

July 12th, 2012

The regular meeting of the Town Board was held on Thursday, July 12th, 2012 with the following members present: Richard Rowland, Supervisor; Daniel Pemrick, Thomas Kinsella, Daniel Cochran and Walter E. Chandler, Councilmen. Also present was Town Counsel Mark Schachner and 7 residents.

The Board met as the Board of Health at 7:25 PM.

99 Wilsey Road - The Board opened an Unsafe Building Hearing for the property at 99 Wilsey Road. The house has been abandoned and there is an open in ground pool which is unsafe and is an imminent life, health and safety risk. Supervisor Rowland reviewed a report from the Code Enforcement Officer dated 7/11/2012. The report indicated that the pool cover that was lying around the side of the pool was installed. Although the Code Enforcement Officer felt that it would be a major deterrent for anyone trying to get in the pool, the NYS Building Code does not allow this style of pool cover as an acceptable pool barrier. The Code Enforcement Officer has informed the BAC Field Services representative and has forwarded copies of the Code to them. Chandler, C. questioned whether they would have to put up a fence to meet the Code. Supervisor Rowland stated that a temporary fence would only be sufficient for 90 days. The Code Enforcement Officer recommended that the Board consider granting a 30 day extension to bring the property into compliance, August 9th, 2012. Board members in agreement.

4422 & 4424 Route 9N - Supervisor Rowland stated that there has been no communication received at all regarding this property since the original notice was issued in April. The Lis Pendens has been filed. Supervisor Rowland reviewed the report from the Code Enforcement Officer dated 7/12/2012. The condition of the structures and property remains unchanged. Garbage is strewn all around the property, up to six feet deep around the perimeter of the structure. They are broken windows that have been somewhat boarded up. There are structural issues with both buildings. Supervisor Rowland stated that the original notice was sent to the owner of record, as well as Corelogic Corporation. It is believed that the property is in foreclosure and Corelogic was last known to be maintaining this property. Corelogic signed for the Certified Notice on April 18th, 2012. During a site inspection done by the Code Enforcement Officer in June, there was an inspection notice found on the rear door. He was able to verify that IPS – Inspection Processing Services was contracted by Corelogic to determine if the building was occupied. Board members in agreement that a letter should be sent giving them a deadline to bring the property into compliance or the Town will commence action.

RESOLUTION # 95 – 4422 & 4424 Route 9N Compliance Notice

Motion: Kinsella, C.

Seconded: Pemrick, C.

RESOLVED, That Certified Notices be sent to the Patricia & James Wolfe (property owners of record), Corelogic Corporation and IPS – Inspection Processing Services giving them 30 days from the date of the notice to bring the property into compliance or the Town will commence action and all expenses incurred will be assessed against the property.

VOTE: Ayes: Rowland, Pemrick, Kinsella, Cochran, Chandler

Noes: None

July 12th, 2012 continued

The regular meeting was called to order by the Supervisor at 7:35 PM and opened with the pledge to the flag. On motion of Cochran, C. and seconded by Chandler, C., the minutes of 6/14/2012 were approved as submitted by all Board members present.

Greenfield Fire District filed their 2011 Financial Report with the Town Clerk.

Prestwick Chase Water District - Supervisor Rowland stated that Prestwick Chase is looking to establish an internal water district to provide water for themselves in order to promote expansion of their facility. Town Counsel Schachner stated that the Town Board would have to consent to the formation of the water works corporation. There would be no commitment or any kind of obligation of the Town Board other than to review the rates that this water works corporation wishes to charge to its customers. Kinsella, C. asked on what basis the Board would review the rates. Town Counsel stated that all the Board would have to do is approve the proposed rates. They could obtain rates from similar corporations prior to approval if they wish to do so. Supervisor Rowland stated that it was his understanding that in order to charge for water this corporation has to be set up. In the next phase of development that they are going to apply for, they are going to charge their residents for water. They currently have a non-metered water system that is part of the rent. The next phase of apartment/townhouse style living will be charged individually. Mr. McNearly stated that currently they have a private water system. When they recently refinanced, the lending institution which was an insurance fund, wanted to make sure that they had proper utilities. Without a public water system they would have no guarantee when they were lending on this project so they encumbered all the vacant land. In order to get the land released so that they can finish developing the project, they have to form this public water works corporation. Town Counsel Schachner stated that after speaking with the attorney for Prestwick Chase it was his understanding that they were looking for a private water company and not public as Mr. McNearly just stated. Mr. McNearly stated that he was not sure of the proper legal terminology, however what they were looking to do was to provide water to their own property only. Cochran, C. asked if this would mean that they can not sell water to other neighbors. Mr. McNearly stated that they do not want to provide service to others. They are looking for offer water for their own property only.

