

**Town Board Meeting
November 19, 2015
7:00 p.m.**

Present: Supervisor Sennett, Councilor Greenfield, Councilor Murray, Councilor Brace, Councilor Howard, Attorney Taylor.

Also Present: Norma Ferris, Jane Anderson, Jonathan Monfiletto (Skaneateles Journal), Bridgett Winkelman, Suzanne Hutchinson, Jim Lanning, Ann Buehler, Julie Stenger, Dan Evans, Dana Pickering, Dave Graham, Gretchen Messer, Pat Taylor, Evan Dreyfuss, Lisa Byrne, Amanda Mazzori, Jason Gabak (Skaneateles Press), Ken Kaufman, Michael DalPos, Jonathan Dalpos.

Department Reports:

▪*Highway, Water, Transfer Station:* Supervisor Sennett reported that Allan Wellington was on vacation and all Departments have normal operations.

▪*Parks:* Supervisor Sennett read the report submitted by Sue Murphy stating that the trees have been planted to finish the landscaping at the Cameron Kenan Playground at Austin Park (pictures were displayed). Supervisor Sennett said that the Town has been lucky to receive tree donations this year from Rotary, the Skaneateles Garden Club and the Cameron Kenan Playground group. She continued to read Sue Murphy's report that stated the snow fence has been put in place at the Conservation Area and snow poles have been placed around the Austin Park walking trail to aid snow removal.

▪*Budget:* Bridgett Winkelman reported that she and Supervisor Sennett met with Eastern Shore Insurance to review our liability policy. Waldis and Company met with employees and retirees regarding the employee health insurance. Water arrears have been submitted to Onondaga County to be added to the 2016 Town and County taxes.

▪*Fire Department:* Chief Dan Evans reviewed the October report listing a total of 39 alarm calls for October with 326 for the year. They had three meetings in October and four drills with 65 active members. November training dates were noted. The membership approved the sale of the surplus spill response trailer to a local contractor for \$1,234.56. Water Rescue 1 (SeaDoo personal watercraft) was returned to Ingles Marina on October 22nd. Water Rescue 2 was removed from the water on November 10th. Chief Evans gave a special thank you to the Skaneateles Country Club for the continued use of the dock space. They have tickets available for the High Stakes Money Drawing. \$100 monthly drawings will begin May 2, 2016 and the 4th Annual Casino Night and High Stakes Money Drawing has been scheduled at Austin Pavilion for Saturday, September 26, 2016.

Resolution #15-199

Minutes: On a motion of Councilor Murray, seconded by Councilor Brace and with unanimous (5-0) affirmation of the Town Board the minutes of November 5, 2015 were accepted as presented.

Resolution #15-200

Fennell Street Petition Request A Speed Limit Reduction: Supervisor Sennett said that the Town Board received this at the last meeting and that the Town Attorney has had an opportunity to review it.

On a motion of Supervisor Sennett, seconded by Councilor Howard and with unanimous (5-0) affirmation of the Town Board, Clerk Aaron was authorized to submit the petition and request to the Onondaga County Department of Transportation for their review and consideration.

Resolution #15-201

Declaring Zamboni Surplus Equipment: Supervisor Sennett said that the Town is now out of the ice business and no longer have use for this equipment.

On a motion of Supervisor Sennett, seconded by Councilor Brace and with unanimous (5-0) affirmation of the Town Board the Zamboni was declared Surplus Equipment and Attorney Taylor was authorized to prepare bid documents to sell it.

Resolution #15-202

Modify Dry Hydrant Resolution: Supervisor Sennett said that much of the year has been spent securing funding for the dry hydrants through Senator DeFrancisco's office. A dry hydrant would be added to Clift Park and Thayer Park with this funding. Yesterday she received a call stating that the problem was that the original resolution transferred ownership of the dry hydrants to the Village. In order to receive funding the Town would have to retain ownership for five years.

Jane Anderson questioned what a dry hydrant was. Supervisor Sennett said that a dry hydrant is a non-pressurized pipe installed at a pond or lake, in this case Skaneateles Lake, that provide firefighters with a way to refill their tanker trucks.

Chief Evans said that when the Town or Village water system is used, especially for a large fire it drops the pressure in the water system and could potentially drain the water towers and cause water safety issues. Dry hydrants can be used without impacting the municipal water supply.

On a motion of Councilor Brace, seconded by Councilor Howard and with unanimous (5-0) affirmation of the Town Board the resolution was amended to state that "*The Town deems it beneficial to provide for the transfer of ownership of the dry hydrants to the Village five (5) years and one day from completion of same.*"

Resolution #15-203

Cuddy & Ward Audit: On a motion of Councilor Greenfield, seconded by Councilor Murray and with unanimous (5-0) affirmation, Supervisor Sennett was authorized to sign the contract with Cuddy and Ward to provide auditing services for the year ended December 31, 2015.

Resolution #15-204

7:15 Public Hearing -2016 Fire Service Agreement: Supervisor Sennett said that the Town Board is in receipt of the Affidavit of posting dated October 27, 2015 and the Affidavit of Publication dated November 4, 2015 for the public hearing on the 2016 Fire Protection Service Agreement with the Village of Skaneateles and the Skaneateles Volunteer Fire Department. With no one wishing to have the public notice read, Councilor Brace made a motion, seconded

by Councilor Greenfield and with unanimous (5-0) affirmation of the Town Board to open the public hearing.

Supervisor Sennett asked if anyone wished to comment on the 2016 Fire Service Agreement. With no one coming forward Councilor Brace made a motion, seconded by Councilor Greenfield and with unanimous (5-0) affirmation of the Town Board the public hearing was closed.

Supervisor Sennett said that this contract is based on actual operational costs from the previous year split between the Village and Town based on assessed value which is 59% Town and 41% Village. The Town also allocates the maximum amount for equipment, which is 35% of the Towns portion of the contract or \$94,437.48.

On a motion of Councilor Brace, seconded by Councilor Murray and with unanimous (5-0) affirmation of the Town Board Supervisor Sennett was authorized to sign the 2016 Fire Protection Service Agreement with the Village of Skaneateles and the Skaneateles Volunteer Fire Department in the amount of \$269,821.38 with an additional \$94,437.48 allocated for equipment.

Resolution #15-205

Climate Action Plan: Supervisor Sennett reported that on July 16, 2009 the Town of Skaneateles agreed to participate in the Climate Smart Community Program that enlists local governments to become part of a statewide effort to make local governments part of the solution in working to reduce the impacts of and adapt to predicted climactic changes. The Village of Skaneateles has adopted a Climate Action Plan.

Supervisor Sennett introduced Amanda Mazonni, Planner with the Central New York Regional Planning & Development Board who has worked diligently with the Town's Engineering Advisory Committee on the Town's Climate Action Plan since early summer.

Ms. Mazonni distributed the Climate Action Plan to the Town Board and displayed her power point presentation on the overhead screen as she reviewed the Plan. She said the CNY Regional Planning & Development Board is a public agency created in 1966 to serve the development needs of five Counties (Cayuga, Onondaga, Cortland, Madison & Oswego) in Central New York. She works primarily in the Energy Management Program working on Climate Action Plans and Greenhouse Gas Inventories through the NYS Climate Smart Community Program.

Amanda said that the NYS Climate Smart Community Program is a partnership between State and Local Governments to reduce energy use and emissions. Working with the Engineering Committee they completed their three month inventory of greenhouse gas emissions to get a sense of how energy was being used in the Town for both municipal operations and the community at large and to see what sources of emissions there were. Based on that greenhouse gas inventory they were able to come up with the Climate Action Plan with various strategies for reducing energy costs and emissions in the Town. Ms. Mazonni said the next step is to formally adopt this Plan. The benefits of adopting the Plan is to show that the Town is serious about Climate Action and the goals that are being proposed.

Ms. Mazonni then reviewed the numbers representing greenhouse gas calculations that use Metric Tons of Carbon Dioxide Equivalent (MtCO_{2e}). This is a way of measuring various greenhouse gases together and their impact on the atmosphere. For example, one metric ton of carbon dioxide equivalent is equal to the emissions from 112 gallons of gasoline or carbon sequestered by almost one acre of US forests in one year.

She reviewed the summary of the 2010 greenhouse gas inventory. She said that the majority (51%) of the Town government emissions is from their vehicle fleet. Buildings and Facilities is 39%. 40% of the Community emissions come from transportation and 49% from commercial and residential energy use. They use the figures to target the major emitting sectors in the Climate Action Plan and come up with strategies for reducing the emissions in these sectors. Next she compared the Town of Skaneateles to other communities in Onondaga County. There are differences between the communities and it doesn't necessarily mean that one community is doing better than another it just shows that the makeup of a emissions really depends on the makeup of the community. For example some communities may have interstates running through them.

Using the information from the inventory they were able to create the Climate Action Plan with the committee. They looked at reduction strategies and came up with a target reduction goal of 25% from municipal operations and 10% from the community by the year 2025. All the calculations and strategies, methodology and sourcing data are available in the Strategy Summary Document which is an appendix to the Climate Action Plan. [both available on the Town website at www.townofskaneateles.com]

Ms. Mazonni reviewed the Charge NY Initiative where the goal is to create a statewide network of up to 3,000 public and workplace charging stations over the next 5 years and to put up to 40,000 plug-in vehicles on the road over that period. She anticipates that there will be funding opportunities in the future. She said that the next steps would be adoption of the Climate Action Plan, the promotion of the plan and project development implementation (e.g. solar, PV installation).

