

**Town of Charlton
Saratoga County
Town Board Agenda Meeting**

December 30, 2019

The Agenda Meeting of the Town Board of the Town of Charlton, Saratoga County, New York was held at the Charlton Town Hall, 758 Charlton Rd, Charlton, NY and called to order by Councilman Grasso at 7:30 p.m. to set the agenda for the January 13th meeting.

Present: Councilman Grasso, Councilwoman Heritage, Councilman Ranaletto, Councilman Robbins, Supervisor Grattidge, Town Clerk Brenda Mills, Attorney Jim Craig.

RESOLUTION #202

Approval of Minutes

Motion by Councilman Grasso

Seconded by Councilwoman Heritage

BE IT RESOLVED that the Town Board hereby approves the minutes from the regular Town Board Meeting on December 9, 2019.

Vote: All Ayes, No Nays. **CARRIED.**

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Town Offices will be closed on New Year's Day, January 1st.

The January Town Board Meeting will begin at 7:00 p.m. and the Board will start with the approval of the Organization Resolutions.

COMMUNICATION

The U.S. Census Bureau is looking for workers for 2020 census. Interested person can call 855-JOB-2020 for more information. The pay is \$18 per hour and applicants must be at least 18 years old.

DISCUSSION

The Sales Tax for the month was \$112,829.00 and the Mortgage Tax was \$8,363.69. The Sales Tax revenue for 2019 was up about 3.5% for the year from 2018.

Supervisor Grattidge said that the Board has received a resignation from John Kadlecsek from the Planning Board. He thanked John for his faithful service on the Planning Board, which was at least 20 years. The Supervisor also noted that the Town Board will need to find someone to fill the vacancy.

Verizon Cell Tower Application Discussion

Supervisor Grattidge said that tonight the Town Board will be voting on the Negative Declaration pursuant to SEQRA for the Charlton Center Wireless Telecommunication facility. He asked Councilman Grasso to give an overview of what the Board will be voting on tonight.

Councilman Grasso gave the following overview:

For the better part of the last year, the Town Board has been considering an application from Verizon to site a new cell tower in Town located at 764 Charlton Road. There has been a lot of information provided by the applicant supporting the information and a lot of review by the Town Board at various meetings. There was also a lot of input given to the Board from various Boards and Committees that input was solicited from, both local Boards and Committees as well as County and State agencies. This is an application that is subject to an Exceptional Use Permit (EUP) approval which the Town Board took primary jurisdiction over. By granting the EUP, that would allow the applicant to submit for a Building permit to construct the tower. There would be no other discretionary approval required by the Town. One of the things that the Town Board needs to do as it considers the EUP, is to go through the State Environmental Review (SEQRA) process, and the Board needs to determine whether the application and the impacts on the environment are sufficient enough to trigger the need for a positive declaration which would result in the preparation of a detailed environmental impact statement. The other option, as you go through the environmental review process, if you determine that the project is not expected to result in significant environmental impact is to move to make a negative declaration pursuant to SEQRA. We have gone through carefully reviewing the merits of the application. We have had a public hearing in which we got a lot of great feedback from the public. Most of the residents that we have heard from are in favor, primarily regarding to improve cell coverage in the Town. We heard a lot about the improved safety characteristics by having improved cell coverage in the Town. There were some residents that spoke against the cell tower being constructed primary due to visual impacts and the potential impact on rural character. This application really stems from the process that the Town has been working on for years trying to find the best location to site a cell tower. A few years back, we considered installing equipment on our water tank but for various reasons, all of which are documented in the Town Board's meeting minutes and public meetings, we decided that the water tower is not the best site for cell equipment, and we directed Verizon to search for alternative sites and they came forward with this site, which I feel is a much more desirable site for cell equipment. We are now at the point where we need to make a decision about the application. As far as procedure, the Board would make a SEQRA determination and we have got a number of documents in front of the Town Board tonight. The Town Board as lead agent would classify the project as an Unlisted Action or Type 1 Action or Type 2 Action. This application based on the scale and amount of disturbance that it would include on the ground, in comparing it the SEQRA regulations threshold, would be an Unlisted Action pursuant to SEQRA. Unlisted Actions typically only require the preparation of the Short Environmental Assessment Form, but because of the complexity of this application and the thoroughness that the Town Board wanted to go through, the applicant was asked to provide a Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF), which has three parts.

Part 1 of the form goes through the project site, the environmental setting, as well as various characteristics of the proposed projects. Part 2 is up to the Lead Agency, and goes through the identification of potential project impacts, and Part 3 is the final determination of significance. Part 1 is 13 pages of the project setting provided by the applicant that goes through a description of the application. It also goes through a description of the site and environmental characteristics of the site. We did provide comments on draft copies of this form in previous months and the applicant has revised the forms based on all of the comments that we provided. What we have before us tonight is Part 1 of the form which the Councilman feels is an accurate depiction of the project site and the proposed project. Councilman Grasso has no further comments on Part 1.

Part 2 is the responsibility of the Lead Agency. Councilman Grasso took the lead on drafting this. It is a 10 page form, part of the Full EAF, that identifies the potential impacts. The purpose is to understand the level of significance of the impacts and the magnitude of the various impacts. The following are the issues that it touches on:

- 1) Impact on Land. Would the action involve construction on or physical alternation of the land surface of the project site. Because this is a construction project of a cell tower on raw land, it would, so the answer is Yes. When you answer these questions, it does not mean that there is going to be significant impact. It means that then you need to go into further evaluation of the level of impact. There are a number of sub questions regarding the overall impact on land. He has answered each question, and all of them resulted in "No or small impact would occur".
- 2) Impact on geological features which talks about the modification or destruction of unique land forms. The answer is "No",
- 3) Impact on surface water. It important to note that there are wetlands and the access road is in close proximity to the wetlands and there is going to be no impact on the wetlands, but the access road is within the regulated buffer area so there would be a potential impact on surface water. To the rest of sub questions, the response is "No or small impact would occur".
- 4) Impact on groundwater which there would be no impact.
- 5) Impact on flooding – "No".