RESOLUTION # 96 - Authorize Formation of a Private
Water Works Corporation for Prestwick Chase

Motion: Chandler, C.

Seconded: Pemrick, C.

WHEREAS, Prestwick Chase, Inc. owns 115 acres in the Town of Greenfield which currently has 190 residential apartment units in one building and 12 duplex units in six buildings and a water facility which provides water to the entire premises; and

WHEREAS, on May 16, 2012, Prestwick Chase, Inc. filed a petition requesting a water district and a Map, Plan & Report supporting a request for the formation of a Water-Works Corporation, Saratoga Boulevard, Inc., by ABD Engineers & Surveyors dated April 27, 2012, to serve the approximately 115 acres located in the Town and described therein; and

WHEREAS, Prestwick Chase requested approval by the Town to form a Water-Works Corporation consistent with the Map, Plan & Report; and

July 12th, 2012 continued

WHEREAS, the Town Board has considered this and supports the request.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Town Board of the Town of Greenfield hereby authorizes the formation of the proposed Water-Works Corporation consistent with the Map, Plan & Report, pursuant to Article 4 of the Transportation Corporation Law; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Town Board is hereby authorized to sign and acknowledge a consent to formation required by the Transportation Corporation Law Section 41 in form acceptable to the Town Supervisor and Town Counsel; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that such Water-Works Corporation shall have nonexclusive jurisdiction to provide pure and wholesome water to the portion of the Town of Greenfield detailed in such Map, Plan & Report; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that such Water-Works Corporation shall charge reasonable rates, which must be approved in advance by Resolution of the Greenfield Town Board; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Town Supervisor and Town Clerk are hereby authorized to sign any documents and take all actions necessary to effect this Resolution.

VOTE: Ayes: Rowland, Pemrick, Kinsella, Cochran, Chandler

Noes: None

Parks Advisory Committee Report – Supervisor Rowland stated that the Board had received a report from the committee outlining various aspects of all the parks. He added that they have made some recommendations and he believed that they are continuing to work on further recommendations. The group of volunteers have gone around and looked at the parks.

Ambulance Committee - Supervisor Rowland stated that the Board had received the following applications – Andrea Mann, Mike Chandler and Tim Kemp. Chandler, C. asked if it was necessary for the Board to conduct interviews since it was such a small group. He added that he spoke with Chief Lant and he felt that the 2 firemen that he recommended would be non-biased and work with the Town Board the best they could. Supervisor Rowland stated that he would really like to have a general Town's person on the committee. He hesitates to have such a weighted committee. Pemrick, C. stated that he has complete confidence in the ability of the individuals who have applied to be objective, however he felt that the Board needed to try to balance the committee more. He understood the desire to get this done as quickly as possible, however he did not believe that this process could be completed by budget time. He would like to take the time to find the additional people. Chandler, C. stated that the feel that he was getting from the community was that they would like to see this ready for budget time. Pemrick, C. suggested that he speak with these members of the community to see if they would be willing to serve on this committee. Supervisor Rowland stated that there will have to be a Town Board representative as well. Board members to continue to solicit more people to serve on the committee for the next meeting.