Ms. Mazonni said that the benefits of adopting the Climate Action Plan is to show the community and funding agencies that the Town is serious about these goals and about climate action and for the Town to receive priority funding status. With adoption the benefit is that even if the Town does not reach the goals by 2025 the Town will not be punished for that. She said that the CNY Regional Planning Board will be there to support the Town on implementation and will let the Town know about any funding opportunities.

Jim Lanning asked if there were any grants to replace Ash trees due to the Emerald Ash Borer and the future loss of these trees. Ms. Mazonni said she was not aware but said she is sure there could be in the future.

Supervisor Sennett thanked the members of the Engineering Advisory Committee and also gave special thanks to Bridgett Winkelman, Budget Officer who was a huge help in gathering data and numbers.

Councilor Brace reiterated what Supervisor Sennett said adding that she thanks Amanda and the staff at CNY Regional Planning and Development Board for all their support of this project. She said that The Plan is a great visionary document that ties in with the Comprehensive Plan.

Supervisor Sennett noted that it is a small step but the Town budgeted for an electric Gator for the Parks Department in 2016. Later on the agenda the Town has a proposal from OPTONY for a huge solar array at the Transfer Station that will also tie into the Climate Action Plan.

Councilor Brace also expressed thanks to the CNY Regional Planning and Development Board who have provided tremendous help to the Open Space Committee.

On a motion of Councilor Brace, seconded by Councilor Howard and with unanimous (5-0) affirmation of the Town Board the Climate Action Plan was adopted as presented.

Resolution #15-206

SEQR Decision-Nicorele, LLC and Elerion LLC Annexation Petition: Attorney Taylor said that at the November 5th meeting the Town Board declared the EAF was complete and there was enough information on the EAF Part I to make a determination on EAF Part 2.

Town Clerk, Janet Aaron read each question and polled each member of the Board for each question on the Full Environmental Assessment Form Part 2. Each Town Board answered each question below affirmatively.

Full Environmental Assessment Form
Part 2 - Identification of Potential Project Impacts

Agency Use Only [If applicable]
 Project : _____
 Date : 11/19/2015

Part 2 is to be completed by the lead agency. Part 2 is designed to help the lead agency inventory all potential resources that could be affected by a proposed project or action. We recognize that the lead agency's reviewer(s) will not necessarily be environmental professionals. So, the questions are designed to walk a reviewer through the assessment process by providing a series of questions that can be answered using the information found in Part 1. To further assist the lead agency in completing Part 2, the form identifies the most relevant questions in Part 1 that will provide the information needed to answer the Part 2 question. When Part 2 is completed, the lead agency will have identified the relevant environmental areas that may be impacted by the proposed activity.

If the lead agency is a state agency and the action is in any Coastal Area, complete the Coastal Assessment Form before proceeding with this assessment.

Tips for completing Part 2:

- Review all of the information provided in Part 1.
- Review any application, maps, supporting materials and the Full EAF Workbook.
- Answer each of the 18 questions in Part 2.
- If you answer "Yes" to a numbered question, please complete all the questions that follow in that section.
- If you answer "No" to a numbered question, move on to the next numbered question.
- Check appropriate column to indicate the anticipated size of the impact.
- Proposed projects that would exceed a numeric threshold contained in a question should result in the reviewing agency checking the box "Moderate to large impact may occur."
- The reviewer is not expected to be an expert in environmental analysis.
- If you are not sure or undecided about the size of an impact, it may help to review the sub-questions for the general question and consult the workbook.
- When answering a question consider all components of the proposed activity, that is, the "whole action".
- Consider the possibility for long-term and cumulative impacts as well as direct impacts.
- Answer the question in a reasonable manner considering the scale and context of the project.

1. Impact on Land Proposed action may involve construction on, or physical alteration of, the land surface of the proposed site. (See Part 1. D.1) <i>If "Yes", answer questions a - j. If "No", move on to Section 2.</i>		<input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may involve construction on land where depth to water table is less than 3 feet.	E2d	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may involve construction on slopes of 15% or greater.	E2f	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may involve construction on land where bedrock is exposed, or generally within 5 feet of existing ground surface.	E2a	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may involve the excavation and removal of more than 1,000 tons of natural material.	D2a	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may involve construction that continues for more than one year or in multiple phases.	D1e	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. The proposed action may result in increased erosion, whether from physical disturbance or vegetation removal (including from treatment by herbicides).	D2e, D2q	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. The proposed action is, or may be, located within a Coastal Erosion hazard area.	B1i	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Other impacts: Comment on #1f. Councilor Brace said no due to strategies outlined in EAF Part 1		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. Impact on Geological Features

The proposed action may result in the modification or destruction of, or inhibit access to, any unique or unusual land forms on the site (e.g., cliffs, dunes, minerals, fossils, caves). (See Part 1. E.2.g) NO YES

If "Yes", answer questions a - c. If "No", move on to Section 3.

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. Identify the specific land form(s) attached: _____ _____	E2g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may affect or is adjacent to a geological feature listed as a registered National Natural Landmark. Specific feature: _____	E3c	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. Impacts on Surface Water

The proposed action may affect one or more wetlands or other surface water bodies (e.g., streams, rivers, ponds or lakes). (See Part 1. D.2, E.2.h) NO YES

If "Yes", answer questions a - l. If "No", move on to Section 4.

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may create a new water body.	D2b, D1h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may result in an increase or decrease of over 10% or more than a 10 acre increase or decrease in the surface area of any body of water.	D2b	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may involve dredging more than 100 cubic yards of material from a wetland or water body.	D2a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may involve construction within or adjoining a freshwater or tidal wetland, or in the bed or banks of any other water body.	E2h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may create turbidity in a waterbody, either from upland erosion, runoff or by disturbing bottom sediments.	D2a, D2h	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. The proposed action may include construction of one or more intake(s) for withdrawal of water from surface water.	D2c	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. The proposed action may include construction of one or more outfall(s) for discharge of wastewater to surface water(s).	D2d	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. The proposed action may cause soil erosion, or otherwise create a source of stormwater discharge that may lead to siltation or other degradation of receiving water bodies.	D2e	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i. The proposed action may affect the water quality of any water bodies within or downstream of the site of the proposed action.	E2h	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j. The proposed action may involve the application of pesticides or herbicides in or around any water body.	D2q, E2h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. The proposed action may require the construction of new, or expansion of existing, wastewater treatment facilities.	D1a, D2d	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

1. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----------------------------------	--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

4. Impact on groundwater

The proposed action may result in new or additional use of ground water, or may have the potential to introduce contaminants to ground water or an aquifer. NO YES
 (See Part I. D.2.a, D.2.c, D.2.d, D.2.p, D.2.q, D.2.t)
 If "Yes", answer questions a - h. If "No", move on to Section 5.

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may require new water supply wells, or create additional demand on supplies from existing water supply wells.	D2c	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Water supply demand from the proposed action may exceed safe and sustainable withdrawal capacity rate of the local supply or aquifer. Cite Source: _____	D2c	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may allow or result in residential uses in areas without water and sewer services.	D1a, D2c	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may include or require wastewater discharged to groundwater.	D2d, E2l	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may result in the construction of water supply wells in locations where groundwater is, or is suspected to be, contaminated.	D2c, E1f, E1g, E1h	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. The proposed action may require the bulk storage of petroleum or chemical products over ground water or an aquifer.	D2p, E2l	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. The proposed action may involve the commercial application of pesticides within 100 feet of potable drinking water or irrigation sources.	E2h, D2q, E2l, D2c	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Other impacts: <u>Comment on #4.g. Councilor Howard said no impact according to EAF</u> _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5. Impact on Flooding

The proposed action may result in development on lands subject to flooding. NO YES
 (See Part I. E.2)
 If "Yes", answer questions a - g. If "No", move on to Section 6.

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may result in development in a designated floodway.	E2i	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may result in development within a 100 year floodplain.	E2j	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may result in development within a 500 year floodplain.	E2k	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may result in, or require, modification of existing drainage patterns.	D2b, D2e	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may change flood water flows that contribute to flooding.	D2b, E2i, E2j, E2k	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. If there is a dam located on the site of the proposed action, is the dam in need of repair, or upgrade?	E1c	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

g. Other impacts: <u>Comment #5.d. Councilor Howard addressed EAF, Councilor Brace said it was actually an improvement.</u>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--	--------------------------	--------------------------

6. Impacts on Air
 The proposed action may include a state regulated air emission source. NO YES
 (See Part 1. D.2.f., D.2.h, D.2.g)
 If "Yes", answer questions a - f. If "No", move on to Section 7.

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. If the proposed action requires federal or state air emission permits, the action may also emit one or more greenhouse gases at or above the following levels: i. More than 1000 tons/year of carbon dioxide (CO ₂) ii. More than 3.5 tons/year of nitrous oxide (N ₂ O) iii. More than 1000 tons/year of carbon equivalent of perfluorocarbons (PFCs) iv. More than .045 tons/year of sulfur hexafluoride (SF ₆) v. More than 1000 tons/year of carbon dioxide equivalent of hydrochloroflourocarbons (HFCs) emissions vi. 43 tons/year or more of methane	D2g D2g D2g D2g D2g D2h	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may generate 10 tons/year or more of any one designated hazardous air pollutant, or 25 tons/year or more of any combination of such hazardous air pollutants.	D2g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may require a state air registration, or may produce an emissions rate of total contaminants that may exceed 5 lbs. per hour, or may include a heat source capable of producing more than 10 million BTU's per hour.	D2f, D2g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may reach 50% of any of the thresholds in "a" through "c", above.	D2g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may result in the combustion or thermal treatment of more than 1 ton of refuse per hour.	D2s	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

7. Impact on Plants and Animals
 The proposed action may result in a loss of flora or fauna. (See Part 1. E.2. m.-q.) NO YES
 If "Yes", answer questions a - j. If "No", move on to Section 8.