- 6) Impact on air – “No”
- 7) Impact on plants and animals. The question asks if the proposed action may result in the loss of flora or fauna. “Yes”, this will be construction on previously undeveloped land, but the response to the rest of the sub questions is “No or small impact would occur”.
- 8) Impacts on agricultural resources – the appropriate answer is “Yes”. It is important to note that this is on former farmland so it will be an irreversible improvement/conversion of former agricultural land to the new use, so there would be an impact on agricultural resources, but the response to the rest of the sub questions is “No or small impact would occur”.
- 9) Impact on aesthetic resources. As he noted earlier, most of the concerns about siting a cell tower in Town is the impact on aesthetic resources, visual impacts and impact on the Town’s rural character which is something very important to us. The question is: The land use of the proposed action is obviously different from, or are in sharp contrast to, current land use patterns between the proposed project and a scenic or aesthetic resources. He feels the appropriate answer to that question is “Yes” because we only have one other cell tower in Town, north of 67 on Jockey Street. This is going to be a second one and when you look at a cell tower, it is in sharp contrast to the rural character and pastoral setting and the other areas of the Town. When you go through the rest of the sub questions the answer is “No or small impact would occur”.
- 10) Impact on historic and archeological resources. The question is: “The proposed action may occur in or adjacent to a historic or archeological resource”. He feels that the appropriate answer is “Yes” because we do have a Historic District in Town which is along the Charlton Road corridor and extends 600 feet north of Charlton Road, well short of the location of the proposed cell tower which is about 2300 feet north of Charlton Road, but nonetheless there are a few instances along the Charlton Road corridor where the cell tower will be visible from, and in terms of relative distance, it would be adjacent to our Historic District. It is important that we acknowledge the proximity of the cell tower to the Historic District, but the response to the rest of the sub questions is “No or small impact would occur”.
- 11) Impact on open space and recreation, which reads: “The proposed action may result in a loss of recreational opportunities or a reduction of an open space resource as designated in any adopted municipal open space plan”. We do not have an Open Space Plan but we do have a Comprehensive Plan which talks about protection of our open space and recreational resources, so the appropriate answer is “Yes”. Under other impacts, we did list that there would be an impact on hunting opportunities and a potential impact on the Charlton Snowmobile Trail that goes past the proposed location, but the response to the rest of the sub questions is “No or small impact would occur”.
- 12) Impact on critical environmental areas. We have none, so the answer is “No”.
- 13) Impact on transportation of traffic patterns. This project is not going to generate significant traffic. There will be 3 to 4 visits by maintenance vehicles throughout the course of the year, so the answer is “No”.
- 14) Impact on energy. This project will result in a negligible or small increase in electric energy and there will backup propane for a generator, so the answer is “Yes”, but the response to the rest of the sub questions is “No or small impact would occur”.
- 15) Impact on noise, odor, and light. There would be some outdoor lighting, in a photocell on a timer. There will be no need for a light at the top of the tower, which was an important consideration. There would be a generator for standby power located as part of the base station. The application materials did do a detailed noise study to demonstrate that there would not be any significant noise impact from the generator. The appropriate answer is “Yes”, there would be an increase in noise and outdoor lighting, but the response to the rest of the sub questions is “No or small impact would occur”.
- 16) Impact on human health – “No”
- 17) The proposed action is not consistent with adopted Land Use Plans – He feels that the appropriate answer is “Yes”. One of the things that our Zoning says is that when you are looking to locate cell equipment in Town, the first place that we would look is existing tall structures, which is one of the reasons that we looked at siting cell equipment on the water tank south of Charlton Road. Siting on a raw land site and having to build a tower is inconsistent, but it is important to note that the Zoning does allow the approval of towers on undeveloped land. You just have to go through the process to show that any other tall structures, including the water tower, are not practical. He feels that we have done that, and when he goes through the reasons supporting the negative declaration there are a lot of reasons why siting the antennas on the water tower are not a practical solution. The application that we are looking at for a cell tower is a better location. When you go through the sub questions for consistency with community plans, the response is “No or small impact would occur”.
- 18) Consistency with Community Character - The proposed project is inconsistent with the existing community character. The appropriate answer is “YES”. One of the things that is very important to the residents as well as the Town Board is the rural character of the Town of Charlton. It is very important

for us to understand that cell equipment can be viewed as being inconsistent with rural character, It is important for us to acknowledge that, but when you evaluate all of the magnitude of the impact, the appropriate response to the rest of the sub questions is "No or small impact would occur".

Part 3 is the actual evaluation of the magnitude and the importance of project impacts and the determination of significance. Typically, you only do the reasons supporting the negative declaration, when during Part 2 you flag that there would be a moderate or large impact. But because of wanting to do a thorough job of explaining the rationale for our decision making, in working with Town Counsel and the applicant, there is an Appendix A to the Part 3 which is the reasons supporting the negative declaration. There are subsections within it, the first one is regarding the SEQRA status and why they feel that this is Unlisted Action pursuant to SEQRA, an introduction of the proposed facility, an overview of the project need which is something that we have heard a lot about from the residents and the Cell Advisory Committee about the importance of improved cell coverage in Town. Next it goes through the description of impact on land, and the small and negligible impact. Not only is about the construction of the tower, but it is about the base station equipment, getting utility service there and the access road that would be used by maintenance vehicles. There is a description of the impact on water, and the location of the wetland and the wetland adjacent area. The access road would be going through the wetland adjacent area, so it is described in detail. There is a description of the impact on air. The generator would be propane fired. The impact on plants and animals, and the small amount of clearing that would be required. The impact on agricultural land resources. It describes that the property right now is not currently in farm production but it was previously. It is not located within the agricultural district but it is within 500 feet of a farm operation that is within the agricultural district, so it is important that we evaluated the impacts of that. One of the things that we are required to do when you meet that criteria, is to complete an Agricultural Data Statement which was completed by the applicant and submitted to the Town Board for review. The impact on aesthetic resources. As mentioned before, that is where most of the concerns are about siting a cell tower, they are about visual impacts. So there is a lengthy description about the height of the tower, and the vegetation that would be important to help screen views of the tower. It talks about where the tower would be visible from, from different vantage points along our public roads and certain properties along Maple Ave and Jockey Street. It talks about the fact that there will not be a light required at the top of the tower, which is important because it will reduce the visual impact during the night time. It also describes some of the mitigation measures that the applicant has agreed to do to try to minimize the visual impacts of the tower, by changing the design of the antennas booms, the structural members, reducing the number of antennas from 12 down to 6, and painting the tower and all of the structural members on the tower, white, so that it blends in better with the sky and the background. It talks about the setbacks of the base station equipment from nearby properties which would also reduce the visual impact. There is a conclusion regarding the visual impacts. There is a section on the impact on historic and archeological resources. A discussion on the impact on open space and recreation, impact on Critical Environmental Areas, impact on transportation, impact on energy, impact on noise and odor, impact on public health, character of community and neighborhood. Within this section, it was appropriate to go into a discussion about how the Town Board had considered use of the water tower site on Cherry Lane. He listed various reasons why the Town Board feels siting cell antennas on the water tank site is impractical. He listed the impact on the ability to maintain the water tank including periodic cleaning, painting and inspections. Impact of the relatively small parcel to maintain the tank and water distribution system. The additional visual impact due to installation of the antenna and other structural elements at the top of the water tank. Additional visual impact due to having to raise the light on top of the water tank to be on top of the cell equipment. The additional impact from the base equipment being in a residential neighborhood. We also found that there would be a greater visual impact of the antenna equipment on the water tank from the Charlton Historic District which runs along Charlton Road. We also identified that there would be a limited ability to accommodate other telecommunications carriers on the water tank. It could be designed for a maximum of 2 or 3. The current application would allow 3 or 4 carriers. At the water tank site there would be potential for additional noise impact from the generator based on the closer proximity to residences. One of the concerns that we heard from residences, which he thinks we could validate, is the potential of ice falling from the antennas and structural members in close proximity to residential properties.