Town Hall Copy Machine - Supervisor Rowland stated that the current copy machine lease has expired. Town Clerk provided Board members with 2 lease proposals. The first one would be for a similar machine to what we currently lease. The cost per copy agreement would include parts, labor and supplies except paper and staples

July 12th, 2012 continued

for 5 k copies per month for \$166.00. Copies over 5 k would be charged at .015 per copy. The second proposal is for a color copier with all the same features, including 5 k black/white copies per month. Additional black/white copies would be charged at .015 per copy and all color copies would be charged at .055 per copy. We would have the capability of connecting to the computer network, as well as wireless print options. It would also be possible to scan, fax and email from the machine. Kinsella, C. did not believe the wireless option was necessary since not all the computers had wireless capabilities. He felt that little by little we should start phasing out the ink jet printers.

RESOLUTION # 97 - Approve Copy Machine Lease Agreement

Motion: Cochran, C.

Seconded: Kinsella, C.

RESOLVED, That the Town Board hereby approves the proposed Cost Per Copy Lease Agreement with Electronic Office Products for the Toshiba e-Studio 3040c Color Digital Printer/Copier at the cost of \$220 per month.

VOTE: Ayes: Rowland, Pemrick, Kinsella, Cochran, Chandler

Noes: None

Zoning Board of Appeals Referrals – Supervisor Rowland stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals supplied the Town Board with information regarding three items that they would like the Board to review and/or take action on. The first item was regarding an Area Variance for frontage. It has come to the attention of the Code Enforcement Officer that there is a NYS law that requires the Town to establish an “open development area” in order to grant variances for pre-existing, non-conforming parcels with no frontage. Town Counsel stated that he was very familiar with the section of the law that they are referring to. This section of the law does state that road frontage is required for the creation of lots. If the lot does not have frontage the applicant needs to seek a variance from that provision. Town Counsel Schachner stated that he just read the minutes of the ZBA meeting and he was not sure exactly what the question was regarding this application. He would speak with them to clarify the situation. Supervisor Rowland stated that the second item had to do with the Hobby Farming regulations. The regulations require that an applicant must comply with all zoning requirements in their zone. In addition, there is no mention as to required acreage or whether an applicant would be allowed a total of 44 animals or some other combination of total number of animals. Kinsella, C. asked if what they were saying was that if there was a pre-existing non-conforming lot that did not have the required frontage for that particular zone, they would not be able to have a hobby farm. Supervisor Rowland believed that was the question. Supervisor Rowland stated that the last item had to do with frontage requirements for a Cluster Development. The regulations allow for a reduction in lot size, minimum requirement for front and rear yard setbacks, and require the side yard setbacks to remain the same as the underlying district. However, there is no mention of frontage. Town Counsel Schachner will review the items with the Zoning Board to clarify their questions and concerns and bring information back to the next meeting.

Tom Hill – 12 Walker Drive – Mr. Hill stated that he had a couple of issues with the decisions made by the Planning Board regarding Greenfield Estates. He was not sure that everything that has taken place was legal and there were some outstanding issues going on. He did not see how there could possibly be a Phase I lot left to be developed after 25 years. Lot 15 is still sitting there as a substandard lot and he

