

**Town of Wright Town Board  
Public Hearing Meeting Minutes  
April 19, 2010 at 7pm**

A Public Hearing to discuss the Proposed Draft of the Agriculture and Farmland Plan was held at the Gallupville House, in Gallupville, NY, on the above date at 7pm. Roll call by the Town Clerk showed the following to be present:

**Present:** Supervisor Goblet  
Councilman Bleau  
Councilman Burton  
Councilman Sanchirico  
Councilman Tobiassen

**Also Present:** Town Clerk: Kirsten Sanchirico; Mark Stolzenburg, Chairman of the Agriculture and Farmland Committee, the following Committee members: Reta Youngs, Ed Thornton, Vicki McCaffery, Raymond Lurhman; Michelle Strobeck; County Planning Ag and Marketing Specialist, Laura Ten Eyck, Field Consultant, American Farmland Trust and approximately 24 Town Residents.

Salute to the flag

**Town Clerk** read the legal notice:

There will be a Public Hearing for the Agriculture and Farmland Plan at the Gallupville House at 7pm on April 19<sup>th</sup>; Respectfully Submitted, Kirsten Sanchirico, The Town Clerk of the Town Of Wright

**OPEN PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR**

**Supervisor Goblet** turned the meeting over to Mark Stolzenburg, the Chairman of the Committee.

**Mark Stolzenburg** presented a brief introduction of the Committee members that were present: Reta Youngs, Vicki McCaffery, Ed Thornton, and Raymond Lurhman and those that were not present: Jerri Murray and Karl Westfall. Thanked John Sanchirico the Committee Liaison for his efforts initially for getting the Grant off the ground, Jean Burton for being the Committee's secretary, Laura Ten Eyck, Field Consultant, American Farmland Trust Committee Consultant, Michelle Strobeck, County Planning Ag and Marketing Specialist, John Brennan, Farmland Protection Specialist from the NYS Dept of Ag and Markets. The plan is a way for the community and the Town to make the Town of Wright a better place to farm. We have surveyed the Town residents, the soils, the types of farming that are in operation today, interviews with farmers. The meat of the plan is the recommendations to the Town. The Education component is a big part of the plan as far as providing information to the people about farming as it is an important part of the Town.

The Grant received awarded \$25,000 to the Town for the planning and development process, the Committee developed the plan with all the input just discussed, as well as from two public meetings to get input from the Town Residents and farmers. Where do we go from here? The

Town Board will hear comments tonight, a copy of the draft will be sent to Schoharie County Planning for review, the Committee will meet again to contemplate any possible recommendations for changes, and then re-submit the plan to the Town Board for approval. The plan presents five goals: 1. Encourage existing farms in the Town. 2. Attract new farmers and cultivate the next generation of farmers in the Town; 3. Educate the residents of the Town about agriculture, 4. Retain a critical mass of Farmland in the Town; 5. Support the development of opportunities for agriculture in the Town. Michelle has displayed two different maps a prime soil map, and a map developed by the committee of active agricultural land in the Town. There are extra copies of draft plan, samples of other approved plans in other Towns, an The Schoharie County Agriculture and Farmland Protection Plan.

**Seymour Vanderveen**- Borderline kind of guy, Farm is on the borderline of Schoharie and Wright. Property is mostly in the Town of Wright but home is in Schoharie. I have read the plan. A lot of wouldn't it be great to have a festival to gain some momentum. The plan is great, what are we going to do to keep the farmers interested in farming? Farmers should be free to sell their land to whomever. I recommend that this Plan be adopted.