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may cause reduction in population or loss of individuals of any threatened or endangered species, as listed by New York State or the Federal government, that use the site, or are found on, over, or near the site.	E2o	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may result in a reduction or degradation of any habitat used by any rare, threatened or endangered species, as listed by New York State or the federal government.	E2o	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may cause reduction in population, or loss of individuals, of any species of special concern or conservation need, as listed by New York State or the Federal government, that use the site, or are found on, over, or near the site.	E2p	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may result in a reduction or degradation of any habitat used by any species of special concern and conservation need, as listed by New York State or the Federal government.	E2p	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

e. The proposed action may diminish the capacity of a registered National Natural Landmark to support the biological community it was established to protect.	E3c	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. The proposed action may result in the removal of, or ground disturbance in, any portion of a designated significant natural community. Source: _____	E2n	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. The proposed action may substantially interfere with nesting/breeding, foraging, or over-wintering habitat for the predominant species that occupy or use the project site.	E2m	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. The proposed action requires the conversion of more than 10 acres of forest, grassland or any other regionally or locally important habitat. Habitat type & information source: _____	E1b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Proposed action (commercial, industrial or recreational projects, only) involves use of herbicides or pesticides.	D2q	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j. Other impacts: _____		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

8. Impact on Agricultural Resources			
The proposed action may impact agricultural resources. (See Part 1. E.3.a. and b.)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
<i>If "Yes", answer questions a - h. If "No", move on to Section 9.</i>			
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may impact soil classified within soil group 1 through 4 of the NYS Land Classification System.	E2c, E3b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may sever, cross or otherwise limit access to agricultural land (includes cropland, hayfields, pasture, vineyard, orchard, etc).	E1a, E1b	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may result in the excavation or compaction of the soil profile of active agricultural land.	E3b	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may irreversibly convert agricultural land to non-agricultural uses, either more than 2.5 acres if located in an Agricultural District, or more than 10 acres if not within an Agricultural District.	E1b, E3a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may disrupt or prevent installation of an agricultural land management system.	E1 a, E1b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. The proposed action may result, directly or indirectly, in increased development potential or pressure on farmland.	C2c, C3, D2e, D2d	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. The proposed project is not consistent with the adopted municipal Farmland Protection Plan.	C2c	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. Other impacts: _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

9. Impact on Aesthetic Resources

The land use of the proposed action are obviously different from, or are in sharp contrast to, current land use patterns between the proposed project and a scenic or aesthetic resource. (Part I, E.1.a, E.1.b, E.3.h.)

If "Yes", answer questions a - g. If "No", go to Section 10.

NO YES

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. Proposed action may be visible from any officially designated federal, state, or local scenic or aesthetic resource.	E3h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may result in the obstruction, elimination or significant screening of one or more officially designated scenic views.	E3h, C2b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may be visible from publicly accessible vantage points: i. Seasonally (e.g., screened by summer foliage, but visible during other seasons) ii. Year round	E3h	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
d. The situation or activity in which viewers are engaged while viewing the proposed action is: i. Routine travel by residents, including travel to and from work ii. Recreational or tourism based activities	E3h E2q, E1c	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may cause a diminishment of the public enjoyment and appreciation of the designated aesthetic resource.	E3h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. There are similar projects visible within the following distance of the proposed project: 0-1/2 mile 1/2 -3 mile 3-5 mile 5+ mile	D1a, E1a, D1f, D1g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

10. Impact on Historic and Archeological Resources

The proposed action may occur in or adjacent to a historic or archaeological resource. (Part I, E.3.e, f. and g.)

If "Yes", answer questions a - e. If "No", go to Section 11.

NO YES

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may occur wholly or partially within, or substantially contiguous to, any buildings, archaeological site or district which is listed on or has been nominated by the NYS Board of Historic Preservation for inclusion on the State or National Register of Historic Places.	E3e	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may occur wholly or partially within, or substantially contiguous to, an area designated as sensitive for archaeological sites on the NY State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) archaeological site inventory.	E3f	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may occur wholly or partially within, or substantially contiguous to, an archaeological site not included on the NY SHPO inventory. Source: _____	E3g	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

d. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. If any of the above (a-d) are answered "Yes", continue with the following questions to help support conclusions in Part 3:			
i. The proposed action may result in the destruction or alteration of all or part of the site or property.	E3e, E3g, E3f	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. The proposed action may result in the alteration of the property's setting or integrity.	E3e, E3f, E3g, E1a, E1b	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. The proposed action may result in the introduction of visual elements which are out of character with the site or property, or may alter its setting.	E3e, E3f, E3g, E3h, C2, C3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

11. Impact on Open Space and Recreation
 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. NO YES
 (See Part 1. C.2.c, E.1.c., E.2.q.)
 If "Yes", answer questions a - e. If "No", go to Section 12.

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may result in an impairment of natural functions, or "ecosystem services", provided by an undeveloped area, including but not limited to stormwater storage, nutrient cycling, wildlife habitat.	D2e, E1b, E2h, E2m, E2o, E2n, E2p	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may result in the loss of a current or future recreational resource.	C2a, E1c, C2c, E2q	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may eliminate open space or recreational resource in an area with few such resources.	C2a, C2c, E1c, E2q	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may result in loss of an area now used informally by the community as an open space resource.	C2c, E1c	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

12. Impact on Critical Environmental Areas
 The proposed action may be located within or adjacent to a critical environmental area (CEA). (See Part 1. E.3.d) NO YES
 If "Yes", answer questions a - c. If "No", go to Section 13.

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may result in a reduction in the quantity of the resource or characteristic which was the basis for designation of the CEA.	E3d	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may result in a reduction in the quality of the resource or characteristic which was the basis for designation of the CEA.	E3d	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

13. Impact on Transportation
 The proposed action may result in a change to existing transportation systems. NO YES
 (See Part 1. D.2.j)
If "Yes", answer questions a - g. If "No", go to Section 14.

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. Projected traffic increase may exceed capacity of existing road network.	D2j	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may result in the construction of paved parking area for 500 or more vehicles.	D2j	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action will degrade existing transit access.	D2j	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action will degrade existing pedestrian or bicycle accommodations.	D2j	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may alter the present pattern of movement of people or goods.	D2j	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Other impacts: <u>Comments on #13 d. Councilors Howard and Brace both agreed that it would be an improvement</u>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

14. Impact on Energy
 The proposed action may cause an increase in the use of any form of energy. NO YES
 (See Part 1. D.2.k)
If "Yes", answer questions a - e. If "No", go to Section 15.

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action will require a new, or an upgrade to an existing, substation.	D2k	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action will require the creation or extension of an energy transmission or supply system to serve more than 50 single or two-family residences or to serve a commercial or industrial use.	D1f, D1q, D2k	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may utilize more than 2,500 MWhrs per year of electricity.	D2k	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may involve heating and/or cooling of more than 100,000 square feet of building area when completed.	D1g	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Other Impacts: _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

15. Impact on Noise, Odor, and Light
 The proposed action may result in an increase in noise, odors, or outdoor lighting. NO YES
 (See Part 1. D.2.m., n., and o.)
If "Yes", answer questions a - f. If "No", go to Section 16.

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may produce sound above noise levels established by local regulation.	D2m	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may result in blasting within 1,500 feet of any residence, hospital, school, licensed day care center, or nursing home.	D2m, E1d	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may result in routine odors for more than one hour per day.	D2o	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

d. The proposed action may result in light shining onto adjoining properties.	D2n	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may result in lighting creating sky-glow brighter than existing area conditions.	D2n, E1a	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Other impacts: <u>Comments #15a & c, Councilors Howard and Brace said small impact during Construction period, #15a. Councilor Brace said no due to statements in the EAF</u>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

16. Impact on Human Health			
The proposed action may have an impact on human health from exposure to new or existing sources of contaminants. (See Part 1.D.2.q., E.1. d. f. g. and h.) <i>If "Yes", answer questions a - m. If "No", go to Section 17.</i>		<input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action is located within 1500 feet of a school, hospital, licensed day care center, group home, nursing home or retirement community.	E1d	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The site of the proposed action is currently undergoing remediation.	E1g, E1h	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. There is a completed emergency spill remediation, or a completed environmental site remediation on, or adjacent to, the site of the proposed action.	E1g, E1h	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The site of the action is subject to an institutional control limiting the use of the property (e.g., easement or deed restriction).	E1g, E1h	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may affect institutional control measures that were put in place to ensure that the site remains protective of the environment and human health.	E1g, E1h	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. The proposed action has adequate control measures in place to ensure that future generation, treatment and/or disposal of hazardous wastes will be protective of the environment and human health.	D2t	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. The proposed action involves construction or modification of a solid waste management facility.	D2q, E1f	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. The proposed action may result in the unearthing of solid or hazardous waste.	D2q, E1f	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. The proposed action may result in an increase in the rate of disposal, or processing, of solid waste.	D2r, D2s	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. The proposed action may result in excavation or other disturbance within 2000 feet of a site used for the disposal of solid or hazardous waste.	E1f, E1g E1h	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. The proposed action may result in the migration of explosive gases from a landfill site to adjacent off site structures.	E1f, E1g	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l. The proposed action may result in the release of contaminated leachate from the project site.	D2s, E1f, D2r	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m. Other impacts: <u>Comments #16f, h, j, Councilor Howard said according to EAF, DEC will be involved especially if excavating below three feet. Need to hold feet to fire.</u>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

17. Consistency with Community Plans
 The proposed action is not consistent with adopted land use plans.
 (See Part 1. C.1, C.2. and C.3.)
 If "Yes", answer questions a - h. If "No", go to Section 18.