July 12th, 2012 continued

could not see how that could possibly be a building lot. Mr. Hill stated that past Planning Boards have not let them add in the 25 acres into the development where this Planning Board does not seem to have a problem doing. The two lots up on the corners, Lots 6 and 7, do not meet road frontage and acreage requirements respectively. Mr. Hill stated that he lives on Lot 39 and his neighbor Mr. Clemmey lives on Lot 23. Mr. Clemmey also owns Lot 22, which he purchased on 2004. Mr. Hill stated that his issue is with the undeveloped portion of Walker Drive. In 2010, he received a letter from Mr. Hannah, the executor of Sarcom Estates, which stated that there was not any money and that they would not be developing the remainder of Walker Road, nor would they be doing any further maintenance of the road. Mr. Hill noted that his deed states that Sarcom will maintain and plow the road until such time it is turned over to the Town. The next correspondence they received was when they applied for lot line revisions. Mr. Hannah is proposing to give Walker Drive to both owners with a cross easement, which Mr. Hill did not agree to. He added that he was the only one that was using the roadway as a driveway and Mr. Hannah was proposing to give more than half of the easement to Mr. Clemmey. Since Mr. Hill was not in agreement, the Planning Board Chairman asked Mr. Hannah to contact him to see if they could work something out. Mr. Hill stated that the most recent proposal was for Mr. Clemmey to receive 53 feet and he would receive 67 feet, of which only 12' was level. He asked for the property lines to be flagged so that it would show where his driveway was, etc. This has not been done. The next map that was submitted by Mr. Hannah shows the edge of his driveway right at the edge of the property line. The only place that he would be able to push snow would be on someone else's property. There have been no negotiations or conversations with Mr. Hannah. Mr. Hill stated that he has been offered this "take it or leave it" offer. Mr. Hill stated that the proposal did not meet Town Code or the Zoning Law for several reasons. What is being proposed is a substandard driveway that is to be shared with a keyhole lot. Mr. Hill felt that this was extortion and that he did not feel that the Town was under any obligation to allow Mr. Clemmey to develop this keyhole lot. He moved to Greenfield for his privacy and green space. Mr. Hill stated that he was not sure how to proceed at this time. If the Town allows the back lots along the proposed Walker Drive to be combined with the 25 acre parcel in the rear it would leave him landlocked. Mr. Hill spoke with Mr. Hannah after the last Planning Board meeting and he indicated that if he knew that Lot 22 was not a buildable lot he would just give up the easement. However, Mr. McKenna has told him that if they have 40 feet for the driveway it could be a building lot. He felt that it was extortion that in order for him to own his driveway he would have to allow a keyhole lot. Mr. Hill was worried about having a substandard driveway and adequate access by emergency vehicles. He questioned what the Town Board's position was regarding this matter. Supervisor Rowland stated that there were a few issues here. There were some planning issues that need to be worked out with the Planning Board. In addition, there are some civil issues that would have to be worked out with Sarcom. Mr. Hill stated that the Planning Board had already ruled on this and was not sure that going back to them would do any good. Town Counsel stated that he was out of Town and unable to return a call to Mr. Hill prior to the Planning Board meeting. He explained to Mr. Hill that he would not have been able to do anything for him since he worked for the Town. Mr. Hill felt that as a Town citizen part of his tax dollars paid his salary and he should not have to pay for his own attorney. Town Counsel explained that Mr. Hill has a number of

