

From: [Charles Klaer](#)
To: [Jesse McCaughey](#)
Cc: [Jim Abbruzzese](#); [Jessica Montgomery](#); [Jaclyn Hakes](#); [Peter G. Barber](#); [Jim Gade](#); [Stephen Wilson](#); [Jr. Joseph Muia](#)
Subject: Re: Final Recommendations from Agriculture Sub committee
Date: Thursday, October 5, 2023 6:58:10 PM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)

Since the Agriculture CPUC committee failed to meet on October 2nd I didn't have an opportunity to add my comments to Jim's "final draft" I have hereby tried to add my comments for consideration:

Goals and Recommendations to CPUC

From the Agriculture Sub Committee

Sept 28, 2023 **plus the comments of Charles Klaer October 5, 2023**

1. We would like to see some type of light retail/ and farm service business on the western end of Rt 20. Being near the border of the Town of Princetown would possibly allow development with the negotiated use of Princetown's water resources. By creating a business zone in this area, the hope is to reduce traffic and reduce energy resources on the Route 20-155 corridor, by being closer to the residences of Western Guilderland.

[It might be help to more areas to what type of businesses the far western residents want to have or perhaps businesses with products actual

Western Guilderland farmers need or would sell there products to.]

[By "reduce energy resources" do you mean the amount of gas used by Far western residents use to get groceries and basic needs?]

2. In the RA 3 and RA 5 zone we would encourage flexible zoning options for increasing the density of development in areas where public and sewer is available.

[I accessed the Dunsville intersection area and the satellite option it provides.

It appears to me that the whole area in all directions fails to have "public sewer and water".

Are we suggesting that we encourage Princetown AND Guilderland create a Business Zone on Route 20 on either side of their respective Town lines which would be serviced by Princetowns water. I assume Guilderland would

have to extend Public Sewer to development on Guilderland’s properties accessing Princetown water.]

Even in minor subdivision projects, the hope is reducing the footprint of new homes by placing them on smaller lots and allowing the saved property be used for agricultural enterprise/open space. We understand this is a complex goal; soil type, drainage, and Albany County Health department requirements would have to be addressed.

[It is NOT Clear whether this is a general comment for Rural Guilderland or for a radius of some size around the Dunsville intersection of rte 397 and rte 20 which would be provided with public sewer and water provide to the Princetown/Guilderland proposed business district]

3. An agriculture committee should be formed, with oversight by the town.

The purpose of this committee would be **to incentivize farmers** to utilize any open space on agricultural land that the town owns or acquires. The open private property, which could be worked and maintained so the property does not become overgrown. It would be another tool in the **view** to keep farmlands in agriculture. Financial benefits would have to be developed for both the farmer and the landowner.

DRAFT

[Do we have examples of any “financial benefits” we’d recommend?]

4. We encourage the town to continue the flexible conservation easement program (tiered payments depending on the length of the easement). We encourage the town to enter into partnerships with the variously affected school districts, in the hope that school tax abatements can be added to this program. Better communication from the town, about the availability and the tiered structure of this program would be an important improvement of this conservation tool.

5. Purchase of development rights: The town should seek resources to fund this program. We encourage the town to embark on this project in a more flexible matter. We would encourage the town to have flexible PDR’s terms of 25 to 60 years.

[Do we mean sliding between 25 and 60 years or a couple/few increments

between 25 and 60 years?]

This way it would be a less costly and would allow future generations of residents to control their own resources. “Forever” forfeiture of property rights, limits many landowners’ consideration of this program as a viable possibility. Possible ways to fund this project would be through substantial development fees on projects in town, which cost in excess of 5 million dollars.

6. The use of town funds should NOT be used for the purchase of agricultural land for the benefits of the residences of town. These properties should remain as tax generating enterprises.

[Since there are already examples of the Town’s purchasing open space/farmable land (I think) Our recommendation may need a bit more justifying language]

7. Solar farms in town should be used on areas that do not impact prime agricultural soils or view sheds that have been identified as important to the town and neighborhood. Large scale solar farms, however that term is defined, must be located near high power infrastructure (National Grid) with sufficient southern exposure. Regardless of present zoning, the town should map such delineated areas, which would be routinely brought up to date.

DRAFT

[Perhaps we should recommend that we propose that the Federal and State governments pressure Companies responsible to High Power lines and right of ways create a system that allows right of ways to be used as Solar Farms with stations which provide direct access to high power lines. Thus utilizing Right of Way open space out of sight from nearby residential areas and relieving pressure on other open space and agricultural land for use as Solar Farms]

8. The sub-committee is concerned about the management of wildlife habitat, through well-planned forestry practices to preserve the town’s large acreage of forests. Open space includes not only fields and cropland but also our numerous valuable woodlots. An offshoot of such concerns is the protection of wildlife, and the preservation of honey production and maple syrup production which are growing more popular, and lumber/firewood production. These activities are based on the responsible management of

our forested areas. We do, however, recognize the important role played by NYDEC with regards to this issue.

[Consider adding: The Town and NYDEC should develop a program to harvest the thousands of ash trees that have been killed by the green ash borer for firewood or construction lumber.]

9. When considering extension or establishment of new municipal water and/or sewage services in the undeveloped western portions of the Town, the potential specific and cumulative impacts of the inevitable future developments on the rural character of these areas should be assessed and weighed against the values of sustaining those qualities.

10. The subcommittee recognizes the value of the Watervliet Reservoir and the surrounding property as valuable open space within town. We encourage the town to explore options as a partnership with the City of Watervliet to preserve this open space. Also due to a lack of accessible aquatic locations in town, consideration might be given to limited access to the reservoir for educational and certain recreational activities.

Finally, in partnership with Watervliet, both entities should seek to acquire funds, through grants and other means, to clean up the backwater area which is visible from Route 20.

DRAFT

Regards to all

Chuck Klaer

On Thu, Oct 5, 2023 at 2:48 PM Jesse McCaughey <jmccaughey@mjels.com> wrote:

Confirming the receipt of the Agriculture Subcommittee's draft goals/recommendations document. Thank you very much, Jim, for submitting that. (We will be sending out a reminder to CPUC members very shortly, as not all subcommittees have worked at the same pace, but you can take this email as verification that your group's work has been received and filed.)

With appreciation,

Jesse

Jesse McCaughey

Planner



T: 518.371.0799 x433

E: jmccaughey@mjels.com

W: mjels.com

1533 Crescent Road | Clifton Park, NY | 12065



DRAFT

From: Jim Abuzzese <jim.ab1@aol.com>

Sent: Thursday, October 5, 2023 2:42 PM

To: Jessica Montgomery <jmontgomeji@togny.org>; Jocelyn Hakes <hakes@mjels.com>; Jesse McCaughey <jmccaughey@mjels.com>; Peter G. Barber <barberp@togny.org>

Cc: Jim Gade <gadefarm@icloud.com>; Charles Klaer <cklaer32@gmail.com>; Stephen Wilson <stephenwilson282@gmail.com>; Jr. Joseph Muia <jmuiajr@aol.com>

Subject: Final Recommendations from Agriculture Sub committee

Good Afternoon:

Attached is copy of the sub committee work and recommendation to the CPUC committee. We did not want to reinvent the wheel, most of what is in the plan still applies today. However we did look at making changes that might make some of the conservation tools more available and hopefully will be used in the future. Our hope was to still provide landowners the equity in their properties and hopefully save some agricultural lands for future generations.

If you have any questions feel free to reach out.

Thanks

Jim

DRAFT