**Nan Stolzenburg**- I have typed up my comments for the Board to review as I do not want to take up too much time tonight. I hope that the Committee will review my comments and possibly implement some of them so that it is clearly defined and can be interpreted easily by all those people who may be involved in developing the recommendations of the plan in the next five years. I thank the Town Board for putting this process into motion, I thank all the committee members for all their hard work, and urge the Town Board to approve the plan and get started right away. I have a few things that I feel are significant: 1. What is it's connection to the Comprehensive Plan, 2. What is the vision statement of the plan?, 3. The plan should include information about what the County can do to help us accomplish our goals and what do we can expect the state to do for us. 4. How can they help us develop the recommendations of the plan? 5. What about Prioritizing Farmlands- What are the areas in need? As time goes on, what is a the priority farmland that needs to be protected? 6. What is the definition of "a critical mass of Agricultural land"? 8. There are a lot of goals, one of the goals is to develop strategies and activities to educate the public about farming within three years of the plans approval. I would suggest that you do this immediately, and every year. Education is the critical piece suggested in the plan to help promote agriculture. 9. What is a Conservation Sub-division? Describe it more clearly.

Letter submitted to the Town Board:

To: Town of Wright Town Board and Agriculture and Farmland Plan Committee

From: Nan Stolzenburg

Date: April 19, 2010

Re: Comments on Draft Agriculture and Farmland Protection Plan

I want to commend the Town and its volunteers for putting together this very important plan. As a member of a farm family in Wright, I think it is critical that the plan exist and that the Town commit to implementing it. Overall, I agree with all the goals and recommendations and urge the Town Board to adopt the plan. Further, I feel adopting it as an appendix or addendum to the Town's Comprehensive Plan will strengthen both plans and allow full coordination of efforts as Wright moves forward. Once adopted, I also urge the Town Board to form the suggested

Agricultural Committee so the excellent recommendations made in this plan can be put to work to promote agriculture in our town.

I do have some specific comments that I hope you will consider:

1. How does the Ag Plan correlate to the adopted Comprehensive Plan? There is very little mention of the Comprehensive Plan in the document. At the least, more explanation of how the two are related and work together should be included. This may be more important if the Ag Plan is adopted as a standalone plan and is not part of the Comprehensive Plan. At this point, it is not clear if the Ag Plan is an effort to begin implementing the Comprehensive Plan, or unrelated.

2. The Plan uses a lot of acronyms, and while these are spelled out the first time they show up in the text, it might be helpful to have a list of acronyms used (maybe near the list of figures?). This might help an unfamiliar reader understand it better.

3. There is no vision statement about agriculture in the Plan. I think that is an important item that was left out. There is plenty of information from the survey and public meetings to put together a statement that expresses what the future state of agriculture in Wright is desired to be. Without a vision statement, there is no guidance as to what we hope to attain when this plan is fully realized. A vision statement does not have to be complicated, but I think that having one will help put all the recommendations into some sort of context. What kind of agricultural community does Wright want to be? Do we want to see our dairy farms remain? Do we want to promote new alternative farm operations? Without the vision statement, it is hard to understand the full direction the many recommendations take us.

And, many recommendations are oriented to direct marketing, agri-tourism, and other farming alternatives. There are no statements anywhere that state the importance of our dairy farms. A vision statement could correct that and set the stage for the broad diversity of farming that we want here, but with also recognizing the importance of our dairies.

4. There are no recommendations oriented to what the Town should ask/expect the County and New York State to take. Since the preservation and promotion of our farms must be influenced by county and state-wide policies, I think it is vital that the Plan articulate what we expect the County and State to do for us.

5. Page 11 (Definition of Agriculture) – this definition is alluded to being the one that should be adopted as “the” definition of agriculture, but it doesn’t really say that. Perhaps a short sentence that says this is the definition that is being used and adopted in the Plan would clarify that.

6. Page 16 (Prioritizing Farmland) – this does not really say much. It does not identify or define what a priority farmland would be. There is no map, and only says that certain “areas of farmland in Town are in need of special consideration”. What areas? What kind of special consideration? Is it prime soils? Currently farmed? Farms of certain sizes? In an Ag district? All of the above? I think this can be clarified to at least have a list of features that make up those areas that might be considered priority farmland. The maps show where farmland is, but they do not define in any way the priority areas.