July 12th, 2012 continued

concerns that seem to him to be concerns with how the Planning Board is or is not deciding the application of Sarcom. He felt that Mr. Hill also had some civil issues with Sarcom itself. Town Counsel stated that in his opinion, regardless of the validity of the concerns, he has not heard anything from Mr. Hill or the Planning Board Chairman that would be in his legal opinion a Town Board matter. Town Counsel questioned Mr. Hill as to whether the Planning Board made a ruling on the issue of the shared driveway at the last meeting, because it was his understanding that a ruling was not going to be made on this matter. Mr. Hill stated that what they said was that his easement was valid if he did not go along with the proposal of splitting it. Mr. Hill stated that he understood that there was a very fine line here as to what was a Town matter and what was civil. Town Counsel Schachner disagreed and stated that it was very clear to him. Mr. Hill questioned if the Town has any issue with the fact that a developer comes in and states that he is going to build a Town road for which they never got a road bond for and the road is never built. Town Counsel Schachner stated that he did not believe that the original Planning Board approval back in the 1980's was contingent upon granting the road to the Town. He added that the Planning Board can not bind the Town Board to accept the road even if it is offered to the Town. Town Counsel Schachner stated that as of this time he has not heard from Mr. Hill's attorney. It was his understanding that the Planning Board issued a ruling on the proposed modification of the subdivision but did not rule on the common driveway due to the fact that no agreement could be reached. Mr. Hill was disappointed that the Town was taking the position that he, as a property owner and taxpayer, was on his own. Mr. Hill added, that knowing lawyers, he could not believe that there was not some argument that could be made from the Town's standpoint to help resolve this matter. Mr. Hill stated that he was not willing to be extorted into giving up over half his driveway to Mr. Clemmey, have to pay for the legal fees for his lawyer to research his deed to make sure there are not any other easements on it and be stuck with a driveway that was substandard. Town Counsel Schachner reiterated that Mr. Hill did not agree to the offer that was presented to him so the Planning Board did not approve that portion of the application. Mr. Hill agreed and stated what they have now done is incorporate his driveway into lot 16. Town Counsel Schachner stated that in their original approval, Sarcom was granted approval for a certain number of lots. He was not sure of the exact number, however they were given development rights for a certain number of lots. Sarcom and/or its successors have decided that they do not want to develop that many lots and have proposed a modification of the subdivision which would merge some of the lots which would result in a smaller number of lots than was originally approved. Mr. Hill stated that was not true and that they would only have 3 years from when the subdivision was approved in 1988 to build out the subdivision. Town Counsel stated that was not the case. Kinsella, C. stated that when he was on the Planning Board Sarcom came back on several occasions for extensions, modification, etc. Kinsella, C. stated that if he was understanding correctly, in combining the lot they took away the paper street and Mr. Hill's easement was now part of the back lot. He added that Mr. Hill would have had frontage on a road if it had been built, but since it was not he would now have an easement to access his home. Town Counsel agreed and stated that would be an issue between Sarcom and Mr. Hill. Mr. Hill stated that he has spent a great deal of time and money defending his property rights. He did not ask Sarcom to build him a legitimate driveway since the existing driveway did not meet Town Code. However, the

July 12th, 2012 continued

Planning Board allowed a keyhole to be created on a substandard driveway. Mr. Hill stated that all he was looking for was his driveway easement and he would bring it up to code and maintain it. Town Counsel Schachner asked Mr. Hill if he has made that request with the Planning Board. Mr. Hill stated that Mr. Hannah never contacted him except for a map he handed him dated July 2nd and July 5th. Attached to the July 2nd map was a one line letter that stated they would deed to him 67 feet and Mr. Clemmey 53 feet, so that the current proposed road would go to them. Mr. Hill again stated that he was not going to be extorted into developing a substandard lot that Mr. Clemmey bought knowing full well that it was not a buildable lot. He did not feel that there was any legitimate attempt by Mr. Hannah to negotiate giving them this easement. Town Counsel Schachner again asked if Mr. Hill had brought this proposal to the Planning Board. Mr. Hill stated that he was told that it was a civil matter and that they could not get involved. He realized that the Town needed to walk the line but he felt that there must be some avenue to make Mr. Hannah either build or give up the easement. He was not looking for a public road to be built. He was just looking to take over his driveway and maintain it. Town Counsel Schachner stated that if what Mr. Hill has said was that he reached an agreement after the meeting with Mr. Hannah, he would be surprised that if this agreement was presented to the Planning Board that they would not approve it. Mr. Hill stated that it has been two years since he received the first letter from Mr. Hannah stating that they would no longer be able to maintain the road, i.e. plow snow, etc. He asked if the Highway would be able to handle plowing snow until this matter could be resolved. Town Counsel Schachner stated that there was no way that this could happen. The Town can not do any work on private property. Mr. Hill asked if it was the Board's opinion that a lot line adjustment can be made and the road dissolved while someone is living on it and at the same time just say the property owner is on their own. Supervisor Rowland stated that the Town Board did not say that and he did not believe that the Planning Board said that. Town Counsel Schachner did not feel that it was a fair characterization. He added that by law, the Town Board can not second guess the Planning Board. This Board appoints the Planning Board members as vacancies occur. The Town Board has no control over the Planning Board. Mr. Hill stated that he would like to resolve this and take over the road that Sarcom never built in the current condition that it is in. He was willing to allow minimal lot line adjustments on the easement. He was wondering if there was any possible avenue that the Town could take to help Sarcom and himself resolve this matter. Town Counsel Schachner again stated that Mr. Hill needed to bring the agreement that was reached between the two of them back to the Planning Board. Mr. Hill stated that due to past history he did not feel that Mr. Hannah would honor that agreement, however he would write a letter to him and send a copy to the Town asking to take that agreement to the Planning Board. Mr. Hill stated that he was not convinced that the Town could not do anything and felt that they should do more.