NO YES

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action's land use components may be different from, or in sharp contrast to, current surrounding land use pattern(s).	C2, C3, D1a E1a, E1b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action will cause the permanent population of the city, town or village in which the project is located to grow by more than 5%.	C2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action is inconsistent with local land use plans or zoning regulations.	C2, C2, C3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action is inconsistent with any County plans, or other regional land use plans.	C2, C2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may cause a change in the density of development that is not supported by existing infrastructure or is distant from existing infrastructure.	C3, D1c, D1d, D1f, D1d, E1b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. The proposed action is located in an area characterized by low density development that will require new or expanded public infrastructure.	C4, D2c, D2d D2j	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. The proposed action may induce secondary development impacts (e.g., residential or commercial development not included in the proposed action)	C2a	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. Other: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

18. Consistency with Community Character
 The proposed project is inconsistent with the existing community character.
 (See Part 1. C.2, C.3, D.2, E.3)
 If "Yes", answer questions a - g. If "No", proceed to Part 3.

NO YES

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may replace or eliminate existing facilities, structures, or areas of historic importance to the community.	E3e, E3f, E3g	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may create a demand for additional community services (e.g. schools, police and fire)	C4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may displace affordable or low-income housing in an area where there is a shortage of such housing.	C2, C3, D1f D1g, E1a	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may interfere with the use or enjoyment of officially recognized or designated public resources.	C2, E3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action is inconsistent with the predominant architectural scale and character.	C2, C3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Proposed action is inconsistent with the character of the existing natural landscape.	C2, C3 E1a, E1b E2g, E2h	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Attorney Taylor said in light of the answers that have been given by the Town Councilors and Town Supervisor, the Town Board can now adopt the resolution declaring a Negative Declaration.

Resolution #15-206

On a motion of Councilor Greenfield, seconded by Councilor Murray and with unanimous (5-0) affirmation of the Town Board, that based on the foregoing, and pursuant to SEQR's Regulations the Town Board hereby issues a Negative Declaration regarding the Nicorele, LLC and Elerion LLC Annexation Petition.

[Resolution Attached]

Resolution #15-207

Updates to Employee Handbook: Supervisor Sennett said that our HR support company, HR Public Sector has implemented the changes to the Employee Handbook for non-union employees that the Town Board discussed at the last meeting.

Janet Aaron, explained that the updates included eligibility for first year full time non-union employees to receive limited benefits including holiday, vacation, personal and sick leave pay. The changes would also provide eligibility for year round part time non-union employees to receive limited benefits including holiday, vacation, personal and sick leave pay. Updates were also added to the "Use of Communication Systems and Equipment", "Cash Management", "Social Media" and "Dispute Resolution Procedure" sections of the handbook.

Supervisor Sennett said that the Town Board would need to accept the updates so that the handbook can be submitted to the non-union employees for their comment. The final approval of the Town Board would be at the December 3rd meeting.

On a motion of Supervisor Sennett, seconded by Councilor Brace and with unanimous (5-0) affirmation of the Town Board, the updates to the employee handbook for the non-union employees were accepted and the Town Clerk was authorized to send the handbook to all non-union employees for their comments and to come back to the Town Board for their approval on December 3rd.

Resolution #15-208

Proposal From Matt Ingalls: Supervisor Sennett said that on Monday the Town Board and members of the Planning and Zoning Board met with Matt Ingalls of Ingalls Planning & Design. Now that the Comprehensive Plan has been adopted the Town Board needs to align the Zoning Code with the Plan. This is being addressed on two parallel courses. One is Town Planner, Howard Brodsky who is going to be looking at the Zoning Code in detail such as definitions, language, areas where there are consistent variances, and an alignment of the Zoning Code to the Comprehensive Plan to see where the weakness are. In addition, there are areas that need public input and more study. The Town Board has identified three of those areas. One area would be looking at the gateways, particularly the eastern gateway. She said we know the community does not want a big sports complex and we need to look at what the community does want. Another area is mining, looking at setbacks and possible compressing the size of the

mining district. And then last would be to have planning regarding our agriculture lands, open space and rural character. These areas will require additional community input.

Councilor Brace said there is a detailed proposal from Mr. Ingalls that includes a great deal of community involvement. To be successful, steering committees will need to be established and she encouraged anyone interested to participate in the future of the community. She said we are investing in the outcome of this process upfront by spending now for professional services to lead the Town in the right direction. That investment will pay back enormously over time. Councilor Brace read a letter of support from Bob Eggleston for this proposal. In the letter Mr. Eggleston was in support of hiring professional consultants. He said that a lot of hard work was done by volunteers in drafting the updated Town and Village Plan but now it was time to turn it over to qualified professionals to translate this into the appropriate zoning laws.

Supervisor Sennett said that we need community input so the Town Board knows what everyone is comfortable with. The zoning code will then be easier and less expensive to write.

Councilor Brace said that we need to integrate the Open Space Plan that is in the works. That is why the Open Space/Rural Character Preservation Planning component of these services will take a back seat to what can proceed right now. Councilor Howard said that is because the Open Space Plan has not been completed yet. When completed it will feed into the discussion on zoning. Councilor Brace said that Matt Ingalls stated that his services can be used more cost effectively because the people that are on the Open Space Committee understand what areas need to be preserved making his job easier to move forward.

Councilor Greenfield questioned if he is a facilitator? Supervisor Sennett said, yes. Supervisor Greenfield said he just received this proposal this afternoon. He said previously, Joel Russell who is an attorney facilitator with the original Comprehensive Plan and wrote the zoning for the 1996 Plan as well as the updated Plan in 2005. Supervisor Sennett said he is a form-based Planner. Councilor Greenfield said he thought the new Town Board members should be included in this decision. Supervisor Sennett said that they were invited to attend the Monday meeting with Mr. Ingalls.

Councilor Murray said that with a new Board coming in she believes it should be tabled tonight in order to meet with the new Board and bring them up to date. She said the new Board needs to have a discussion as they will be the ones working with it in the future.

Supervisor Sennett said she reached out to Rob Coville who was supposed to reach out to the other two and she believes that he did invite them to Monday's meeting. She said that Councilor Brace and Howard have met with the two Councilors where this was discussed, and a second meeting has been scheduled.

Councilor Brace said that the Board has invested a lot to move this forward.

Councilor Howard said that this has been tabled since June and if it is tabled again who knows where it will fall be on agenda in 2016. She also wants to see this moved forward because we need zoning and we need it soon.

Councilor Brace said this is not new to the Board. This has been discussed before. This is not making zoning changes, it is the development of ideas. The next stage will be zoning changes.

Councilor Murray said that she believes the fee of \$33,250 is high. She said that Matt Ingalls did a great job but she believes in an open meeting with the future Board members. Councilor Murray said she did not know that the future Board members had been invited.

Supervisor Sennett said she has met with the two new Councilors and so have Councilors Brace and Howard and that no one sensed any push back from them on this proposal. Councilor Brace said in fact she believes they are in favor of it. She said that this has been discussed and she believes this is a more refined proposal and she does not think it is an exorbitant proposal. The amount is about half of what was budgeted for this year let alone next year.

Supervisor Sennett said that it is not just a Town Board decision. She said that both the Planning and Zoning Boards are chomping at the bit to get going. They are totally in support of this approach and they were at the Monday meeting.

Councilor Brace said this has been discussed at several meetings and said she wants to move this Board forward.

Resolution #15-208

Councilor Brace made a motion to accept the proposal from Matt Ingalls of Ingalls Planning & Design (in the amount of \$33,250). Seconded by Councilor Howard.

Councilor Howard	Yes
Councilor Brace	Yes
Councilor Greenfield	No
Councilor Murray	No
Supervisor Sennett	Yes

Carried 3-2

Councilor Greenfield said he had nothing against Matt Ingalls and questioned if he will write the zoning code. He said that Joel Russell was a lawyer and he was confident that what he did would stand up in court.

Supervisor Sennett said this proposal is not to write the code. She said maybe an attorney will be the one to write the code. She said we are trying to establish the framework.

Announcements/Correspondence/Updates

▪ *Town Hall Closed 11/27 & 11/28/ Transfer Station Closed 11/27 open 11/28 & 11/29*

▪ *Salvation Army request for Ringing of the Bells for the 2015 Red Kettle Campaign:*

Supervisor Sennett said if anyone is interested in ringing the bells on Saturday or Sunday during the Dickens Christmas events they should contact the Chamber of Commerce.

▪*New Farmers Grant Fund Supporting Agribusiness:* Supervisor Sennett said that this \$1 Million dollar fund has been established by NYS to help support new and early-stage agricultural businesses across New York State. She said this is the second round for this funding.

▪*Solar Feasibility Assessment Report:* Supervisor Sennett said that the Board has been working for quite some time with the CNY Regional Planning and Development Board on the potential for a solar installation at the Transfer Station. She said that a south facing large array could be installed behind the gold building. The proposal is for 190 kw array for offsetting the electricity at the Transfer Station and also two major street lighting accounts. For next year the Regional Planning Board is looking for community solar. This year the Town of Skaneateles sponsored a solarize event at the end of September and we had the best turnout of any community in the County. There is a big demand for solar but some residents aren't able to do it because of trees around their home and some homes do not have the southern exposure. Community solar at the Transfer Station could be the perfect site. Supervisor Sennett showed a graph that showed solar output outpaces the solar usage. There are three different options in the proposal. One is direct purchase for \$522,500 for a potential savings of \$297,000. The second and third options would be working with third parties could save the town between \$295,000 and \$500,000 depending on pricing. The next step would be to sign a memorandum of understanding with the CNY Regional Planning and Development Board. Supervisor Sennett said she expects to receive the agreement shortly for review. Then the Regional Planning Board would issue an RFP. It would not commit the Town to anything. It would get the Town in line for doing something. She said this is very exciting and this plays in very nicely with the Climate Action Plan.