7. Page 18 (Conversion Pressure) – the first paragraph does not adequately show what the conversion pressure is. The data listed can not show any trends or changes in the amount of building that has gone on in town. We can't use this information to understand the trends or the magnitude of change. I think this would be important information and this could be learned by including a 10 or more year listing of the number of building permits for new homes that have been issued over that time period. We also have 1980, 1990, and 2000 US Census information that could be shown and 2008 or 2014 estimates are also available for the number of homes in the town. We could also look at the number of subdivisions that have been approved over the last decade. Together, all this could easily show the conversion pressure in Wright.

8. Page 19 (Future of Farming) – how do you know these things stated in the first paragraph? What information or data has been collected to support these statements? If you have that data, add it in to strengthen them. Otherwise, it may be interpreted as “conjecture”. Can you also add in a simple list of “serious challenges”? The Plan mentions them, but does not tell us what is considered a serious challenge to farming in Wright. It would be nice to have a list that includes this.

9. What is the “critical mass of ag land”? This is not defined, mapped, described. Why is having a critical mass important and how does the plan help us attain that? It is an important concept. See page 25 Goal IV (1) for another reference.

10. Page 20 (Goal 1). Can the Plan go a bit further to explain how an Agricultural Committee “ensure that the State Ag District Law and the Town Right-to-Farm Law are being adhered to”? What authority will this committee be given to enforce these things? Isn't this enforcement the job of the building inspector and the Planning Board now?

11. Page 21 (D) – I would guess that not many people even know what an assessment code is much less what their own assessment code is. Perhaps a short explanation of what this is would help.

12. Page 21 (3)(a) – Can you have a map that clearly shows the lands that are being farmed and that are not in an Ag District? That might help everyone know what areas need to be concentrated on.

13. Page 22 (b) - Perhaps it should be clarified that it is currently (as per State Law) the responsibility of the Planning Board (and sometimes the ZBA) to require the Ag Data Statement. We should expect them to ask applicants for it, and use it to help identify and inform farmers in the Ag District that might be impacted by a project being reviewed.

14. Perhaps it would be important to add in that the Planning Board, as required through SEQRA, must already evaluate the impact a proposed project will have on continuing agriculture in the Ag District. What we as a Town should do is make sure the Planning Board does that and has the information they need to do that.

15. Page 22 (4)(b) – In order to do this one, we will need our local laws to be amended to include the intent and purpose of the Right to Farm Law.

16. Page 23 – Road safety for farm vehicles. If the intent of this is to ensure that our roads remain suitable for farm equipment I would think that means both maintenance of existing roads, and creation of new roads. Roads should be maintained as rural roads, not overbuilt (which speeds up traffic), and sufficient for farm equipment. You might want to consider adding bridges to this statement too, as a bad bridge could prevent heavy or wide equipment from passing.

17. Page 23 (Goal 1, IIa, 1) – you may want to consider making this a bit broader. Farm Link may be in jeopardy for funding now or in the future so it may be better to just reference organizations and agencies that can link buyers and sellers. There are actually some other good ones on the web not part of Farm Link.

18. Page 24 (Goal III, 1) – this is a really important one – can we move this to be done the first year and then every year after? Same for page 25, #2 and #3?

19. Page 26 (#2) says to update the plan every five years. Can this be tied to the required update of the Comprehensive Plan and do both at the same time?

20. Page 26 (3)(a) – Can the Plan offer model definitions for ALL these terms in the appendix rather than leaving them open for interpretation that may not be consistent with the Ag Plan in the future? Also, it mentions that we have to update the current, but why? What is wrong with the current one?