Denise Jenks – Wilsey Road - Mrs. Jenks wanted to talk about the proposed cluster development on the Makkay property. She stated that they have been before the Zoning Board regarding road frontage. Mrs. Jenks feels that the required road frontage in a cluster development should be whatever is required in the zone it is being proposed, which in this case is 200 feet. Mrs. Jenks understood that because it was a cluster development some people think that the frontage should be decreased. She asked how the Board would determine what amount the frontage would be decreased to. Town

July 12th, 2012 continued

Counsel Schachner noted that this was one of the items that the ZBA had forwarded to the Town Board for review. He believed what they were asking was if the Town Board wanted to consider reducing the frontage requirement for a cluster development which would require an amendment to the Subdivision Regulations. Town Counsel Schachner noted that if the Town Board were to entertain making a change to the Cluster Development regulations reducing the required frontage, it would be generic to all cluster developments and not specific to this one particular development. Mrs. Jenks stated that some of the lots are quite small and the majority of them have under 200 feet of road frontage. Mrs. Jenks also stated that Mr. Makkay was approved for a ZBA hearing on June 5th to be held in July. He also went to the Planning Board to talk about the same thing on June 12th. She asked who would ultimately make that frontage decision. Mr. Jenks stated that this proposed development has been in the works for 3 years and they did not know anything about it and questioned why the Town did not tell them about it sooner. Kinsella, C. stated that neighbors are notified prior to a public hearing being held. Kinsella, C. added that it was not unusual for an applicant to be before both boards as the same time. Mr. Jenks stated that he is also concerned about the water run off from the proposed development coming on to their property. Kinsella, C. stated that water concerns would be something that would be addressed at the Planning Board during their review process. Supervisor Rowland stated that the Town Board will have to review the information provided by the ZBA and determine if they want to amend the regulations. If so, it will require a local law to amend the Subdivision Regulations which would require a public hearing to be held by the Town Board. Town Counsel Schachner noted that he was just reviewing the draft minutes from the ZBA meeting and it appears to him that they passed a resolution stating that they were supporting the interpretation of the Code Enforcement Officer that a frontage reduction in a Cluster Development is not allowed under the current regulations.

Caboose Day - Town Clerk stated that the Board had approved the request of the Historical Society to hold an Open House at the Caboose again this year. The Historical Society is asking for the Town to cover the cost of the portable toilet for the event as they have in the past.

RESOLUTION # 98 - Approve Portable Toilet Rental for
Caboose Day

Motion: Chandler, C.

Seconded: Pemrick, C.

RESOLVED, That the Town Board hereby authorizes the rental of a portable toilet for Caboose Day to be held on August 11th, 2012.

VOTE: Ayes: Rowland, Pemrick, Kinsella, Cochran, Chandler

Noes: None

Highway Dept. Budget - Kinsella, C. stated that he was looking at the monthly financial statements and saw that as of the end of June, a little over 50% of the budget had been spent. Kinsella, C. asked if that was due to the cost of the truck, excess spending, etc. and wondered if they would be able to stay within budget for the year. Duane Wright, Highway Clerk, stated that everything was okay and they were right where they should be for this time of year. Supervisor Rowland asked if the CHIPS check had been received. Duane stated that the CHIPS information had been submitted however they have not received the check as of yet.