Based on all of those reasons, the Town Board feels that the water tank would have a greater adverse impact on the community than the 764 Charlton Road site.

The last section is other factors and considerations that the Town Board used to make its determination. In summary, after going through the Full EAF, all parts and the detailed evaluation of all of the environmental issues, we come to the conclusion that this project is not expected to result in a significant adverse environmental impact and therefore that the appropriate decision for the Town Board would be adoption of a

negative declaration pursuant to SEQRA. This process is a required prerequisite for approval of an Exceptional Use Permit application, which he feels would be the next step for the Town Board to consider in the process. Tonight they will make a decision on SEQRA. All of the Board has been provided copies of all of the SEQRA forms and supporting documentation and had a chance to review it all.

Supervisor Grattidge said that the Board received from Young, Sommers today, a report with a Phase 1 archeological survey that was done, which he assumes was included in the SEQR. The Board had no further comments or questions.

MOTIONS, RESOLUTIONS, AND AUTHORIZATIONS

**RESOLUTION # 203
RESOLUTION FOR BUDGET TRANSFER – GENERAL FUND**

Motion by Councilman Ranaletto
Seconded by Councilman Robbins

Roll Call: Councilman Grasso: Aye, Councilwoman Heritage: Aye, Councilman Ranaletto: Aye, Councilman Robbins: Aye, Supervisor Grattidge: Aye. **CARRIED**

12/30/2019

Resolution # 203

Resolution for Budget Adjustments/Transfer of Funds

To cover the cost of additional engineering expenses and to cover the increased costs of conferences and mileage, supplies and computer support:

For Budget Year 2019, General Fund,

- Increase expenditure account, A1440.4, Engineer-Contractual, by \$393.75
- Decrease expenditure account, A1620.1, Buildings-Personal Services, by \$393.75
- Increase expenditure account, A1610.404, Conferences, Mileage, by \$768.20
- Decrease expenditure account, A1620.411, Buildings-Other, by \$768.20
- Increase expenditure account, A1660.4, Central Storeroom-Contractual by \$1,515.00
- Decrease expenditure account, A1650.4, Central Comm.-Contractual, by \$1,515.00
- Increase expenditure account, A1680.4, Central Data-Contractual, by \$1,789.00
- Decrease expenditure account, A1990.4, Contingency, by \$1,789.00

Moved by	Councilman Ranaletto	Voting:	Councilman Grasso	Aye
			Councilwoman Heritage	Aye
Seconded by	Councilman Robbins		Councilman Robbins	Aye
			Councilman Ranaletto	Aye
			Supervisor Grattidge	Aye

I certify that this is a true and exact copy of this original as passed by the Town Board of the Town of Charlton on

Dated: December 30, 2019

Brenda Mills, Town Clerk

RESOLUTION # 204
RESOLUTION FOR BUDGET TRANSFER – HIGHWAY

Motion by Councilman Grasso
Seconded by Councilman Ranaletto

Roll Call: Councilman Grasso: Aye, Councilwoman Heritage: Aye, Councilman Ranaletto: Aye, Councilman Robbins: Aye, Supervisor Grattidge: Aye. **CARRIED**

12/30/2019

Resolution # 204

Resolution for Budget Adjustments/Transfer of Funds

To cover the cost of additional repair expenses and to cover the increased costs of fuel and payroll costs due to winter weather overtime hours:

For Budget Year 2019, Highway Fund,

- Increase expenditure account, DA5130.4, Machinery-Contractual, by \$19,337.42
- Decrease expenditure account, DA5110.414, Road Construction, by \$19,337.42
- Increase expenditure account, DA5110.411, Maint. of Roads-Other, by \$420.62
- Decrease expenditure account, DA5110.414, Road Construction, by \$420.62
- Increase expenditure account, DA5142.406, Snow Removal-Gas/Diesel by \$6,156.55
- Decrease expenditure account, DA5142.410, Snow Removal-Road Materials, by \$6,156.55
- Increase expenditure account, DA5142.1, Snow Removal-Personal Svcs., by \$25,048.00
- Decrease expenditure account, DA5110.1, Maint. of Roads-Personal Svcs., by \$25,048.00

Moved by	Councilman Grasso	Voting:	Councilman Grasso	Aye
			Councilwoman Heritage	Aye
Seconded by	Councilman Ranaletto		Councilman Robbins	Aye
			Councilman Ranaletto	Aye
			Supervisor Grattidge	Aye

I certify that this is a true and exact copy of this original as passed by the Town Board of the Town of Charlton on

Dated: December 30, 2019

Brenda Mills, Town Clerk

Supervisor Grattidge asked Attorney Craig give an overview of the next resolution which is the SEQRA resolution for the telecommunications EUP application on 764 Charlton Road.

Attorney Craig said that the resolution is about 11 pages of text and additional pages of summary of the SEQRA process timeline, makes a determination that it is an Unlisted Action, that is not in an Agricultural District, and that the Full long form EAF is adequate for determining the significance of the proposed project. It then goes into each bullet item that Councilman Grasso just read. It concludes in the end that the Town Board is making a determination of a Negative Declaration determining that there is no significant environmental impact as part of this project. Attorney Craig said that he agreed with Supervisor Grattidge and Councilman Grasso's previous suggestion that they waive the full reading of the resolution, given the length and the fact that the Board members were provided copies of the resolution prior to the meeting, and proceed to the vote.