21. Page 26 (c) – perhaps it would be clearer to just use the term “purpose statement” as that what it is called in the local law. The Ag Plan is recommending that the local law purpose statements be amended to strengthen the role of agriculture right? Perhaps it should more clearly just say that. OK

22. Page 27 (e) – Can you add in a picture of a conservation subdivision so people understand what it is? Can you add in that the open space preserved as part of a conservation subdivision should be allowed to be farmed (many do not state that in the law). Wright already allows for clustering. Perhaps this recommendation should be changed to amend our existing clustering section to incorporate the conservation subdivision methods to preserve ag. lands? Can you explain the difference between clustering and conservation subdivision. I think it is important that the Town (and reader) understand that we already have the clustering option.

23. Page 28 (7) – What is the Hill Town Revitalization effort and how could we participate and how would this benefit us? Not enough information.

24. Page 30 (c) – This is of great concern to me in how this is worded. Can you get rid of the first sentence? This can give fodder to those who want to gut the regulations we have and I don't think that was the intent of this. This first sentence adds nothing to the discussion but opens us up for lots of negatives. I would suggest it be simply rewritten to ensure that site plan allows for

the flexibility in the placement and design of permanent and seasonal signs associated with agricultural businesses and farms.

25. Page 31 (4) – This is also of great concern to me. I recognize the importance that having renewable energy facilities on a farmers land may be economically important to them, but large commercial wind mills affect everyone in some way. To blanket encourage or allow for large commercial wind mills without careful review and placement and consideration of the other goals of the Town is misplaced. The State has already issued guidance that personal use wind mills used for on-farm use cannot be prohibited. But generation of energy for off-site use is an entirely different matter and need to be reviewed and carefully sited. This recommendation mixes on-site use and generation of off-site energy and perhaps it would be better served to split into on-site, off-site facilities. I do not agree that farmers, by the fact that they are a farmer, should be given freedom to place commercial wind turbines without strict review.

26. Page 42 – Appendix D (SWOT) – can you add a sentence or two to describe what this is and why it is important? There does not seem to be any explanation for those unfamiliar with this.

27. Page 56 (Review of Town of Wright Land Use Regulations) – Overall, I think these are very good and wonder why they are not all included in the main part of the Ag Plan?

Recommendation 1 – this was not included in the recommendation section of the Ag Plan. Why not? Does that mean that it is not really being considered as a recommendation and is just part of the consultants review? I think this is very important to include and would like to see this part of the Ag Plan recommendations with the wording it has here.

Page 56 – recommendation under “Development” is also not included in goals and recommendations. Why? Can it be included?

Page 57 – “Storing Trash” is not included. Why? Can it be?

28. Page 57 Recommendation 3. This is excellent and I am wondering why it is not included in this exact wording under Goal IV #3?

29. Page 56. While Wright does not have zoning, it does have a Board of Appeals, and I believe that it is referred to as a Zoning Board of Appeals. Same with Page 59 (Action 5) and Page 61 (buffers, private road standards, drainage, etc.) – very important but not included in plan recommendations. Could they be included even as guidance for how the Planning Board could use them to help ensure compatibility of new development with farms?

30. Page 61 – Junkyards. Given the problems along Route 146, this is a problem recommendation. I think it needs to be carefully worded so as to allow junk and storage on bona fide yards, but not allow for abuse. Same with Page 63 related to the Local Law related to Dumps.

31. Page 61 – Lighting. I recommend that the Plan remove all references to the Site Plan Law as having “fairly strict regulations”. Who defines “strict” and why is this important to bring up. Isn’t it more important to state that the Site Plan Law should be amended to clarify that agricultural buildings and ag uses are exempt from the Site Plan lighting standards? The strictness of the law is not the issue. The issue is that we don’t want farm buildings or uses to have to go through site plan and that should be the point, in my view. I think the first sentence is critical to remove that kind of judgmental criticism that could be misinterpreted. The standards of the Site Plan Law serve many different public interests. Same for Page 62 related to the signs (get rid of first sentence). Same for Page 62 related to non-highway commercial (take out first sentence).