▪*Petition re: Drainage and Annexation:* Supervisor Sennett said that the letters received will be considered as the Board moves into the next decision on the annexation.

▪*Letter from Diane McCarron – re: Annexation project and expansion*

▪*Debbie Durr Letter re: Mottville and Rails to Trails:* Councilor Brace read the letter from Deb Durr which she states: *“I have recently become aware of crude, aggressive, and unkind statements on social media posted by a community member of Mottville. I am disappointed at such behavior and although we are fortunate to live in a country where free speech is a right, that right does not excuse statements of hate. This community member has also insinuated that they speak for the entire Hamlet of Mottville. They do not. I appreciate the Nature Trail, the children’s play area, the restoration of the one lane bridge and being a community member in the Town of Skaneateles living in the Hamlet of Mottville. I and others look forward to the Rails to Trails project continuing to make the area safer for walking and biking. Please do not let one person of aggression hamper a project that would bring even more beauty to the area and a sense of connection and community. Thank you for your time. Debbie Durr.*

Comments: Jim Lanning expressed his disappointment saying that previously he asked to join a meeting on the Ingalls proposal and was told it was a private meeting and that he could not attend. He said he wished he had been invited to the Monday Ingalls meeting saying that he is the Supervisor-Elect and expected Supervisor Sennett to reach out to him directly. Supervisor Sennett said she did reach out to Rob Coville and asked him to notify Jim Lanning and Dave Badami. Mr. Lanning said he was outraged that the Board is going forward with this proposal.

He said the public has not seen it and we don't know the dollar amount. He said that the Board is going to change and it is going to be a completely different makeup long before this process begins and this Board just obligated the future Board to a contract that they don't agree with. He said this was a major issue in the election. There are differing opinions on the extent to which zoning should be changed. He said the action of this Board is an outrage to the people who voted us in.

Referring to the meeting that Mr. Lanning could not attend, Councilor Brace said that she believes the Town Attorney could speak to the privileged nature of consultant services. Attorney Taylor said when the Board is interviewing for professional services that is outside the Open Meetings Law.

Jim Lanning questioned Attorney Taylor if the future Board would be obligated to this contract. Attorney Taylor said no, but also said that he has not seen a contract he has just seen this proposal. He said with any professional service you can dismiss and terminate at your pleasure.

Councilor Brace said that this is not about writing the laws, it is about evaluating and bringing public comment into the process to help the Board to define the future for our community. She said they haven't tied anyone's hands.

Jim Lanning questioned if the proposal was available to the public. Supervisor Sennett said yes. Jim Lanning questioned when the proposal became available. Supervisor Sennett said that they just received it today. Jim Lanning stated that the Board just received the proposal today and future Board members have not been brought up to speed on it and yet this Board adopted it. He said he finds that outrageous.

Councilor Brace said that this has been the focus of this Board for the last two years and she believes it was appropriate for this Board to move things forward.

Councilor Howard said this is something we have been working on for a long time. The wheels have been in motion for months. This is coming out of the Comprehensive Plan which took two years to adopt. She said the zoning needs to happen and we need to keep moving forward especially with all the development pressures in the community.

Jim Lanning said that all he is asking is to be involved in the discussion and that should have been made aware of it.

While Councilor Greenfield and Murray stated that they did not see the proposal until just before the meeting, Supervisor Sennett said that everything that is on the proposal was discussed at the Monday meeting.

Councilor Greenfield questioned the cost of the proposal. Supervisor Sennett reminded the Board that in October 2013 when Joel Russell came here for one meeting it cost the Village and Town \$7,000.

Councilor Brace said that Matt Ingalls will be out here meeting with the Board and public several times. She said that Phase One of the proposal is \$14,760 for looking at the Eastern Gateway Planning, \$6,810 for the Mining Review and \$10,780 for the Open Space/Rural Character Preservation Planning. With \$900 in mileage and expenses the total cost is \$33,250.

Gretchen Messer suggested that the Board put a date when the decision should be made to go with Ingalls. She also questioned why the Town Board did not put more focus on the New Farmers Grant Fund supporting Agribusiness saying that \$1 Million is a lot that a farmer could apply for. Supervisor Sennett said that Sue Murphy did notify the farmers market vendors. This is a pool of \$1 Million not a \$1 Million for each successful grant. The grants are for new farmers and will range from \$15,000 to a maximum of \$50,000. The Town would not be applying for these grants it was just an announcement.

Resolution #15-209

Budget Amendments/Adjustments: On a motion of Councilor Greenfield, seconded by Councilor Murray and with unanimous (5-0) affirmation of the Town Board the following budget amendments and adjustments were approved:

Budget Adjustments

General Fund

\$ 185.00	Increase	011104.01.004.00	Justice – C/E
\$ 185.00	Decrease	011104.01.004.67	Justice – C/E - Training
Additional expenses associated with Outstanding Expenses			
\$ 400.00	Increase	013554.01.004.58	Assessments – C/E - Legal
\$ 400.00	Decrease	019904.01.004.00	Contingency
Additional expenses associated with Assessment Challenges			
\$ 275.00	Increase	070204.01.004.00	Rec. Admin. – C/E
\$ 275.00	Decrease	070204.01.004.85	Rec. Admin. – C/E – Telephone
Cost of doing business			
\$ 750.00	Increase	071104.01.004.52	Summer Rec. – C/E – Supplies
\$ 750.00	Decrease	071104.01.004.51	Summer Rec. – C/E – Fields
Additional costs for walking path drainage			
\$ 18,120.00	Increase	090608.01.008.00	Medical Insurance – C/E
\$ 350.00	Increase	090408.01.008.00	Workers Comp. – C/E
\$ 18,470.00	Decrease	019904.01.004.00	Contingency
Adjustment to reflect where new employee was allocated for insurance, premium increase			

Abstract #15-22: On a motion of Councilor Greenfield, seconded by Councilor Murray and with unanimous (5-0) affirmation of the Town Board vouchers #1440-1529 were approved from the following funds:

General Fund:	\$52,737.14	Part Town:	\$ 6,353.20
---------------	-------------	------------	-------------

Highway:	\$ 9,597.12	Highway Part Town:	\$ 2,694.27
Lighting:	\$ 385.96	Water:	\$13,502.93
Sewer:	\$ 888.98	Water #5	\$ 135.09
T & A:	\$21,381.25	Sewer #6	\$ 228.27

Total: \$107,904.21

Executive Session: On a motion of Supervisor Sennett, seconded by Councilor Brace and with unanimous (5-0) affirmation of the Town Board the meeting was adjourned to Executive Session to discuss a personnel issue.

The meeting was returned to open session at 9:05 p.m.

Administrative Aide Assignment – Sue Murphy: In response to a request from Linda Wright, Town Assessor for assistance in her office, Supervisor Sennett made a motion, seconded by Councilor Murray and with unanimous (5-0) affirmation of the Town Board, to assign Sue Murphy, Administrative Aide to support the Assessor's Office part time.

Meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Respectively submitted,



Janet L. Aaron
Town Clerk

**RESOLUTION REGARDING DETERMINATION
OF ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE UNDER SEQR
FOR THE ANNEXATION OF PROPERTY LOCATED IN THE TOWN OF THE SKANEATELES TO THE
VILLAGE OF SKANEATELES**

NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR TYPE ONE ACTION

WHEREAS, on January 8, 2015, the Town Board of the Town of Skaneateles (the "**Town Board**") was presented with a Petition for the Annexation of Territory Adjoining the Village of Skaneateles in the Town of Skaneateles, Onondaga County, New York, (the "**Petition**"), attached hereto as **Exhibit A**, which Petition was submitted by Elerion, LLC and Niorele, LLC (collectively, the "**Applicant**"); and

WHEREAS, the Petition was submitted in accordance with New York Town Law ("**NY Town Law**") § 703(1), and was accompanied by a Full Environmental Assessment Form Part 1 ("**EAF Part 1**"), attached hereto as **Exhibit B**, pursuant to the regulations implementing the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("**SEQRA**"); and

WHEREAS, the Applicant requested that certain parcels of real property located at the intersection of Franklin Street and West Genesee Street, and more specifically identified as tax map parcel numbers 047.-01-24.0 and 047.-01-25.0 (the "**Property**") in the Town of Skaneateles be annexed to the Village of Skaneateles (the "**Annexation**"), as depicted on the plans and specifications attached as **Exhibit C**; and

WHEREAS, the Annexation requested by the Applicant is in connection with the Applicant's proposed development known as the "Mirbeau Gateway Project" (the "**Gateway Project**"), and together with the Annexation, collectively the "**Proposed Action**"), which Gateway Project includes: (1) converting an existing vacant building into office space, (2) constructing a new professional/medical office building with parking, (3) creating a driveway entrance off West Genesee Street, (4) creating walking paths, water features, and landscaped areas, (5) constructing six residential dwellings along Fuller Street, (6) donating land to the Village of Skaneateles for a pocket park area on the corner of West Genesee Street and Fuller Street, and (7) redesigning and enhancing the existing storm water management system; and

