frank asked that the Town Board name the town-owned former BOCES property at 6565 East River Road and suggested that the Town provide a public participation in naming the property by submitting names.

Resident and RACC member Kathryn Hankins stated that the committee already refers to the property as the Rush Preserve and would like a separate page on the town website for it.

Supervisor Anderson stated that Citizen Committee progress reports can be posted on the town website.

IX. OPEN FORUM

Supervisor Anderson offered the floor to anyone who wished to address the Board.

Resident Carol Barnett responded that during the EAF portion of the meeting there was no reference of there being a revolutionary war home next to the proposed rezoning and she does not care that it is not on a registry. The Town should be considering that. Because the other 3 corners are commercial does not mean that the entire property should be zoned commercial as well. The Town leaders may have decided differently in the past, however, to make it a forgone conclusion is an abdication of responsibility and a rush to judgment not to mention that a very sanitized discussion has taken place at this meeting and it is a concern.

X. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to conduct, the meeting was adjourned by Supervisor Anderson at 8:23 PM and approved by common consent of all councilpersons present.

Respectively submitted,

Pamela J. Bucci
Town Clerk