32. Page 62 – Roadside Stands and Direct Marketing -- I agree that we want to encourage farm stands, but a very large farm stand could cause traffic and safety issues. You might want to consider exempting small ones, but require site plan review for large ones or have some sort of limited site plan review for large ones.

33. Page 62 -- The plan mentions “farm store”. Can this be added into the definitions or defined here? What is this and why should they be exempt?

34. Page 63 (Minimum Lot Size) – I strongly disagree with this. The Town set a three-acre minimum lot size, in part, to control the overall density of development. That is still a valid purpose. I agree that a three-acre minimum lot size however, is not necessary and that smaller lots are desired and useful in many situations. I do not think however that the Ag Plan should infer that we allow for higher density of development. Density and lot size need to be separated as different concepts. I would recommend that this be re-written so that we keep the density control of 3 acres, but allow for flexibility in lot sizes to be smaller (when allowed by the Health Department). Use of average lot sizes is a good way to cover this – require a density of development to be one house per every three acres or with an average lot size of 3 acres.

**Edward Kruzinski-** My fear is that I will not be able to sub-divide my land if the Town adopts this plan. Is there anything in the plan that would prevent me from being able to do this? I support farming but I cannot afford to have one. It is too expensive. I am concerned that my life will be jeopardized.

**Mark Stolzenberg-** There is nothing in the plan that suggests any regulations to the Town Board.

**Regina Embler-** All my life I wanted to be a farmer. If you have those dreams keep them. I cashed in my retirement to start my farm.

**Vicki McCaffery-** as a member of the committee what you are doing is exactly what we want. If you are taking care of your land and maintaining it, that is what we want o encourage. If the possibility exists that you might be able to rent your land to someone else who could farm it, then you may be able to increase your income. This is exactly the type of situation the Committee wants to encourage.

**Milford Hayes-** fencing is a one shot deal. It does not cost that much. It is hard work but it will last a long time. It is a good investment.

**Mark Stolzenburg-** What it boils down to is, we want to teach people a respect for the land.

**Virginia Scholomiti-** I am a hobby farmer on Larry Hill. I commend all those involved. What it boils down to is making money. But you can only encourage people to farm if they can afford to and that is obviously the question. I do have some serious concerns about who makes the decisions about where construction goes. Who decides where and who can build on prime farmland? In reality, someone may need to sub-divide or construct due to a financial necessity? There is a horribly thin line that everyone worries about?

**Mark Stolzenburg-** Ultimately the decisions will be made by the Town Board. Regulations can only be made by the Town Board. The plan does not regulate. If we have a community that supports agriculture then we should educate the people about agriculture.

**Vicki McCaffery-** Teaching you to value the land and to consider other options that will have less impact environmentally.

**Virginia Scholomiti-** indicated pg 20 second paragraph- "avoid construction"- but you answered the question.

**Jim McLean-** If I have ten acres and I want to put houses on that land, I would have to go to the planning Board?

**Vicki McCaffery-** Jim, the Planning Board will not tell you cannot do something that you can legally do; they will encourage certain kinds of development that will preserve the land.

**Jim McLean-** What I am talking about is the Planning Board is not going to tell us what we can or cannot do with our land? I have not read the plan, I just want to know.

**Mark Stolzenburg-** You should read the plan for yourself and let me know.

**Seymour Vanderveen-** A property owner should be able to do with his house what he wants to.

**Theresa Murphy:** The plan should include a map of the land that needs to be protected.

**Mark Stolzenburg-** The grants were initially started to identify areas that are potential for the purchase of the development rights. The owner can sell the development rights of their property to keep the land from being developed. The idea here is to identify these areas that need to be protected .

**Laura Ten Eyck-** talked about her family and the development rights that were sold on their Farm.

**Mark Stolzenburg-** The purpose of the grant program was to promote Towns to identify their own land that would be a priority to preserve, "prime land" . The committee has determined that the Town of Wright does not really qualify because there is a lot of other land nearby that would more of a priority. That is why there is no land identified as a priority in the plan.