RESOLUTION # 205

RESOLUTION TO WAIVE THE READING OF THE COMPLETE

Motion by Councilwoman Heritage
Seconded by Councilman Ranaletto

RESOLUTION # 206

SEQR RESOLUTION AND NEGATIVE DECLARATION PURSUANT TO THE NEW YORK STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW ACT (SEQRA) REGARDING THE EXCEPTIONAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION OF CELLCO PARTNERSHIP d/b/a VERIZON WIRELESS TO PLACE A CELL TOWER AT 764 CHARLTON ROAD

Motion by Councilman Grasso
Seconded by Councilman Robbins

Roll Call: Councilman Grasso: Aye, Councilwoman Heritage: Aye, Councilman Ranaletto: Aye, Councilman Robbins: Aye, Supervisor Grattidge: Aye. **CARRIED**

**TOWN OF CHARLTON
COUNTY OF SARATOGA
STATE OF NEW YORK**

**RESOLUTION NO. 206
December 30, 2019**

SEQR RESOLUTION AND NEGATIVE DECLARATION PURSUANT TO THE NEW YORK STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW ACT (SEQRA) REGARDING THE EXCEPTIONAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION OF CELLCO PARTNERSHIP d/b/a VERIZON WIRELESS TO PLACE A CELL TOWER AT 764 CHARLTON ROAD

WHEREAS, the Town Board approved a Resolution, dated September 23, 2019, acknowledging receipt of a telecommunications tower exceptional use permit application from Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board accepted primary jurisdiction of the exceptional use permit application as authorized by the Zoning Ordinance of the Town of Charlton; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board, the Charlton Planning Board, the Charlton Zoning Board of Appeals, the Charlton Environmental Conservation Committee, the Charlton Historical District Commission, the Cell Services Advisory Committee, the Saratoga County Planning Board, and the Town Engineer were provided the documentation presented by the applicant regarding this matter for review and comment; and

WHEREAS, the Town Engineer has submitted a detailed opinion to the Town Board and the Town Planning Board, the Town Attorney, and the Applicant's Counsel, regarding an analysis of the issues to be considered in the processing of the application for Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board received feed-back and/or comments from each of the above Boards and Committees; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board met with the applicant on several occasions to review and discuss the application, and comments and responses, and the applicant, through its attorney, presented

written responses to the various comments and concerns made, and supplied documentation to support and address same; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was duly advertised and held in compliance with Town law, on November 25, 2019 at 6:30 p.m. at Charlton Town Hall and all parties in attendance were permitted an opportunity to speak on behalf of or in opposition to said application of Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless, to place a cell tower at 764 Charlton Road, or any part thereof, and

WHEREAS, the Town Board received a duly completed Full Environmental Assessment Form (“EAF”) for the project completed by the Applicant, which was reviewed by the Board and Town Engineer; and

WHEREAS, the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) regulations found at 6 NYCRR Part 617.3(a) require that no agency shall carry out, fund, or approve an action until it has complied with the requirements of SEQRA; and

WHEREAS, 6 NYCRR 617.6(a) requires that when an agency receives an application for approval of action it must: (1) determine whether the action is subject to SEQRA, (2) determine whether the action involves a federal agency, (3) determine whether other agencies are involved, (4) make a preliminary classification of the action, (5) determine whether a short or full EAF will be used to determine the significance of the action, and (6) determine whether the action is located in an Agricultural District; and

WHEREAS, NYCRR 617.6 establishes procedures for the review of Unlisted actions and whether a coordinated review is required or necessary, if the Town can proceed as lead or sole agency with an uncoordinated review, and what notices, if any, need to be sent out regarding same, and the Town has properly, fully and completely followed all of such procedures and requirements contained therein and as set by law, and duly sent all notices required, if any, as are required thereunder and set by law, and has received no objections to the Town proceeding as lead or the only involved agency under SEQRA; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board has independently considered both the information provided in the EAF and comments on the application provided by the Town Engineering and Board members, as well as the Saratoga County Planning Board, various other entities, the Boards and Committees abovementioned, and including the public comments received;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Board hereby determines that:

1. approval of the proposed project constitutes an Unlisted action which is subject to SEQRA,
2. the proposed action is not located in an Agricultural District and, while it is located within 500 feet of lands within an Agricultural District, it will not have any ascertainable significant impact on any farm or farming operations,
3. a Full EAF is adequate for determining the significance of the proposed action; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Town Board, as provided at 6 NYCRR Part 617.6(b)(4) hereby determines no coordinate review of the proposed action is necessary, and the Town Board shall and can proceed as if it were the only involved agency; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Town Board previously and hereby does declared itself as lead agency with respect to SEQRA review of the proposed action; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that based upon its review of the project and the EAF, review of the proposal by the various other Boards, the Town Engineering and the Town and County Planning Boards, and upon comparison with the Criteria for Determining Significance found at 6 NYCRR Section 617.7(c), the Town Board hereby finds that the proposed construction of a cell tower at 764 Charlton Road constitutes an action which will not have a significant impact on the environment and, therefore, does not require preparation of Draft Environmental Impact Statement; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this determination is based in part, upon the following facts and conclusions:

SEQRA Status

This matter is an unlisted action under SEQRA as it does not qualify for any of the actions on the Type II list that are not subject to review (6 NYCRR 617.5) and does not fit within the description of any of the actions identified on the Type I list (6 NYCRR 617.4). The site is not identified by Saratoga County as being in a certified agricultural district (6 NYCRR 617.4(b)(8)). Even if it were, nothing in the application exceeds 25 percent of any threshold established elsewhere in that section (Id.). Similarly, while the access road and utilities originate within the Historic District, thereby implicating 6 NYCRR 617.4(b)(9), nothing within the application materials exceeds 25 percent of any threshold established elsewhere in that section. Thus, the action is properly characterized as an Unlisted action under SEQRA.