July 12th, 2012 continued

Brookhaven – Duane Wright presented the Board with a report regarding current expenditures. He asked the Board to consider the purchase of a rough mower at a cost of \$50,000. At the present time there is no large “gang mower” to be use to mow the rough. What is happening now is that the other new small mowers that have been purchased this past year are being used 11 hours a day in order to try and keep up. This is not the right equipment to be using and it is beating up some of the newer equipment. Pemrick, C. added the individuals operating those machines could be spending more time on other things that need to be done. Duane also updated the Board on the railing for the new deck with handicapped access. The original estimate was approximately \$4,000. As of this time he has not received a detailed invoice for the railing, however it looks like the cost of the railing is going to be more like \$8,000. The railing for along the handicapped ramp itself had been left out. Duane stated that approximately \$4,700. is left from the original approval to spend UDAG funds. He will be able to cover the original \$4,000. however he is going to need additional funds if it turns out to be closer to \$8,000. Duane asked the Board to consider approving \$54,000. UDAG expenditure. For informational purposes, Duane updated the Board regarding the motor for the pump house, which totally quit. There were 3 electric motors that were supposed to be used as a backup that have not been tested and did not work. They have rented a backup pump that will put out 800 gallons per minute. In the meantime, they have taken a motor from the Highway Department which they are modifying. The cost should be between \$200. & \$300. The motor should be installed within the next week. The cost to modify the motor will come out of the Brookhaven budget. Duane added that since there is not a backup for the system, they could purchase the rental pump. The rental cost would be eliminated, The cost of the new pump would be \$9,650 which would also be paid for out of the Brookhaven budget. Chandler, C. stated that he toured the course recently and was very impressed. Everything was going very well and he thought it was a great asset for the Town. Supervisor Rowland stated that there have been a lot of positive comments about the condition of the course, the employees, etc. He added that the purchase of the backup pump was necessary in order to maintain the course. It would also be portable so that it could be used in other areas if necessary. Pemrick, C. noted that the course is 50 years old and has been neglected. In spite of the hard work that has been done up there, it is things like this pump and other infrastructure up there that has been neglected. He hoped that the Town would continue its commitment to spending some money up there when necessary on the course, simply because of the potential that it offers to the Town and its residents.

RESOLUTION # 99 - Approve UDAG Expenditure

Motion: Pemrick, C.

Seconded: Chandler, C.

RESOLVED, That the Town Board hereby authorizes the purchase of a Rough Mower at a cost of \$50,000 as well as an additional \$4,000. for the railing for the handicapped ramp to be paid for from the UDAG Fund.

VOTE: Ayes: Rowland, Pemrick, Kinsella, Cochran, Chandler

Noes: None

Monthly reports were submitted by the Highway Supt, UDAG Revolving Loan Fund, Town Clerk and the Town Supervisor.

July 12th, 2012 continued

RESOLUTION # 100 – Highway Bills

Motion: Pemrick, C.

Seconded: Cochran, C.

RESOLVED, That Highway Bills # 150 to #174 in the amount of \$117,675.66 be paid, subject to audit.

VOTE: Ayes: Rowland, Pemrick, Kinsella Cochran, Chandler

Noes: None

RESOLUTION # 101 – General Bills

Motion: Pemrick, C.

Seconded: Chandler, C.

RESOLVED, That General Bills # 326 to # 392 in the amount of \$30,395.07 be paid, subject to audit.

VOTE: Ayes: Rowland, Pemrick, Kinsella Cochran, Chandler

Noes: None

RESOLUTION # 102 – Park Bills

Motion: Pemrick, C.

Seconded: Kinsella, C.

RESOLVED, That Park Bills # 149 to # 187 in the amount of \$21,672.71 be paid, subject to audit.

VOTE: Ayes: Rowland, Pemrick, Kinsella, Cochran, Chandler

Noes: None

RESOLUTION # 103 – UDAG Bills

Motion: Pemrick, C.

Seconded: Chandler, C.

RESOLVED, That UDAG Bill # 12 in the amount of \$2,175.00 be paid, subject to audit.

VOTE: Ayes: Rowland, Pemrick, Kinsella, Cochran, Chandler

Noes: None

On motion of Cochran, C. and seconded by Pemrick, C., the meeting was adjourned at 9:25 PM.

Town Clerk