**Laura Ten Eyck-** talked about the process that her family went through for her family Farm, Indian Ladder, there are a million different variables.

**Councilman Bleau-** Who absorbs the difference in tax dollars?

**Mark Stolzenburg-** all the other properties.

**Raymond Lurhman** – presented information about how the tax difference balances out and no one pays extra.

**Theresa Murphy-** Asked who would the advisory committee and what will their authority be?

**Mark Stolzenburg-** The Town Board will decide.

**Dick Ogsbury-** the definition of agriculture is extensive. My view of Agriculture covers every square foot of land in the Town. The plan is a protection of the land itself.

**MOTION: Public Hearing Remains Open until the next Regular Town Board Meeting.**

**Supervisor Goblet moved to: KEEP THE PUBLIC HEARING OPEN UNTIL THE NEXT REGULAR TOWN BOARD MEETING ON MAY 10, 2010.**



**Councilman Sanchirico seconded the motion and it was carried by the following vote:**

Supervisor Goblet	YES
Councilman Bleau	YES
Councilman Burton	YES
Councilman Sanchirico	YES
Councilman Tobiassen	YES

**MOTION- Adjourn**

Councilman Goblet moved to: **ADJOURN THE APRIL 19, 2010 TOWN BOARD PUBLIC HEARING MEETING AT 8:20 PM.**

Councilman Sanchirico seconded the motion and it was carried by the following vote:

Supervisor Goblet	YES
Councilman Bleau	YES
Councilman Burton	YES
Councilman Sanchirico	YES
Councilman Tobiassen	YES

**Respectfully Submitted**

**Kirsten Sanchirico  
Town Clerk**

**laura**

---

**From:** townclerk@nycap.rr.com  
**Sent:** Monday, May 24, 2010 6:36 PM  
**To:** lteneyck@farmland.org; stolzenburg@hughes.net  
**Subject:** Re: Fw: meeting reminder Wed. 5/26



Public Hearing Ag  
and Farm Pla...

Laura and Mark:

Attached please find a draft copy of the TB Public Hearing meeting minutes for the Ag Plan. Please keep in mind they have not been approved by the Town Board. If anyone from the committee has any corrections or additions to the minutes that they feel should be made, they should be submitted to me as soon as possible prior to the next Board meeting (preferably as a committee and not by each individual member).

I have also copied below, the section from the next Monthly meeting minutes pertaining to the Public Hearing. Again, not approved by the Board yet.

You should also note to the Committee, as indicated in the minutes below that the Public Hearing has been Closed by the Town Board.

Hope this works. If you would like me to make copies for the committee members please let me know and I can have them ready for tomorrow nights meeting.

Thanks Kirsten Sanchirico  
Town Clerk  
Town of Wright

OPEN PRIVLEDGE OF THE FLOOR: Continue Public Hearing of proposed Ag and farmland plan. Supervisor Goblet- asked if anyone had comments.

Fred Martin- There are no complaints from farmers about the plan. They know that it is an economic problem nothing the Town Board will be able to fix. Members of the Town Board are not going to fix the farmers problems. I do not think it is necessary to adopt an Agriculture and Farmland Plan. The Comprehensive Plan has everything covered. I do not see that there is anything you people can do.

Reta Youngs- We know that. It is a good plan. Education is the key. People in the Town need to know what is involved in farming. They do not know about farmers. If we educate people, they will know what to expect when they move into town.

Councilman Bleau- I received the information at the closing of my house. Don't we still do that?

Fred Martin- No, we do not do that anymore.

Milford Hayes- Farming is a dying breed. No use in trying to save the farms, we cannot compete with the big boys. Maybe the little guys can make it ("Hobby Farms").

Dick Ogsbury- Mark was right when he said it is not a protection plan for the land- It is an economic development plan for agriculture. Farmland protection has to start with the farmers. Town Board cannot do anything.