WHEREAS, on January 28, 2015, in accordance with NY Town Law §704(1), the Town Board caused a notice to be published in its official newspaper and on the Town Board's website, which notice stated that a joint hearing would be held by the Town Board and the Village Board of the Village of Skaneateles ("**Village Board**") on February 25, 2015; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with NY Town Law §705, on February 25, 2015, the Town Board and the Village Board held a joint hearing to hear testimony and receive evidence and information concerning the Petition and Proposed Action (the "**Joint Hearing**"). A transcript from the Joint Hearing is attached as **Exhibit D**; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to 6 NYCRR §617.4(9), the Gateway Project is classified as a Type I action under SEQRA because the Gateway Project occurs wholly or partially within, or is substantially contiguous to, a historic building, structure, facility, site or district or prehistoric site that is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The Applicant has identified the James and Lydia Canning Fuller House on the EAF Part 1 as the historic site; and

WHEREAS, because the Proposed Action is classified as a Type I action under SEQRA, a coordinated review with interested and involved agencies was required pursuant to 6 NYCRR §617.6(b)(2)(i); and

WHEREAS, in accordance with 6 NYCRR §617.6, on March 5, 2015, the Town Board passed a Resolution Declaring Its Intent to be Lead Agency with Regard to the State Environmental Quality Review Act, which resolution is attached **Exhibit E**; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with 6 NYCRR §617.6, by correspondence dated March 6, 2015 and March 11, 2015, the Town Board caused a (1) letter, (2) a copy of the EAF Part 1, (3) the Petition, (4) all drawings, plans and specifications related to the Gateway Project, and (5) Resolution Declaring Intent to Be Lead Agency to be mailed to the following interested and involved agencies, which letter requested consent from the agencies for the Town Board to act as the lead agency, and to respond within thirty (30) days: New York State Department of Transportation, New York State Historic Preservation Office, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, New York State Department of Health, Village of Skaneateles Zoning Board, Village of Skaneateles Planning Board, Town of Skaneateles Planning Board, Town of Skaneateles Zoning Board, Onondaga County Department of Transportation, Onondaga County Department of Health, Syracuse Onondaga County Planning Agency, Onondaga County Soil & Water Conservation District, Onondaga County Department of Law, Onondaga County Clerk, Department of Emergency Communications, City of Syracuse, City of Syracuse Water Department, Environmental Bulletin, Army Corps. of Engineers, Onondaga County Planning Board, Village of Skaneateles Mayor, and Village of Skaneateles Board of Trustees (collectively the "**Involved/Interested Agencies**"); and

WHEREAS, the Town Board received consents to serve as lead agency from the following Involved/Interested Agencies, and received no objections: Town of Skaneateles Planning Board, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, New York State Department of Transportation, Village of Skaneateles Zoning Board, Village of Skaneateles Board of Trustees, Mayor of Skaneateles, Mayor Hubbard, Onondaga County Health Department, Onondaga County Department of Law, Onondaga County Clerk, Department of the Army District, Corps. of Engineers, and New York State Department of Health, which consents are collectively attached at **Exhibit F**; and

WHEREAS, following the thirty (30) day period proscribed in 6 NYCRR §617.6, and after receiving no objections to the Town Board serving as the lead agency, on April 13, 2015, the

Town Board passed a Resolution Declaring itself Lead Agency with Regard to the State Environmental Quality Review Act, which resolution is attached as **Exhibit G**; and

WHEREAS, on April 13, 2015, the Town Board caused a letter to be sent to the Involved/Interested Agencies stating that the Town Board would serve as lead agency, and to notify the Involved/Interested Agencies that the Town Board would hold a public meeting on April 20, 2015 ("**First Work Session**"), which letter is attached **Exhibit H**, which public meeting would serve as a work session for the Town Board to conduct a detailed review of Full Environmental Assessment Form Part 2 ("**EAF Part 2**"), and to encourage the Involved/Interested Agencies to attend the public meeting; and

WHEREAS, on April 20, 2015, the Town Board, at the First Work Session, reviewed in detail the EAF Part 1 prepared by the Applicant, reviewed EAF Part 2, and identified areas where the Town Board required additional information in order to make a SEQR determination. The transcript from the First Work Session is attached as **Exhibit I**; and

WHEREAS, subsequent to the First Work Session, additional information was requested from the Applicant, specifically regarding water and sewer lines, traffic patterns, odors, storm water drainage and flooding, lighting, a group home, and the prior contamination and remediation that occurred on the Property; and

WHEREAS, on May 12, 2015, the Town Board held a second public meeting and work session ("**Second Work Session**"), which Second Work Session was held for the purpose of continuing to review EAF Part 2. It was determined that the Town Board would require additional information from the Applicant before a SEQR determination could be made. The transcript from the Second Work Session is attached as **Exhibit J**; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board received various letters, comments, input, and reports from the following Involved/Interested Agencies: New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, New York State Department of Transportation, Village of Skaneateles Zoning Board, Town of Skaneateles Planning Board, the New York State Historic Preservation Office, and the Village of Skaneateles, which letters, reports, and comments are collectively attached as **Exhibit K**; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board received various letters, comments, memorandums, presentations, input, and reports from members of the public, which information is collectively attached as **Exhibit L**; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with 6 NYCRR §617.6, the Town Board carefully considered, investigated, researched, and reviewed all comments, reports, letters, and concerns it received from the Interested/Involved Agencies, and members of the public relating to the Proposed Action; and

WHEREAS, between June 1, 2015 and October 26, 2015, the Town Board worked with the Applicant, the Applicant's environmental engineer, the Town of Skaneateles environmental engineer C&S Companies ("**C&S**"), and other professionals to obtain additional information specifically related to the storm water drainage system on the Gateway Project, and to address concerns regarding flooding; and

WHEREAS, on October 26, 2015, the Town Board held a third public meeting and work session ("**Third Work Session**") to address remaining concerns and questions regarding the Proposed Action, to request additional information from the Applicant, and to review EAF Part 2. The transcript from the Third Work Session is attached as **Exhibit M**; and

WHEREAS, on November 3, 2015, the Town Board declared it had all of the information it required to make a determination of significance regarding the Proposed Action, that the Petition submitted by the Applicant was complete as of November 3, 2015, and the Town Board now desires to determine the significance of the Proposed Action pursuant to SEQRA, 6 NYCRR § 617.7, and set forth its determination and its reasoning therefor, in this written resolution, pursuant to SEQRA, 6 NYCRR § 617.7(b)(4).

NOW, THEREFORE, the Town Board:

RESOLVES to adopt the following findings and determinations:

(I) The Town Board obtained substantial input and collaboration during the Joint Hearing, the First Work Session, the Second Work Session and the Third Work Session. These public information sessions were well attended and resulted in dialogue between the public and the Town Board, and resulted in requests for more information from the Applicant.

(II) In preparing this Resolution and negative declaration, the Town Board drew on its members' expertise, personal and professional experience, and knowledge of the Skaneateles community, as well as the following written documents and reports, among others: (1) Drainage report prepared by C&S (2) Traffic Operations Review prepared by GTS Consulting, (3) Memorandum submitted by the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board, (4) Letters from the New York State Department of Transportation, Department of Environmental Conservation, Historic Preservation Office, Village of Skaneateles Zoning Board, Village of Skaneateles, and (5) Letters, comments, memorandums, presentations, and input from members of the public. In adopting this Resolution, including its negative declaration, the Town Board duly considered the same documents and reports.

(III) In considering the Proposed Action, the Town Board recognizes that the Town of Skaneateles seeks to preserve, protect, and improve the environmental elements of and in the Skaneateles community and the Town Board took care to scrutinize the Proposed Action for any potential negative environmental impacts.

(IV) With regard to SEQR, the Town Board serves as Lead Agency for SEQR purposes. Accordingly, in accordance with 6 NYCRR § 617.7(b)(3), the Town Board has taken a deliberate and thorough review of the potential areas of environmental concern, as set forth in SEQR's Regulations, to determine if the Proposed Action may have a significant adverse impact on the environment.

(V) In accordance with SEQR's Regulations, 6 NYCRR § 617.7(b):

(a) The Town Board has considered the Proposed Action in the context of the definitions regarding "actions" contained in SEQRA, 6 NYCRR § 617.2(b) and 6 NYCRR § 617.3(g). As set forth herein above, the Proposed Action is the Town Board's review of the Annexation and the Gateway Project.

(b) The Town Board reviewed the EAF Part I submitted by the Applicant. Furthermore, the Town Board held three public work sessions, noticed and open to the public, on April 20, 2015, May 12, 2015 and October 26, 2015, to review and complete EAF Part 2, a copy of which is attached hereto as **Exhibit N**. As set forth in the NY Department of Environmental Conservation's "SEQR Handbook" ("**SEQR Handbook**"), EAF Part 2 assists lead agencies in identifying major environmental categories, major environmental impacts, and potential magnitudes of such environmental impacts (SEQR Handbook, page 74). The Town Board recognizes that the EAF Part 2's content is derived from SEQR's regulations regarding the criteria for determining significance contained in SEQRA, 6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1). During its three public work sessions, the Town Board thoroughly reviewed and considered each and every category set forth in the EAF Part 2 to determine whether the Proposed Action may have a significant adverse impact on the environment. In completing such review of the categories in the EAF Part 2, the Town Board also reviewed and considered each and every indicator of significance set forth in SEQRA, 6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1). The following is the Town Board's reasoned elaboration for its responses to the categories/indicators of the EAF Part 2 and SEQRA, 6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1). The following also serves as, and satisfies, the Town Board's completion of the procedure outlined in part 3 of the EAF ("**EAF Part 3**"), which is to explain why a particular element of the Proposed Action will not result in a significant adverse environmental impact.