Introduction

The purpose of the Charlton Center communications facility is to provide an adequate and safe level of emergency and non-emergency Verizon Wireless communications services to the south and central portions of the Town of Charlton. More specifically, the facility will offer significant improvements in both capacity (ability for the network to adequately satisfy the demand for high speed wireless services) and in-building coverage to the homes, businesses and communities along County Route 51 (CR-51 / Charlton Rd), County Route 52 (CR-52 / Jockey St & Swaggertown Rd), and into the Hamlet of Charlton. Additionally, the proposed facility will fill in existing coverage gaps in the 4G network and along several local thoroughfares and community roads (e.g., Stage Road, Maple Avenue, Peaceable Street, etc.) across the target coverage area.

Overview of Project Need

The area within which Verizon Wireless can locate its facility to provide adequate and safe coverage (the “search area”) is determined by a number of factors, including terrain, vegetation and the locations of local population centers and surrounding sites in the Verizon Wireless network.

Existing 4G/LTE service in the area is limited and originates from several existing Verizon Wireless communications facilities within the Town of Charlton and in the neighboring Towns of Ballston and Glenville. Verizon Wireless’ surrounding facilities include its “Charlton” site (3.5 miles north on the self-support tower off Jockey Street in the Town of Charlton), “Ballston” site (3.8 miles east on the self-support tower off N.Y. State Route 50 in the Town of Ballston), “Glenville” (3.7 miles southeast on a monopole tower off NY-50), “Rotterdam Junction” (4.5 miles south on a monopole tower off

Rector Road), and “Pattersonville” (4.5 miles south on a monopole tower off Waters Road) sites. Although these facilities are successful in providing coverage within their intended localized areas, they do not provide sufficient 4G/LTE coverage to the targeted area in southern and central Charlton.

Accordingly, construction of a new, locally-based communications facility is required to provide a dominant (i.e., continuous) level of advanced communications service to this area (For reference, see the Site Selection Analysis prepared by Verizon Wireless’ Radio Frequency (RF) Engineer and Site Acquisition Specialist, detailing the purpose and need for this facility). This project is part of a comprehensive upgrade of the Verizon Wireless network in Saratoga County, and serves as a suitable platform for future advanced wireless services expansion at the proposed site and deeper into the town’s residential and more rural areas.

The facility is located on a relatively large (47.14± acre) parcel, located within the search area. The monopole, equipment pads and associated improvements will be located on a 100± ft. x 100± ft. (10,000± sq. ft.) section of the premises. Additionally, the site will generate a minimum amount of vehicular traffic (3-4 trips per year by Verizon Wireless for routine maintenance purposes). As an unmanned communications facility, no water supply or sewage treatment / disposal issues have been identified. An emergency generator fueled by propane gas is proposed.

Impact on Land

This project will result in a small to negligible impact on land. The project site is located on a large (47.14± acre) parcel, which is in residential use and was formerly in agricultural production. Ingress, egress and utility services (power and telephone/fiber) will originate from Charlton Road utilizing an existing gravel access road for a portion of the distance, which will be extended and will connect the public road with the tower compound. Utilities will be installed underground in a trench adjacent to the access drive. The access road runs in a generally northerly direction from Charlton Road to the base station yard.

The monopole facility and ground equipment will be located within on a 100 ft. x 100 ft. lease area in a location characterized by both open agricultural fields (or former agricultural fields) and dense, mature trees. The proposed monopole facility and associated ground equipment are located inside a 75 ft. x 75 ft. fenced tower yard. In general, the installations include: six (6) panel antennas mounted at the top position of a proposed 120± ft. monopole (124± ft. when including a 4± ft. lightning rod); an equipment cabinet on a concrete pad measuring 4.0± ft. x 7.0± ft. in size; utility and RF equipment on a “H” frame mounting structure; a 30 kW propane generator on a concrete pad measuring 4.0± ft. x 7.0± ft. in size for emergency power; cabling connecting the antennas to the equipment platform; and associated cabling and all related ground equipment and utility services (power and telephone/fiberoptic services).

The lease area/tower compound will be accessed over an existing gravel access road that is 1,537± feet in length that will be extended by 993± feet to reach the lease area/tower compound. When combined with the construction of the tower compound, there will be a total of 30,492± square feet (0.7± acres) of grading/disturbance.

The parcel is a large property in an area of residential, agricultural, commercial and municipal uses. Due to the relatively low height of the facility, FAA obstruction lighting is not required at this site.

The communications facility will be unmanned and visited for routine maintenance purposes approximately 3-4 times per year by Verizon Wireless (only as needed). As such, this project will not have any impact on existing water and sewage services. In addition, neither pedestrian nor vehicular access will be significantly impacted. Adequate parking is provided for emergency vehicles and/or infrequent maintenance visits adjacent to the fenced tower compound. A six (6) foot high chain link safety fence (with three strands of barbed wire at top) will be installed to secure the tower site and protect Verizon Wireless’ telecommunications equipment from unauthorized access.

Impact on Water

The proposed Communications Facility will not result in any significant impact upon (a) any water body, protected or non-protected, (b) surface or groundwater quality or quantity, or (c) drainage flow or patterns, inclusive of surface water runoff.

No NYS or federal regulated wetlands are located on, or in close proximity to, the work to be constructed for the tower compound. There is an existing New York State regulated wetland (NYS Wetland ID B-42) and a farm pond in the vicinity of the existing access road. While the existing access road is not in the wetlands, it is in the 100 foot buffer. Accordingly, a permit must be secured to install the underground utilities within the buffer area. It is expected that the permit will contain standard and site-specific conditions to maintain the quality of the nearby wetlands. Standard sedimentation and erosion control techniques will be implemented at the site during the construction phase to eliminate potential impact(s) to the wetlands and farm pond. Silt fence will be utilized around the site to prevent silt and soils from being impacted by stormwater. Accordingly, any potential sedimentation and/or erosion-related impact(s) will primarily be confined to the construction phase, and will not be continuous in nature and scope and will be mitigated by the use of appropriate controls.

Along the path of the existing and proposed access road, existing culverts will be utilized to limit the required construction activities to minimize any impact to streams and wetlands.

With respect to the generator, diesel fuel is not proposed as a fuel source and will not be stored on-site. Rather, propane will be used as a fuel source. In the unlikely event of a leak of propane, the gas vaporizes and does not affect soil or water.

Impact on Air

This project will not result in any significant impact on air quality. The Communications Facility proposed does not involve or concern any air quality issues, permit or otherwise. As previously mentioned, this Communications Facility will be unmanned, and visited for routine maintenance purposes approximately 3-4 times per year by Verizon Wireless (only as needed). Therefore, no significant traffic-based impact(s) exist. The site will have a backup propane-fueled generator located on a concrete pad which is exercised automatically every other week and which otherwise only runs during a power outage to keep the network in operation. The generator complies with all existing emissions regulations. As such, any minimal impact(s) on air quality, if any, will be confined to the construction phase and/or will be negligible in scope and effect during the operational phase.