Supervisor Goblet- asked what we should do next, how we should proceed.

Discussion

MOTION- Close the Public Hearing.

Supervisor Goblet moved to: CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE AGRICULTURE AND FARMLAND PROTECTION PLAN.

Councilman Tobiassen seconded the motion and it was carried by the following vote:

Supervisor Goblet	YES
Councilman Bleau	YES
Councilman Burton	YES
Councilman Tobiassen	YES

CLOSE PRIVLEDGE OF THE FLOOR

---- John and Kirsten <sanchirico2002@yahoo.com> wrote:

>  
>  
> --- On Mon, 5/24/10, laura <lteneyck@farmland.org> wrote:

>  
> From: laura <lteneyck@farmland.org>  
> Subject: meeting reminder Wed. 5/26  
> To: "David Cox (E-mail)" <dgc23@cornell.edu>, "Ed Thornton (E-mail)"  
<edsfarm@midtel.net>, "Jean Burton (E-mail)" <wburton2@nycap.rr.com>, "Jeri Murray (E-  
mail)" <bluriver@midtel.net>, "John & Kirsten Sanchirico (E-mail)" <sanchirico2002  
@yahoo.com>, "Karl Westphal (E-mail)" <rundycup@earthlink.net>, "Mark Stolzenburg (E-  
mail)" <stolzenburg@hughes.net>, "Michele Strobeck (E-mail)"  
<michelestrobeck@co.schoharie.ny.us>, "Raymond Luhrman (E-mail)"  
<foxcreekfarmcsa@earthlink.net>, "Vicky McCaffrey (E-mail)" <oxkill@capital.net>  
> Date: Monday, May 24, 2010, 4:35 PM

>  
>  
> Hello all. I just wanted to remind you that the Wright agricultural and farmland plan  
committee has a meeting Wed., May 26th at 7:00. We will review comments made on the draft  
agricultural and farmland protection plan during the public hearing period and discuss  
revisions. Please let me know if you have any questions. Thanks.

> Laura Ten Eyck  
> New York Field Representative  
> American Farmland Trust  
> New York Office  
> 112 Spring St., Suite 207  
> Saratoga Springs, NY 12866  
> (518) 581-0078 ext, 305 phone  
> (518) 581-0079 fax  
> lteneyck@farmland.org  
> www.farmland.org

Town of Wright  
Agriculture and Farmland Protection Plan  
Public Hearing Comments

Prepared 5/24/10

A public hearing on the Town of Wright's draft agriculture and farmland protection plan was held 4/19/10. The hearing was left open until the close of the May town board meeting. Laura Ten Eyck of American Farmland Trust attended the 4/19 public hearing and recorded the below comments.

Approximately 20 people attended the public hearing, including agriculture and farmland plan committee members and John Brennan from NYSDAM. Town board members are not included in that count.

Seymour Van der Veen

Has home in Schenectady county, farmland in Wright

Have read the whole plan a lot of good things in it, if you wanted to farm anywhere, the way the plan sounded, I'd rather farm in Wright rather than anywhere else, I was really pleasantly surprised, like recommendations about how to keep young people in farming, I've got 25 grandchildren and not one wants to farm

Nan Stolzenburg

Summarized her comments which she submitted in writing (attached)

Landowner with property on Ostrander Rd.

Ed Krawinski (?)

He owns a former farm, dreams of being farmer, can't afford to, cleaning up land, he is concerned that plan will restrict his ability to put houses on his land for his children

Virginia Shulamane (?)

Has hobby farm on Larry Hill Rd.

Bottom line is you have to be able to make money

Good ideas in the plan but people can only stay in farming if they can afford to do that, it's the obvious problem its no one's fault in this room

Good to avoid construction on high quality farmland but if someone has property and they need to sell it, if its high quality farmland who's making the decision

Theresa Murphy

Question and concern re: prioritizing of agricultural land

Mr. Ogsbury

Comments on the definition of agriculture