(1) **Impact on Land (6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1)(viii))**. EAF Part 2, Section 1, asks the Town Board to consider whether the Proposed Action may involve construction on, or physical alteration of the land surface of the proposed site. The answer to Section 1 is **YES**, thus the Town Board must consider the questions listed in (a)-(h) to Section 1. The Town Board answered "*No, or small impact may occur*" for all of the questions listed in Section 1, (a)-(h). In reaching this determination, the Town Board considered input from all of the Involved/Interested Agencies, members of the public, and C&S. The Town Board also relied on the Petition and EAF Part 1 submitted by the Applicant. In particular, the Town Board acknowledged the following with respect to (a), (b), (e), and (f): (a) The Proposed action may involve construction on land where the depth to water table is less than 3 feet, but that a small impact may occur or be likely; (b) The Proposed Action may involve construction on slopes of

15% or greater, but that a small impact may occur in light of the retaining walls to be used; (e) The Proposed Action may involve construction that continues for more than one year in multiple phases but that a small impact may occur in light of the small scale of construction; and (f) C&S recommends the use of silt fences and other erosion control methods during construction mitigating any erosion concerns during the construction phase; moreover, the Applicant has stated that it will not be using herbicides or pesticides.

(2) **Impacts on Geological Features (6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1)(ii)).** The Town Board considered the Proposed Action's goals and objectives and determined that there would be **NO** significant adverse environmental impact from the Proposed Action on geological features because there was no evidence submitted to indicate that the Proposed Action would result in the modification or destruction of, or inhibit access to, any unique or unusual land forms on the site (e.g., cliffs, dunes, minerals, fossils, caves).

(3) **Impacts on Surface Water (6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1)(i)).** The Town Board considered the Proposed Action's goals and objectives with regard to this category and determined there would be **NO** significant adverse environmental impact from the Proposed Action, as the Proposed Action does not propose any adverse change to surface water resources. In reaching this conclusion, the Town Board discussed whether the Proposed Action would affect one or more wetlands or other surface water bodies such as streams, rivers, ponds or lakes, and determined that the Proposed Action would not affect these water bodies. In reaching this determination, the Town Board considered input from all of the Involved/Interested Agencies, members of the public, and C&S. The Town Board also relied on the Petition and EAF Part 1 submitted by the Applicant. To the extent the retention pond is modified as proposed by the Applicant, the Town Board relies upon the advice of C&S to determine that the retention pond is capable of handling a one hundred year flood event, and is sized for the entire drainage area, including Mirbeau and the Town of Skaneateles (expected storm water run-off from Genesee Street will be diverted and excluded from this drainage). Also the Town Board relies upon the advice of the Village of Skaneateles that no new or expanded wastewater treatment facility would be required by the Proposed Action. Finally, the Town Board relies upon the representation and warranty provided by Gary Dower on behalf of the Applicant and the neighboring property (Mirbeau) that a Drainage Agreement with the Town, as outlined by Mr. Dower in his public statement at the Third Work Session, will be consummated prior to the commencement of any construction on the Property.

(4) **Impact on Groundwater (6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1)(i)).** The Town Board considered the Proposed Action's goals and objectives with regard to this category extensively, and spent several months reviewing environmental engineering reports, speaking with environmental engineers, and considering input from the Involved/Interested Agencies, members of the public, and the Applicant. The Town Board answered "**YES**" to whether the Proposed Action may result in new or additional use of ground water, or may have the potential to introduce contaminants to the ground water or aquifer, thus the Town Board must consider and answer questions (a)-(h) to Section 4. The Town Board answered "*No, or small impact may occur*" for all of the questions listed in (a)-(h) of Section 4. In reaching this

determination, the Town Board considered input from all of the Involved/Interested Agencies, members of the public, and C&S. The Town Board also relied on the Petition and EAF Part 1 submitted by the Applicant. In the particular, the Town Board acknowledged the following with respect to (h): (h) The Proposed Action is occurring on a former contaminated spill site, which site has been remediated in accordance with DEC regulations and guidelines. The excavation occurring on the Property may have the potential to introduce contaminants into the groundwater, but the impact will be small because in the event further contamination is discovered, the Applicant is required to immediately cease all work, and the DEC is required to inspect the site and advise the Applicant regarding further remediation. The Town Board recognizes that when construction commences on the Property, the Gateway Project may either confirm that the site has been remediated, or indicate that further remediation is necessary and that construction will be halted until such remediation is accomplished.

(5) **Impact on Flooding (6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1)(i)).** The Town Board considered the Proposed Action's goals and objectives with regard to this category very carefully, and requested further information from the C&S, the Applicant, the Applicant's engineer, members of the public, and Involved/Interested Agencies regarding the impact the Proposed Action may have on lands subject to flooding. The Town Board spent several months reviewing reports, letters, and receiving comments from environmental engineers. The Town Board answered "YES" to whether the Proposed Action may result in development on lands subject to flooding, thus the Town Board must consider questions (a)-(g) to Section 5. The Town Board answered "*No, or small impact may occur*" for all of the questions listed in Section 5, (a)-(g). In reaching this determination, the Town Board considered input from all of the Involved/Interested Agencies, members of the public, and C&S. The Town Board also relied on the Petition and EAF Part 1 submitted by the Applicant. As noted above, to the extent the retention pond is modified as proposed by the Applicant, the Town Board relies upon the advice of C&S to determine that the retention pond is capable of handling a one hundred year flood event, and is sized for the entire drainage area, including Mirbeau and the Town of Skaneateles. In particular, the Town Board acknowledged the following with respect to (d) and (e): (d) The Proposed Action may result in or require modification of existing drainage patterns, but the impact is small, and in fact the existing drainage patterns will be greatly improved by the Proposed Action and the Drainage Agreement; and (e) The Proposed Action may change flood water flows that contribute to flooding, but the impact is small, and again, the flood water flows will be greatly improved by the Proposed Action.

(6) **Impacts on Air (6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1)(i)).** The Town Board discussed the Proposed Action's impact on air and whether the Proposed Action may include a state regulated air emission source. The Town Board concluded that there was **NO** evidence in the record to indicate that the Proposed Action would have a significant adverse environmental impact on air.

(7) **Impact on Plants and Animals (6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1)(ii)).** The Town Board considered the Proposed Action's impact on plants and animals, and whether the Proposed Action may result in a loss or destruction to vegetation or fauna. The Town Board considered

the Proposed Action's plans for residential and commercial development on the Property. The Town Board concluded that the Proposed Action would **NOT** have a significant adverse environmental impact on plants and animals, while recognizing that any development will have some impact on plants or animals. In reaching this determination, the Town Board considered input from all of the Involved/Interested Agencies, members of the public, and C&S (who confirmed that there are no threatened or endangered plants or animals on the Property). The Town Board also relied on the Petition and EAF Part 1 submitted by the Applicant.

(8) **Impact on Agricultural Resources (6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1)(vii))**. The Town Board considered the Proposed Actions impact on agricultural resources. The Town Board concluded that there was **NO** evidence in the record that the Proposed Action would have a significant adverse environmental impact on agricultural resources.

(9) **Impact on Aesthetic Resources (6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1)(v))**. The Town Board considered the Proposed Action's impact on aesthetic resources, and whether the land use of the Proposed Action is different from, or is in sharp contrast to, current land use patterns between the proposed project and a scenic or aesthetic resource. The Town Board further recognized that the Proposed Action does not call for changes in aesthetics that are markedly different from the current aesthetic resources in the community, and in fact the Proposed Action would actually improve aesthetics of the community, by providing similar housing units and bringing a currently vacant building back into productive use. Accordingly, the Town Board concluded that the Proposed Action would **NOT** have a significant adverse effect on the environment regarding aesthetic resources.

(10) **Impact on Historical and Archeological Resources (6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1)(viii))**. The Town Board considered whether the Proposed Action may occur in or adjacent to a historic or archaeological resource. The Proposed Action does occur adjacent to the James and Lydia Canning Fuller House. The Town Board answered "YES" to this Section 10, thus the Town Board must consider questions (a)-(e) to Section 10. The Town Board answered "*No, or small impact may occur*" for all of the questions listed in Section 10, (a)-(e). There was no evidence in the record from or on behalf of the James and Lydia Canning Fuller House as to any objection to the Proposed Action.

(11) **Impact on Open Space and Recreation (6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1)(viii))**. The Town Board discussed whether 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. The Proposed Action does not suggest that open or recreational space be diminished. On the contrary, the Proposed Action includes the development of a pocket park and walking trails, which will be dedicated to the Village of Skaneateles. Thus, the Town Board concluded that the Proposed Action would **NOT** have a significant adverse impact on the environment with regard to open space and recreation.

(12) **Impact on Critical Environmental Areas (6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1)(iii))**. The Town Board determined that there would be **NO** significant adverse environmental impacts on

Critical Environmental Areas ("CEA") because there are no CEAs in the geological area covered by the Proposed Action.

(13) **Impact on Transportation (6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1)(ix)).** The Town Board considered the Proposed Action's goals and objectives with regard to transportation, and whether the Proposed Action may result in a change to existing transportation systems. The Town Board received substantive comments from the New York State Department of Transportation (which letter is attached on **Exhibit K**). The New York State Department of Transportation suggested that the Town Board obtain a drainage analysis, and obtain an explanation of traffic volumes being generated by the Proposed Action. The Town Board's interpretation is that the commercial traffic intersections on Genesee Street are more appropriate to the residential community, rather than such connections to Fuller Street (in contrast to the suggestions by the NYS Department of Transportation). The New York State Department of Transportation advised the Town Board that these concerns would be properly considered by the Village Planning Board. The Town Board answered "YES" to this Section 13, and must consider questions (a)-(f). Based on a thorough review of the comments submitted by the New York State Department of Transportation, a Traffic Operations Review submitted by GTS Consulting, other Involved/Interested Agencies, members of the public, and C&S, the Town Board determined that to the extent the Proposed Action affected transportation, there would be no significant adverse environmental impact. The Town Board answered "*No or small impact may occur*" with regard to questions (a)-(f).