Impact on Plants and Animals

The proposed Communications Facility will not result in any significant impact on threatened/non-threatened or endangered/non-endangered species of plants or animals. The Full EAF and consultation process indicate that lands in the vicinity of the facility are the location of regularly occurring, non-threatened and non-endangered native plants and animals. With respect to other species, given the small amount of clearing that is proposed to accommodate the access drive and facility, no significant impacts to plants or animals are expected, particularly in light of the significant amount of remaining lands available to accommodate existing animals.

Impact on Agricultural Land Resources

The proposed Communications Facility will have minimal impact on agricultural land resources as the property is not currently in agricultural production. In addition, the property is not listed as being a

farm operation within an agricultural district certified under the Agriculture and Markets Law, Article 25-AA, Section 303 and 304. However, the property is within 500 feet of a farm operation within an agricultural district certified under the Agriculture and Markets Law, Article 25-AA, Section 303 and 304. Accordingly, an Agricultural Data Statement was prepared by the Applicant and submitted to the Town for review. Farm operations within 500 feet were notified of the public hearing. The Town Board and the other Town agencies that have reviewed this matter have not ascertained any significant impact on farm operations as a result of the proposal. Accordingly, the use of 0.7± acres of land to support a much needed telecommunications facility is not a significant adverse impact. To the contrary, it is an appropriate use of land to provide a necessary and needed utility service to the residents of the Town.

Impact on Aesthetic Resources

The proposed Communications Facility will result in a negligible to minor impact on aesthetic resources, or no significant visual impact depending on location and view.

A. PROPOSED TOWER HEIGHT

Generally speaking, cellular radio is a “line-of-sight” technology. While radio signals do have some degree of bending (known as diffraction) around obstacles, terrain and vegetation can block or significantly interfere with transmissions to and from a cell site. Distance is also a critical consideration, because increased space to and from the coverage objective means that the proposed facility (and all mobile devices communicating back and forth with that facility) must operate at higher power levels to achieve a proper level of coverage and performance (if possible). Moreover, this technology operates at significantly reduced effective transmit and receive power levels, making modern wireless networks more susceptible to blocking and/or interference than in prior years.

Existing vegetation in the thirty to eighty feet tall range around the tower site will serve to buffer and shield the tower from view from most of surrounding properties and public roads. The Applicant conducted a Visual Resource Evaluation (“VRE”). The Visual Resource Evaluation indicates that, except for a limited number of properties, the vast majority coverage area will not be able to see the facility. As to those properties that have views of the facility, the majority of the views are partially screened and limited by vegetation. More specifically, there are limited areas identified with views of the tower as shown on the Viewshed Analysis Map:

- The primary area from which the tower can be viewed is from certain properties along Maple Avenue.
- There are limited views from Jockey Street.

As noted above, tower marking and lighting is not required by the FAA. Not having a light atop the tower will reduce its visual impact, particularly at night.

During the course of the review process, in response to resident concerns and Town Board requests, the applicant has proposed to reduce the size (width) of the antenna booms and also reduced the number of antennas to be deployed from twelve (12) to six (6). Further, the applicant is proposing to paint the monopole, sector mounts, antennas and associated equipment white to limit the contrast with the sky and better blend the visible portion of the tower with its surroundings.

The compound fence and base station equipment is significantly setback from nearby properties. The distances to nearby property lines are: 306'± to the west; 658'± to the north; 357'± to the east; and 310'± to the south.

In this context, the proposed communications facility has been sited and designed to have the limited visibility, and any resultant visual impact is minimal in nature and scope.

B. CONCLUSION

Due to the physics of radio frequency (RF) signal propagation, Verizon Wireless' antennas need to clear all natural and man-made objects to function properly. This translates to a certain amount of unavoidable visibility, which in this case is limited to small areas and a low number of residential properties. As such, it is determined that the proposed communications facility will not: (a) result in a significant level of visual or other impact to the surrounding community or neighborhood under the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQRA"); (b) have a detrimental effect on adjacent land uses or the development of the area.

Impact on Historic and Archeological Resources

The proposed Communications Facility will not result in any significant impact on site(s) or structure(s) of historic, prehistoric or paleontological importance. The Applicants determined that there would be no direct effect and no visual effect on historic properties. In the unlikely event that any artifacts are uncovered, work will cease in that area and the materials will be recovered and documented in accordance with standard best practices.

The proposed site is near the Charlton Historical District. The Charlton Historic District is generally comprised of properties on either side of Charlton Road and is approximately 123 acres in size. The driveway (existing portion of the driveway) is in the Historic District but the tower compound and monopole are outside of the district by approximately 1,500 feet. As identified in the Visual Resource Evaluation there are very limited views of the monopole from the Historic District. For those locations from which there are views, the views are limited, distant and largely obscured by existing mature vegetation.

The matter was referred by the Town Board to the Town's Historic District Commission ("HDC") for a report. The HDC reviewed the matter and the application materials and adopted a letter advising the Town Board that "[i]t was noted that the view of the 120 foot balloon was barely visible from the hamlet and can only be seen from a few select locations. It was unanimously determined by the membership of the Commission that the tower will not significantly impair the historical character of the hamlet."

Impact on Open Space and Recreation

The proposed Communications Facility will not result in any significant impact on the quantity or quality of existing or future open spaces or recreational opportunities given the small size of the facility and its placement on a large lot in private ownership. To the extent that the current owners utilize the property for recreation or hunting, a very limited amount of land will be removed from use and the minor amount of such land will have no appreciable effect on recreational or hunting opportunities. The Town Board also believes that the tower has the potential to keep the large parcel of land as open space by providing a rental revenue stream to the property owner thereby reducing the potential pressure to subdivide and sell a portion of the property as so often happens in rural communities.

Although by no means determinative of this question, it is noted that the project will provide recreation/open space users (and the traveling public) with additional and/or enhanced access to communications services for emergency and non-emergency use. The historical use of this technology for emergency communications purposes is well-documented.

Impact on Critical Environmental Areas

This project will not impact any Critical Environmental Area(s). According to the NYSDEC website, there are no Critical Environmental Areas in Saratoga County in the vicinity of this project (See, <http://www.dec.ny.gov/permits/25146.html>).

Impact on Transportation

This project will not result in any significant impact on existing transportation systems. An existing gravel driveway/curb cut serving the residential property will be used and extended as a 30± ft. wide access driveway with the installation of gravel and crushed stone material. The access road runs in a generally northerly direction from Charlton Road to the tower yard. Utilities will be installed underground in a trench running along the edge of the access road from Charlton Road to the tower yard. The proposed Communications Facility will be unmanned, and visited by Verizon Wireless approximately 3-4 times each year for Verizon Wireless (only as needed) for maintenance and inspection purposes. There will be a slight increase in vehicle trips during the approximately two month construction time frame associated with work vehicles and delivery trucks. The amount of additional vehicles is comparable to the amount associated with the construction of a single family home. Charlton Road is well maintained and will have no difficulty handling this small number of additional trips. There is no apparent sight distance or other traffic control issues related to the existing location of the driveway curb cut.

Impacts on Energy

The proposed Communications Facility will not result in any significant impact on the community's sources of fuel or energy supply. First, an adequate source of power exists at the existing service lines in the vicinity of the project. Second, it is estimated that the Communications Facility will require approximately the same number of kW hours of power as a 3-4 bedroom house per year to operate, an impact which is not considered to be significant and which will not cause the need for any major electrical upgrades.

Noise and Odor Impacts

This project will not result in any significant environmental impact due to objectionable odors, noise or vibration. Any such impact(s) will be temporary and minor in nature and confined to the construction phase. All construction equipment will be equipped to properly mitigate noise and dust, properly muffled and otherwise in compliance with OSHA standards.

The only time that the propane-fueled emergency generator will run continuously is during times of a power outage. This is necessary to provide continuous wireless service to Verizon Wireless customers. The only other time that the generator will run is for a test cycle once every other week for approximately 20 minutes. The test cycle is generally set for Tuesday mornings after 9:00 am but can be adjusted as necessary.

Given the significant distance in all directions to the property lines and the heavy tree cover, the occasional use of a backup generator will not impact any neighboring land uses. The Applicant has

submitted a Noise Evaluation Report which identifies that the sound at the nearest property line (315'± to the west) is 34.7 dBA and the sound at the nearest residence (800'± to the east) is 26.6 dBA which is significantly lower than the sound associated with a normal conversation (60 dBA).

Based upon the foregoing, the periodic operation of the generator will not represent a significant impact on the neighboring properties.

Impact on Public Health

The proposed Communications Facility will not impact the public health and safety.

A propane powered emergency generator will be located on a proposed equipment pad. The emergency generator and fuel storage tank are designed in accordance with all applicable laws, rules, regulations and safety requirements for New York State.

Without limitation to this evaluation, the Town is prohibited by the Telecommunications Act of 1996 from regulating the placement, construction and modification of personal wireless service facilities on the basis of the environmental effects of radio frequency emissions to the extent that such facilities comply with the Commission's regulations concerning such emissions. 47 USC 332 [c] [7] [B] [iv].

Notwithstanding this Federal preemption, the Applicant has provided a written report entitled "RF Safety FCC Compliance of Proposed Communications Facility", prepared by a New York State licensed professional engineer (Paul Dugan, P.E. of Millennium Engineering, P.C.), which documents that the proposed Communications Facility: (a) will comply by a wide margin with the requirements of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) concerning radio frequency (RF) emissions (i.e., operate at a composite ground level below 1% of the applicable FCC exposure limits); and (b) be categorically excluded from local regulation under applicable federal law. The Town has had its Consultant review these matters.

Impact on Growth and Character of Community or Neighborhood

This project will result in a negligible impact on the character of the existing community. Although a variety of land uses exist in the general vicinity, the impact on such uses (if any) is typically visual in nature when considering a telecommunications tower. As previously stated, visibility of the proposed Communications Facility will be minor or insignificant in nature and scope. By proposing a facility of a limited height in this setting on a large (47.14 acre) lot surrounded by mature vegetation, the Applicant has largely eliminated impact on the neighborhood and growth and character of the community will be unaffected.

The Charlton Town Board previously considered use of the Town's water tank which is located on Cherry Lane approximately 1,100'± south of Charlton Road to mount telecommunications antennae along with ground mounted equipment. The Town Board decided that the water tank site is impractical as compared to the proposed Charlton Road site because of, but not limited to, the following reasons:

- Impact on the ability to maintain the water tank including periodic cleaning, painting, and inspections.
- Impact on the use of the relatively small parcel to maintain the tank and water distribution.
- Additional visual impact due to the installation of antennae and other structural elements at the top of the water tank,
- Additional visual impact due to having to raise the light on top of the water tank.

- Additional visual impact of the base equipment within a residential neighborhood.
- Greater visual impact from the Charlton Historic District.
- Limited ability to accommodate other telecommunication carriers on the water tank.
- Potential for additional noise impacts from the generator(s) due to residences in much closer proximity to the equipment.
- Potential for ice falling from the antennae and structural members in close proximity to residential properties.

The above items show and evidence an increased potential for negative impacts on the health and safety of the residents surrounding the Water Tower, impacts that do not exist, or that exist to a much lesser extent at the proposed 764 Charlton Road location. Town Code requires the Board to first consider existing tall structures, and give preference towards use of such, unless the use of the existing structure is impractical. Here, based on the above, public health and safety considerations make the use of the water tower impractical, and the stand alone tower on Charlton Road the much better and safer option. Based on the above, the Town Board has determined that the Town's water tank would have greater adverse impact on the community than the tower proposed at the 764 Charlton Road site.

Other Factors and Considerations

Based on the foregoing discussion and the materials in the Record, the Town Board has determined that:

(i) The construction of a monopole and related equipment will not cause a substantial adverse change in existing air quality, ground or surface water quality or quantity, traffic or noise levels. In addition, the project is unmanned so there will be no production of solid waste, let alone a substantial increase in solid waste production. Due to the minor size of the construction activities and the mitigation measures proposed, there is no substantial increase in potential for erosion, flooding, leaching or drainage problems.

(ii) The project will not result in the removal or destruction of large quantities of vegetation or fauna. Because the site is in a location with an existing driveway and is largely surrounded by trees and is in an open field, there will be no interference with the movement of any resident or migratory wildlife species. The existing property does not contain a significant habitat area. Given the existing state of the land use, largely surrounded by woods and agricultural fields and the minor nature of the construction activities, no adverse impacts on a threatened or endangered species of animal or plant, or the habitat of such a species or other significant adverse impacts to natural resources have been identified.