(14) **Impact on Energy (6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1)(vi)).** The Town Board discussed the Proposed Action's impact on energy and whether the Proposed Action may cause an increase in the use of any form of energy. The Town Board requested further information from the Applicant and C&S regarding this question. C&S did not identify any potential significant adverse environmental impact regarding energy from the Proposed Action, however, as the Proposed Action includes building a medical building and adding residential housing, there would be an impact on energy, thus the Town Board must consider questions (a)-(e) to Section 14. The Town Board answered "*No, or small impact may occur*" for all of the questions listed in Section 14, (a)-(e). In reaching this determination, the Town Board considered input from various involved/interested agencies and from members of the public. In reaching this determination, the Town Board considered input from all of the Involved/Interested Agencies, members of the public, and C&S. The Town Board also relied on the Petition and EAF Part 1 submitted by the Applicant. In the particular, the Town Board acknowledged the following with respect to (h): (h) The Town Board specifically considered a letter from the Village of Skaneateles, specifically addressed the issue of energy and costs, attached as **Exhibit O**. The letter stated there would be no impact or unusual increases to energy as a result of the Proposed Action.

(15) **Impact on Noise, Odor, and Light (6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1)(i)).** The Town Board considered the Proposed Action's impact on noise, odor, and light and whether the Proposed Action may result in an increase in noise, odors, or outdoor lighting. Due to the nature of the Proposed Action, the Town Board answered "YES" to Section 15, and thus must considered

questions (a)-(f). The Town Board considered the impact the construction and operation of a medical building and residential units would have on noise, odor and light. In its discussions, the Town Board considered on the Applicant's Petition and EAF Part 1, the Involved/Interested Agencies and members of the public. The Town Board answered "*No, or small impact may occur*" for all questions in listed in Section 15 (a)-(f). The Town Board recognizes that during construction of the Gateway Project, there may be temporary increases in noise, but that such impact is expected to be small. The construction activities would also occur largely during normal construction season and during normal working hours. The Applicant has assured the Town Board that the lighting from the buildings erected on the Property will be directed away from the residential areas near the Property. In reaching this determination, the Town Board considered input from all of the Involved/Interested Agencies, members of the public, and C&S. The Town Board also relied on the Petition and EAF Part 1 submitted by the Applicant.

(16) **Impact on Human Health (6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1)(vii)).** The Town Board discussed the Proposed Action's impact on human health and whether the Proposed Action may have an impact on human health from exposure to new or existing sources of contaminants. The Town Board answered "YES" to Section 16, thus the Town Board must consider questions (a)-(m) to Section 16. In considering the questions presented, the Town Board sought input and guidance from the Involved/Interested Agencies and members of the public. Specifically, the Town Board reviewed the input and guidance it received from the NYS DEC regarding the contaminant spill remediation that had been completed on the Property. The DEC advised that it reserves the right to require remediation cleanup at a spill location in the vicinity of 108 West Genesee Street if excavation of deeper than three feet is proposed. Because the NYS DEC did not place any institutional controls on the property, and simply reserves the right require further remediation and cleanup, the Town Board was able to answer "*No or small impact may occur*" in questions (a)-(m) to Section 16. Furthermore, in the event contaminants or hazardous materials are discovered during construction on the Property, the NYS DEC shall cause the construction to be stopped, and the Property to be remediated under the NYS DEC's guidance and supervision. With regard to question (d) to Section 16, the Town Board relies upon the Applicant's representation at the Third Work Session that the Applicant will bear the cost and expense of relocating the existing water line easement, which is presently located on the Property, where the proposed residential units will be constructed. C&S has also indicated that the relocation of the water line may result in improved water pressure, but will be designed to prevent any negative impacts on water quality or pressure. With regard to question (i) to Section 16, the Town Board relies upon the letter from the Village of Skaneateles (attached as **Exhibit O**), that the Proposed Action will not result in a significant increase in the rate of disposal or processing of solid waste. In reaching this determination, the Town Board considered input from all of the Involved/Interested Agencies, including the NY DEC, members of the public, and C&S. The Town Board also relied on the Petition and EAF Part 1 submitted by the Applicant.

(17) **Consistency with Community Plans (6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1)(iv)).** The Town Board discussed the Proposed Action's consistency with other community plans. The Town Board recognized that it recently adopted a new Comprehensive Plan for the Town of

Skaneateles and further recognized that the Proposed Action is, for the most part, consistent with the goals and aspirations of the Comprehensive Plan, while acknowledging that the Proposed Action may induce secondary development impacts (though on a small scale). Accordingly, the Town Board concluded that the Proposed Action would **NOT** have a significant adverse impact on the environment with regard to community plans.

(18) **Consistency with Community Character (6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1)(v))**. The Town Board recognizes that one of the main goals of the new Comprehensive Plan was to preserve the Skaneateles community's character. Accordingly, while the Proposed Action involves future growth in one particular part of the Skaneateles community, the new Comprehensive Plan suggests that such growth be consistent with community character, that it takes place in areas targeted for such growth, and that it be completed in environmentally sustainable methods. For these reasons, the Town Board determined that the Proposed Action would **NOT** have a significant adverse impact on the environment with regard to community character. In fact, the residential units on the Property would seem to be in harmony with the Comprehensive Plan's goal for the Gateway Area. The Applicant has represented that the residential units will be sold for individual, residential, and private use, and will not be used as rental or commercial units.

(VI) In reaching the above-described conclusions, the Town Board considered reasonably related long-term, short-term, direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the Proposed Action, including other simultaneous or subsequent actions which are: (a) included in any long-range plan of which the Proposed Action is a part; (b) likely to be undertaken as a result thereof; or (c) dependent thereon. Furthermore, in reaching the above-described conclusions, the Town Board considered the significance of a likely consequence (i.e., whether it is material, substantial, large, or important) in connection with: (a) its setting (e.g., urban or rural); (b) its probability of occurrence; (c) its duration; (d) its irreversibility; (e) its geographic scope; (f) its magnitude; and (g) the number of people affected.

FURTHER RESOLVES, that based on the foregoing, and pursuant to SEQR's Regulations for determining the significance of an action, 6 NYCRR § 617.7, the Proposed Action, a Type I action under SEQR's Regulations, **will have no significant adverse environmental impacts** and, therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement, as that term is defined in SEQR's Regulations, is not required for the Proposed Action; and

FURTHER RESOLVES, that based on the foregoing, and pursuant to SEQR's Regulations, the Town Board hereby issues a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** with regard to the Proposed Action and pursuant to SEQR; and

FURTHER RESOLVES, in accordance with SEQR's Regulations concerning preparation of documents, 6 NYCRR § 617.12(a), that: (A) this Resolution, including its negative declaration, has been prepared in accordance with Article 8 of the NY Environmental Conservation Law; (B) the Lead Agency is the Town Board of the Town of Skaneateles with an address of 24 Jordan Street, Skaneateles, NY 13152; (C) Supervisor Mary Sennett, with an address of 24 Jordan Street, Skaneateles, NY 13152 and a phone number of 315-685-3473 can

provide additional information with regard to the Proposed Action; (D) the Proposed Action is the Town Board's finding that the Gateway Project will not have a significant adverse environmental impact on the environment; (E) the Proposed Action is classified under SEQR as a Type I action; and (F) the location of the Proposed Action is the entirety of the Town of Skaneateles, County of Onondaga, and State of New York and Village of Skaneateles, County of Onondaga, and State of New York; and

FURTHER RESOLVES, in accordance with SEQR's Regulations concerning filing and distribution of documents, 6 NYCRR § 617.12(b), that: (A) this Resolution, including its negative declaration, will be filed with the Town Board and the Village Board; and (B) the following documents concerning the Proposed Action will be maintained in files of the Town Clerk that are readily accessible to the public and made available upon request: all SEQR documents and notices, including without limitation, this Resolution, including its negative declaration, and the EAFs regarding the Gateway Project; and

FURTHER RESOLVES, in accordance with SEQR's Regulations concerning publication of notices, 6 NYCRR § 617.12(c), that notice of this Resolution's Type I negative declaration shall be published in the Environmental Notice Bulletin (the "ENB") and the Town Board's Attorney is directed to complete said publishing in the ENB.

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that at a meeting of the Town Board of the Town of Skaneateles held at the Skaneateles Town Hall, located at 24 Jordan Street in the Town of Skaneateles, County of Onondaga, and State of New York on the 20th day of November, 2015, the foregoing Resolution, **the Resolution Regarding Determination of Environmental Significance under SEQR for the Annexation of Property Located in the Town of Skaneateles to the Village of Skaneateles** was duly moved by Councilor Greenfield and seconded by Councilor Murray, a quorum of five members of the five-member Town Board being present, and each voted on the Resolution as follows:

Supervisor Mary Sennett	Yes
Councilor Connie Brace	Yes
Councilor Claire Howard	Yes
Councilor Jim Greenfield	Yes
Councilor Nancy Murray	Yes

The Resolution was, therefore, duly adopted.

Dated: November 19, 2015



Janet L. Aaron, Town Clerk, Town of Skaneateles