(iii) There are no designated critical environmental areas on or near the premises. As a result no impact on such an area will occur.

(iv) The proposal of a monopole on private property will not result in the creation of a material conflict with a community's current plans or goals as officially approved or adopted. The proposal is to construct a monopole on a large lot that is largely an open field and wooded. From most vantage points the facility is not visible or if it is visible it is largely screened by the existing woods, which will minimize any visual impact. Moreover, it is the Town Board that is approving the proposal and it is the Town Board that has discretionary jurisdiction over land use matters in the Town, including adopting and amending Comprehensive Plans and Zoning Laws.

(v) As noted above and throughout this document, the construction of a monopole will not result in the impairment of the character or quality of important historical, archeological, architectural, or aesthetic resources or of existing community or neighborhood character.

(vi) The proposed facility uses the amount of electricity consistent with a single-family home. As a result, there is no major change in the use of either the quantity or type of energy.

(vii) The creation of a hazard to human health. This item is discussed in detail above. The finding of no creation of a hazard to human health is supported in the record and not repeated here.

(viii) The proposal does cause not a substantial change in the use, or intensity of use, of land including agricultural, open space or recreational resources, or in its capacity to support existing uses.

(ix) The proposal does not encourage or attract a large number of people to a place or places for more than a few days, compared to the number of people who would come to such place absent the action. The site is unmanned with only occasional visits by a technician.

(x) There is nothing in the record to suggest that the proposal will cause the creation of a material demand for other actions that would result in one of the above consequences. Rather, the site is centrally located to existing Verizon Wireless and other sites that provide appropriate telecommunications services to their nearby localized areas but which cannot serve the proposed area.

(xi) Changes in two or more elements of the environment, no one of which has a significant impact on the environment, but when considered together result in a substantial adverse impact on the environment is not applicable here. This consideration does not apply as multiple minor impacts have not been identified that could aggregate and be elevated to a substantial adverse impact. The only potential impact under consideration is visibility and, as to that impact, it has been determined to be minor in nature.

(xii) Two or more related actions undertaken, funded or approved by an agency, none of which has or would have a significant impact on the environment, but when considered cumulatively would meet one or more of the criteria in this subdivision is not applicable as well, as there is no second action proposed or contemplated.

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

After reviewing the Full EAF submitted herewith, together with the documentation provided by the Applicant and the information provided by the Town's consultants, other Town agencies and boards and the public, the Town Board of the Town of Charlton hereby concludes that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will not be required for the public utility Communications Facility proposed because (a) this Action will result in no adverse environmental impacts, or (b) the identified adverse environmental impacts will not be significant (*see* 6 NYCRR § 617.7(a)(2)).

AND,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that

- (1) the Town Board of the Town of Charlton, based upon (i) its thorough review of the Full EAF, Parts 1 and 2, and any Addendums, along with any and all other documents prepared and submitted with respect to this proposed action and its environmental review, and (ii) its thorough review of the potential relevant areas of environmental

concern to determine if the proposed action may have a significant adverse impact on the environment, including the criteria identified in 6 NYCRR 617.7(c), hereby makes a negative determination of environmental significance (“Negative Declaration”) in accordance with SEQRA for the above referenced proposed action, and determines that no Environmental Impact Statement will be required; and

- (2) the Town Supervisor of the Town of Charlton is hereby authorized and directed to complete and sign as required the determination of significance, confirming the foregoing Negative Declaration, which fully completed and signed Full EAF and determination of significance, along with any Addendums, is attached hereto and incorporated by reference in this resolution; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this Determination of No Significance shall be considered a Negative Declaration made pursuant to Article 8 of the Environmental Conservation Law; and

LASTLY, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Town Clerk is authorized to file this resolution as is required by law and do all that is necessary in order to fully effectuate the determinations contained herein.

Moved by: Councilman Grasso	Voting: Councilman Grasso	Aye
	Councilwoman Heritage	Aye
Seconded by: Councilman Robbins	Councilman Robbins	Aye
	Councilman Ranaletto	Aye
	Supervisor Grattidge	Aye

I certify that this is a true and exact copy of this original as passed by the Town Board of the Town of Charlton on

Dated: December 30, 2019

Brenda Mills, Town Clerk

**RESOLUTION # 207
AUTHORIZATION FOR THE SUPERVISOR TO ATTEND THE ANNUAL ASSOCIATION OF TOWNS
MEETING AND DESIGNATING THE SUPERVISOR AS VOTING DELEGATE**

Motion by Councilman Ranaletto
Seconded by Councilwoman Heritage

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Board hereby authorizes Supervisor Grattidge to attend the annual Association of Town meeting in February, and also designates Supervisor Grattidge to be the Voting Delegate for the Town of Charlton at said meeting.

Roll Call: Councilman Grasso: Aye, Councilwoman Heritage: Aye, Councilman Ranaletto: Aye, Councilman Robbins: Aye, Supervisor Grattidge: Aye. **CARRIED**

ABSTRACT OF CLAIMS

RESOLUTION #208

Abstract of Claims

Motion by Councilman Robbins

Seconded by Councilman Grasso

BE IT RESOLVED that the Town Board has approved the payment of bills as presented in Abstract #122, voucher numbers 794 – 852 in the amount of \$70,297.73 and Abstract #24, voucher number 2401 in the amount of \$110.00 and Abstract #25, voucher number 2501 in the amount of \$25.00.

Vote: All Ayes, No Nays. **CARRIED.**

Supervisor Grattidge said at the next meeting, the Board will vote on the Organizational Resolutions. The Board will work on drafting a resolution for the approval of the Verizon EUP application approval for the next meeting. They will also work on a resolution for the Town revaluation. Councilman Grasso said that they will need to add another member to the Planning Board, but that could be done after the Organization Resolutions if needed.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

No one chose to speak.

RESOLUTION #209

Motion to adjourn and enter into Executive Session to discuss a possible Real Estate transaction with the Town

Motion by Councilman Grasso

Seconded by Councilman Ranaletto

Vote: All Ayes, No Nays. **CARRIED.**

The meeting adjourned at 8:12 p.m. and the Board entered into Executive Session. The Board came out of Executive Session at 8:42 p.m. No action was taken.

Respectfully submitted,

Brenda Mills
Town Clerk